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This mixed method study aimed to redress the gap in the literature on academic service-learning partnerships, especially in Eastern settings. It utilized Enos and Morton’s (2003) theoretical framework to explore these partnerships at the American University in Cairo (AUC). Seventy-nine community partners, administrators, faculty members, and students from a diverse range of age, citizenship, racial, educational, and professional backgrounds participated in the study. Qualitative interviews were conducted with members of these four groups, and a survey with both close-ended and open-ended questions administered to students yielded 61 responses. Qualitative analyses revealed that the primary motivators for partners’ engagement in service-learning partnerships included contributing to the community, enhancing students’ learning and growth, and achieving the civic mission of the University. These partnerships were characterized by short-term relationships with partners’ aspiring to progress toward long-term commitments. The challenges to these partnerships included issues pertaining to the institution, partnering organizations, culture, politics, pedagogy, students, and faculty members. Key strategies for improving these partnerships included institutionalizing service-learning in the University and cultivating an institutional culture supportive of community engagement. Quantitative analyses showed statistically significant relationships between students’ scores on the Community Awareness and Interpersonal
Effectiveness scales and their overall participation in community service activities inside and outside the classroom, as well as a statistically significant difference between their scores on the Community Awareness scale and department offering service-learning courses. The study’s outcomes underscore the role of the local culture in shaping service-learning partnerships, as well as the role of both curricular and extracurricular activities in boosting students’ awareness of their community and interpersonal effectiveness. Cultivating a culture of community engagement and building support mechanisms for engaged scholarship are among the critical steps required by public policy-makers in Egypt to promote service-learning in Egyptian higher education.

Institutionalizing service-learning partnerships at AUC and enhancing the visibility of these partnerships on campus and in the community are essential to the future growth of these collaborations. Future studies should explore factors affecting community partners’ satisfaction with these partnerships, top-down and bottom-up support to service-learning, the value of reflection to faculty members, and the influence of students’ economic backgrounds on their involvement in service-learning partnerships.
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Preface

Impetus for Research

My passion for the topic of this dissertation springs from several factors, including my personal experiences, volunteer work, teaching career, religion, and mother. These factors are discussed in some detail in the third chapter. Given the close ties between the first two factors—personal experiences and volunteer work—and the research topic, I elaborate on them in this introduction. While I grew up in a middle-class family, I often saw myself in the lives of the less privileged. Since my childhood, I have seen several types of oppression, with child labor breaking my heart the most. I felt empathy with the oppressed, sad for my inability to redress injustices, and angry with a society that perpetuates inequalities. While growing older, I developed understanding of the concepts of exploitation and unearned privilege. During my early adulthood, I actively sought volunteer opportunities in an effort to clear my conscience by alleviating the suffering of the disadvantaged. In Message, the biggest non-governmental organization (NGO) in Egypt and the region, I worked shoulder to shoulder alongside fellow youths on a variety of social service activities, such as preparing food packages for the needy, entertaining children with special needs, visiting the elderly, and planning and implementing after-school programs for underserved children and youth. My volunteer work led me to experience positive feelings, including that I was contributing to the lives of the underprivileged. Watching the hard work, enthusiasm, and sincerity of fellow...
volunteers increased my hope for, and belief in, a better tomorrow for Egypt. Most importantly, this work deepened my understanding of societal ills; I came to a realization that while volunteer work may enhance life conditions for the suffering groups, it is neither enough nor sustainable.

This realization led me to decide to pursue my childhood dream to earn a doctorate. I thought that obtaining a Ph.D. degree would allow me access to positions through which I could affect larger and sustainable positive social change. Engaged scholarship literature, among other readings, introduced me to the notion of structural causes of problems. I particularly credit the article by Marullo and Edwards (2000), *From Charity to Justice: The Potential of University-Community Collaboration for Social Change*, for directing my attention to the indispensable importance of addressing the core causes of societal ills as a first essential step to eradicating them rather than focusing exclusively on treating the symptoms, which is a typical practice at the vast majority of NGOs.

My newfound understanding of how to effectively address social issues empowered me to start applying this notion in my dissertation. I could not find a better and a more sustainable strategy for eliminating societal ills than making an effort to connect higher education with the community. Similar to Sockett’s (1998) view, I believe that the byproduct is bigger than the sum of the whole. I developed this work in the hope of connecting expert knowledge in the academy with practitioner wisdom in the community for the benefit of both and the greater society. My ultimate goal is to connect my scholarship with efforts to advance the public good. By connecting higher education
to the community, I hope to advance our capabilities as scholars and practitioners to abolish inequalities, promote social justice, better the lives of the poor, enhance life quality for ordinary people, and cultivate a participatory democracy in society.

**Rationale for Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Egyptian Higher Education**

While promoting service-learning partnerships between the university and the community is a desirable endeavor across the globe, it is critically needed in Egypt for three important reasons. First, Egypt has been experiencing a state of deterioration, which was intensified over the last three decades. Poverty, high levels of unemployment, low wages, low quality of public social services, authoritarianism, and bureaucracy (Richards, 2002) are examples of the humiliation common Egyptians have been suffering on a daily basis.

An examination of Egyptian history would lead one to realize that the current degrading condition of the Country is atypical to its past. Egypt is a venerable nation, more than 5,000 years old (Junior Worldmark Encyclopedia of the Nations, 2007; Mayton, 2008) and is typically described as the cradle of civilization. For example, Encyclopedia Britannica (2012) referred to Egypt as “the site of one of the world’s earliest urban and literate societies.” The Great Pyramids of Giza along with a myriad number of ancient monuments spreading all over the Country and displayed abroad reflect a distinguished past.

In addition to its glorious history, Egypt is known for its bright minds. Ahmed Zewail (scientist) and Naguib Mahfouz (novelist) are among the Egyptian icons who earned the Nobel Prize for their distinct achievements. In the same vein, Encyclopedia
Britannica (2012) described Egypt as “one of the intellectual and cultural centres of the Arab and Islamic world.” The Country was known, for long periods, as a mineral of scholarship such that many students sought their higher education in the nation and Egyptian scholars were hired to teach in several countries across the globe, especially in the Arab and Muslim worlds. Moreover, Egypt is privileged with a strategic geographic location in North Africa with the Sinai Peninsula in Asia (Junior Worldmark Encyclopedia of the Nations, 2007). Egypt is also rich with natural beauty with many of its cities overlooking the Mediterranean and Red Seas as well as the River Nile.

Several factors caused the current miserable condition of Egypt. Examples of these factors include the exploitation of the nation’s resources during the colonial eras; allocating significant portions of its resources to the wars of 1948, 1956, 1967, and 1973; uneven trade treaties imposed by economic powers; and corruption and authoritarianism of the Country’s government (Richards, 2002). Regardless of the cause, the widespread societal ills in Egypt call upon higher education to intervene to confront them. In order for this intervention to be authentic and sustainable, higher education should collaborate with the community in defining and addressing these ills. Service-learning partnerships are an effective strategy for establishing a connection between higher education and the community. Thus, I call upon Egyptian academia to seek these partnerships to advance the public good in society and restore the glory of the past that our ancestors built.

Second, establishing service-learning partnerships between the university and the community could be an effective approach for addressing violence and radicalism, serious problems spreading among some groups of young people in Egypt, as is the case
in other countries. Injustices, especially economic ones, are widespread in Egyptian society. These injustices coupled with dictatorial practices of previous governments that marginalized youth and hardly allowed any opportunities for ordinary people to voice their concerns led some youth to join and/or support violent opposition movements to express their frustrations with miserable life conditions prevailing in the nation. Resorting to violence is not atypical to young people; as criminologists explained: The use of violence is overwhelmingly a phenomenon of youth (Richards, 2002). The typical reaction of previous governments to this problem was to arrest these young people, send them to long periods of detention, force them to live in inhumane conditions, and torture them. From a moral standpoint, these practices are unethical, shameful, and violate human rights. In practical terms, handling youth violence with extreme measures of punishment and humiliation heighten this problem instead of solving it.

Rather than suppressing and intimidating young people with abuse of power, I believe that allowing them opportunities to express their feelings of oppression and anger through legitimate channels would be an effective solution to this problem. Because reflection is built into service-learning pedagogy, engaging students in these courses would afford them opportunities to express any negative feelings that they have, as well as converse and receive support from peers and the instructor. Additionally, the practical aspect of service-learning courses would help youth to turn their negative feelings into positive energy; service-learning provides students with legitimate avenues through which they can confront societal injustices, play a role in correcting them, and make a positive difference in the community. Engagement in such activities may alleviate
youth’s feelings of vulnerability and increase their sense of self-efficacy to enact positive change.

In addition to its potential to address violence among youth, service-learning can promote Egyptian youth’s capability to succeed in the competitive global workforce by affording them professional development opportunities. For example, participation in service-learning enables students to establish connections with many individuals on campus and in the community, thus increasing their social capital and honing their interpersonal effectiveness skills. Also, service-learning equips students with practical experiences, a critical requirement for employment.

Third, I author this work at a point in time that the media has described as “Arab Spring.” This dissertation started before the January 25th Egyptian Revolution of 2011, continued during, and finished shortly after the Revolution. At the present time, Egypt undergoes fundamental changes, including alteration in the constitution, change in legislations and laws; appearance of new political parties and orientations, and most importantly emergence of youth activism. In addition to these grand changes, there exist many competing visions of thinking about what is the right thing that should be done. The new situation created by the Revolution calls into question the role of higher education in shaping the nation’s future. Indeed, there has never been a more critical time than the present for Egyptian higher education to connect with its society. Therefore, my humble research effort calls upon Egyptian higher education to seize this rare opportunity by collaborating with communities to prepare students for active citizenry, enhance life quality for common people, and advance the Country.
Audience

This dissertation may attract a broad audience from higher education, policy, and community arenas both at national and global levels. Specifically, senior administrators at institutions of higher education aspiring to embrace the civic mission of their institutions could draw on the outcomes of this study to cultivate an institutional culture that supports engaged scholarship on their campuses. Likewise, senior administrators who are skeptical about the scholarship of engagement may deem this work helpful as it deepens understanding of the rationale for endorsing this type of scholarship as well as documents the value of service-learning partnerships to the university with its multiple constituents. Also, staff members at service-learning offices/centers could use this work as a resource from which to extract ideas and strategies to support university and community partners. Faculty members, especially those who are new to service-learning pedagogy, could utilize this dissertation as a guide in planning and teaching fulfilling service-learning courses for students and community partners. College students may find this dissertation a source of inspiration and empowerment to become agents of positive change in their communities while enriching themselves with experiential education.

In addition to the potential appeal of this work to higher education constituents, this dissertation could be useful to others outside of academe. In particular, community constituents—whether they are civil society organizations, corporations, government bodies, or other entities—may benefit from this work as it unveils untapped opportunities to enlarge their impact on society by partnering with institutions of higher education, as well as discusses how to facilitate these partnerships. Parents or guardians of college
students could deem this dissertation an eye-opening reading for understanding the
critical role that they can play in encouraging and/or supporting college students’
involvement in the community as an integral component of their academic experience.
Funding agencies focusing on promoting engaged scholarship in higher education may
find this dissertation informative in both developing calls for grants and reviewing
applications based on the principles of exemplary partnerships described in this
dissertation. Public policy-makers wanting to ensure that policies governing higher
education lead to advancing the public good may use the outcomes of this dissertation as
supporting evidence to highlight the need for applying modifications on existing policies
and/or initiating new ones that advance the civic goals of higher education.

Finally, researchers aiming to bridge the gap between the university and the
community could expand their understanding of service-learning partnerships and gain
new insights into these collaborations by reading this work. This dissertation is
particularly informative to researchers interested in exploring the role of culture in
shaping university-community partnerships, and to those focusing on comparative
studies; having been conducted in Egypt, the outcomes of this dissertation facilitate
cross-cultural comparisons.

Layout of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. The first chapter, Introduction,
provides a foundation for understanding service-learning partnerships in higher education
and introduces Enos and Morton’s (2003) theoretical framework utilized in the study.
The use of this framework responds to the calls for theoretically-based investigations of
service-learning research. The second chapter, Literature Review, presents a critical examination of the literature as it pertains to three major areas: the rationale for; progression models and orientations of; and institutional factors facilitating these partnerships. The third chapter, Method, offers a detailed explanation of the methods used in the study. The use of a mixed design along with the comprehensive nature of the study is an important response to increasing the rigor of service-learning research. The fourth chapter, Findings and Results, delineates the outcomes of the study, reflecting four unique perspectives of community partners, administrators, faculty members, and students. The fifth and last chapter, Conclusion, offers a succinct summary of the study, implications for policy, practice, and research, as well as a discussion of the study’s limitations and contributions.
Chapter On: Introduction

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. (Marullo & Edwards, 2000, p. 911)

With a firm belief in the positive impacts of connecting universities to communities, the author of this dissertation embarks on this study hoping to add knowledge to the literature, and expand understanding of university-community collaborations, especially for service-learning. The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the reader to the topic under study, university-community partnerships for service-learning. The chapter begins by presenting operational definitions of the key terms used in this study. It then provides a brief overview of the scholarship of engagement. After that, the discussion turns to service-learning as a strategy for advancing engaged scholarship. This discussion is followed by an argument, demonstrating the connections between service-learning and partnerships. Finally, this chapter concludes by providing a detailed description of the theoretical framework employed in this research, and its use in the study.

Operational Definitions

Making clear distinctions among terms is crucial to promoting the work at institutions of higher education (Bringle, Hatcher, & Holland, 2007). For the purposes of clarity and preciseness, this section briefly discusses the three key terms, “service-
learning,” “community,” and “partnership,” used in this research and introduces operational definition for each term.

**Service-learning.**

Although the literature offers many definitions for service-learning (e.g., Barber, 1994; Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Ehrlich, 2000; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Furco, 2003; Howard, 2003; Kolibia, 2000; McCarthy, 2003; Schwartzman, 2002; Sigmon, 1979, 1996; Smith, 2004; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999; Stevens, 2001; Treuthart, 2003), there is no one universal accepted definition for this term (Furco, 2003). This section provides examples of service-learning definitions and introduces the operational definition used in this study. According to Jacoby (1996), service-learning is a type of experiential learning in which students are engaged in activities that focus on human and community issues, along with structured opportunities deliberately designed to advance student learning and development. Ehrlich (2000) defined service-learning as the various pedagogies that link community service and academic study so that each strengthens the other. The basic theory of service-learning is Dewey’s: The interaction of knowledge and skills with experience is key to learning. (p. 16)

Hunter and Brisbin (2000) referred to service-learning as a type of experiential learning in which classroom instruction is strengthened by community service. McCarthy (2003) defined service-learning as, “Linking academic instruction with the community service, guided by reflection” (p. 2).

Butin (2010) noted that service-learning connects academic coursework with community service within the framework of reflection, reciprocity, respect, and relevance. Scheibel, Bowley, and Jones (2005) defined service-learning as a process in
which an academic course encompasses student participation in meaningful community work that supports course concepts. Drawing on the definitions provided in the literature for the term, academic service-learning in this dissertation research is defined as an experiential pedagogy that intentionally connects course content with community service so that each improves the other for the benefit of all involved participants. Reflection, reciprocity, democracy, and respect are fundamental concepts in ideal service-learning courses.

The emphasis on combining academic study and community service is a common thread among the above definitions. In this regard, O’Byrne (2001) reminded us that academic service-learning is distinct from other forms of community-based learning activities, such as internships, practica, and fieldwork; while these activities are valuable, they lack the connection to the curriculum, which is part and parcel of service-learning. The emphasis on reciprocity between the campus and the community in service-learning is another key distinction between this pedagogy and other types of co-curricular and extracurricular service (e.g., Furco, 1996; Jacoby, 1996 & 2003; Kretchmar, 2001; Marullo & Edwards, 2000; Sigmon, 1979; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000). In this respect, Bringle Hatcher, Hamilton, and Young (2001) argued that service-learning courses establish reciprocal relationships between the university and the community within which each partner contributes and benefits. Reflection is another core element of service-learning (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby). McCarthy (2003) noted that reflection is an effective strategy to connect theory to practice. It helps students put their experiences
into context, and motivate them to become engaged in what they learn in their classes and what they experience at their service-learning sites.

**Community.**

According to the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (2011), the term, “community,” may refer to a group that self-identifies by age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, illness or health condition. It may also refer to a common interest or cause, a sense of identification or shared need or emotional connection, common values or norms, mutual influence. Defining community in a community-campus partnership pertains more to the process of responding to critical questions than to developing a precise definition of what constitute a community. Examples of these questions include, “Are those most affected by the issue being addressed at the table? Are those who have a stake in the issue being addressed at the table? Are community members at the table? Do they play decision making roles?” (CCPH).

A number of scholars use the term, “community,” to refer to agency staff members and/or clients of not-for-profit agencies. Yet others interpret community as a neighborhood or geographic location (Cruz & Giles, 2000). For instance, Jacoby (2003) explained that the term, “community,” in service learning refers to “local neighborhoods, the state, the nation, and the global community” (p. 4). She noted that the human and community needs that academic service-learning courses address are those issues defined by the community. In this dissertation, the term, community, refers to not-for-profit organizations that work in their local neighborhoods to address pressing societal needs. It is necessary to note that the names of these organizations may differ, depending on their
geographic locations. For example, these agencies are commonly called civil society organizations in Egypt, the country where the empirical study of this dissertation research was conducted.

**Partnerships.**

CCPH (2010) defined a partnership as, “A close mutual co-operation between parties having common interests, responsibilities, privileges, and power.” The use of the term, “partnerships,” varies in the literature; many scholars use the term in a general sense to refer to any types of interactions while others distinguish between partnerships and relationships. For example, a number of scholars raised questions concerning the accuracy and appropriateness of using the term partnership to describe the relationships between institutions of higher education and communities. They argued that the power differential between the two entities is too big to even allow for the development of a real equal relationship between universities and communities (Jacoby, 2003). Another way of differentiating between partnerships and other kinds of institutional relationships is to ask the question, who benefits? “If the answer is not ‘all parties,’ the arrangement is not a true partnership” (Grobe, 1990, p. 6). Similarly, Sigmon (1979) stressed that service-learning takes place only when both the providers and recipients of service benefit from the activities.

Bringle, Clayton, and Price (2009) differentiated between the two terms, “relationships” and “partnerships,” suggesting that the former is a broad term that could be used to refer to all kinds of interactions among persons, whereas the latter refers to the relationships that are characterized by three specific qualities: closeness, equity, and
integrity. For the purposes of this dissertation research, the term, “partnerships,” is used to refer to all types of interactions between universities and community-based organizations in service-learning.

**Service-learning partners.**

There is a growing body of literature that attempts to accurately identify the various participants in service-learning and civic engagement initiatives. For example, Ash, Clayton, and Atkinson’s (2005) graphical representation of the partners in service-learning used a Venn diagram that includes students, faculty/staff members, and community partners. Jacoby’s (2003) work on partnerships for service-learning explored individual and group partners, such as community agencies, local neighborhoods, schools, and corporate partners. In the Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning, Bringle and Hatcher (1996, 2000) included campus administration, faculty members, and students as partners in service-learning. Bringle et al. (2009) noted that service-learning and civic engagement encompass interactions among individuals. Accordingly, each of these individuals is a candidate to the term, “partner,” and that the relationships between and among all of them can be explored and evaluated. In this dissertation research, the term, “service-learning partners,” refers to students, faculty and staff members, as well as staff and clients of community-based organizations who participate in service-learning.

**The Scholarship of Engagement**

In his pioneering work, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate*, Boyer (1990) challenged traditional conceptualizations of scholarship, calling upon
higher education scholars to consider promoting what he named, the “scholarship of engagement.” In describing this type of scholarship, Boyer noted:

At one level, the scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of the university to the most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems, to our children, to our teachers, and to our cities... Campuses would be viewed by both students and professors not as isolated islands, but as staging grounds for action... Ultimately, the scholarship of engagement also means creating a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other, helping to enlarge what anthropologist Clifford Geertz describes as the universe of human discourse and enriching the quality of life for all of us. (p. 19-20)

Boyer’s call for developing the scholarship of engagement is a good way to interrelate and enhance the three common types of scholarship: research, teaching, and service. The section that follows demonstrates that institutionalizing service-learning in higher education is an effective strategy for promoting the ideals of engaged scholarship.

Service-learning.

Service-learning is well-suited for advancing the scholarship of engagement through collaborative work that is consistent with the missions of institutions of higher education. Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education transforms college campuses in various ways pertaining to reinvigorating the civic purposes of higher education (Boyer, 1997; Holland, 1997, 1999; Rice, 1996; Zlokowski, 1999). Past research indicated that service-learning courses are associated with various positive outcomes for all involved participants; these impacts are described in detail in the second chapter. Bringle et al. (2001) argued that service-learning provides a high standard for all civic engagement endeavors because its emphasis on dialogue and reciprocity alters the commonly held assumption that expertise is a resource that resides only in the academy
and is to be shared, at its discretion, with the community. They further explained that service-learning recognizes that knowledge, skills, and wisdom exist both inside and outside of the academy, and that community representatives should play substantial roles in knowledge generation and student education.

Likewise, Zlotkowski (1999) explained that a notable difference between service-learning courses and other community–related initiatives is that, with the former, the issues addressed are defined by the community, and not the campus, stressing, “Service-learning deliberately seeks to reverse the long-established academic practice of using the community for the academy’s own ends” (original emphasis, p. 98). As such, Bringle et al. (2001) argued that service-learning is a “smart” choice for institutions of higher education, emphasizing that increasing the role of community service as a means for civic education is also meaningful to the extent to which it is a socially and morally responsible choice.

**University-community partnerships.**

Establishing partnerships between universities and their local communities can result in substantial change on campus and in the community (Harkavy, 2009). In this regard, Swick (2001) asserted that mutual learning and growth can be realized when higher education, students, and the community work with each other. Many scholars advocate for campus-community partnerships to become a more intentional element for achieving the service mission of higher education (e.g., Benson & Harkavy, 2000; Boyer, 1990; Bringle, 1999; Enos & Morton, 2003; Jacoby, 2003). The involvement of institutions of higher education in their communities can take several forms, such as
structured community-service and volunteer opportunities for students, service-learning courses, research focused on community concerns, resource sharing, as well as training and continuing education programs for representatives of community based-organizations (Scheibel, Bowley, & Jones, 2005).

**University-community partnerships for service-learning.**

Significantly, Bringle and Hatcher (2002) argued that service-learning is the most meaningful way to build campus-community partnerships. In justifying their argument, they noted that service-learning embraces the fundamental mission of higher education—teaching and learning—and that it engages students and faculty members in academically meaningful service activities that address issues in their communities. They also explained that service-learning recognizes professionals of community-based organizations as co-educators. In the same vein, Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett (2000) noted that service-learning leads to more forms of civic engagement which can promote other scholarly activities. Likewise, Zlotkowki (1996, 1999) asserted that service-learning entails continuing dialogues among all partners to ensure successful delivery of its courses.

Campus-community partnerships have become recognized as connected to service-learning both as a means for providing students with service experiences, and for assessing the impact of service-learning (Bailis, 2000; Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Dorado & Giles, 2004; Gelmon, Holland, Seifer, Shinnamon, & Connors, 1998; Jacoby, 2003; Jones, 2003). Bailis concisely explained that “service-learning and partnerships are two
sides of the same coin” (p. 5). Likewise, Jacoby asserted that “service-learning must be grounded in a network, or a web, of authentic, democratic, reciprocal partnerships” (p. 6).

Sandy and Holland (2006) placed a high emphasis on campus-community partnerships in relation to service-learning, explaining that it is hard to envision how service-learning may take place in the absence of community-campus partnerships. Similarly, Kelshaw, Lazarus, and Minier (2009) asserted that partnerships are necessary for the initiation, implementation, and development of the service-learning experiences. In the same vein, Cruz and Giles (2000) postulated that partnership between the university and the community is the infrastructure that facilitates both service and learning in service-learning. They suggested that the partnership is an intervening variable in examining particular learning and service impacts, and as an outcome in itself. Cruz and Giles further explained that focusing on the partnerships as a unit of analysis provides a framework for generalization across communities, and also facilitates studies examining the changes in both service and learning. The sections that follow discuss the use of theory in this study, introduce the theoretical perspective employed in the study, and describe the modifications applied on this perspective.

**Theoretical Framework**

Kelinger (1986) defined theory as, “A set of interrelated constructs (concepts), definitions, and propositions that present a systematic view of phenomena by specifying relations among variables, with the purpose of explaining and predicting the phenomena” (p. 9). Goetz and LeCompte (1984) advocated incorporating theoretical perspectives into
scholar studies, noting that the use of theory contributes to the trustworthiness of research studies. Enos and Morton’s (2003) conceptualization of transactional and transformative relationships along with their theory for the Development of University-Community Partnerships serve as an analytic guide for this dissertation. This section opens by describing both transactional and transformative relationships and highlighting the differences among them. It then introduces Enos and Morton’s typology for the Development of University-Community collaborations. This part is followed by a section describing the modifications applied to the graphic representation of typology as used in the study. After that, a detailed discussion of the specific uses of the theory in the study is provided.

Transactional and transformative relationships.

Inspired by the work of Burns (1978) on transactional and transformative leadership relationships, Enos and Morton (2003) proposed a theoretical perspective for examining campus-community partnerships as they move from transactional to transformative relationships. They argued that these partnerships have the ability not only to accomplish specific tasks, but also to transform individuals, institutions, organizations, and communities. Enos and Morton provided a thoughtful discussion concerning the differences between transactional and transformative relationships (see Table 1 for a list of differences, p. 25).
Table 1

*Transactional and Transformative Relationships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis of relationship</td>
<td>Exchange-based and utilitarian</td>
<td>Focus on ends beyond utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End goal Purpose</td>
<td>Satisfaction with exchange</td>
<td>Mutual increase in aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles played by partners</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Arouses needs to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of existing institutional goals</td>
<td>Accepts institutional goals</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>Works with systems to satisfy interests of partners</td>
<td>Transcends self-interests to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner identity</td>
<td>Maintains institutional identity</td>
<td>Change group identity in large definition of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of commitment</td>
<td>Limited time, resources, personnel to specific exchanges</td>
<td>Engages whole institutions in potentially unlimited exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enos and Morton (2003) posited that transactional relationships operate within existing structures in which partners connect together because each has something that the other perceives as useful. These relationships are instrumental and project-based. They are characterized by limited commitments and minimum disruption of the regular work of the organizations and their constituents. By the end of transactional relationships, partners feel contented with the outcomes, but not much changed. Transformative relationships progress in less defined manners and there are expectations that things may be altered and order may be disrupted. These relationships are characterized by genuine and long-term commitments. Partners reflect deeply on their organizations and examine the way they define and comprehend problems. According to
Enos and Morton, transformative relationships can lead to the development of new values and identities for partners.

**Typology for the development of campus-community partnerships.**

In light of their framework, Enos and Morton (2003) offered a typology for the development of campus-community partnerships (see Figure 1 for the graphical representation of this typology, p. 27). They posited that the depth and complexity of campus-community partnerships increases over time. They also suggested that the development of campus-community partnerships does not follow a linear fashion. Rather, the development of such partnerships could be better perceived as “accretions that are layered over time” (p. 26). This framework is comprised of five levels based on the depth and complexity of the partnership: one–time events and projects; short-term placements; ongoing placemats, mutual dependence; core partnerships, interdependence; and transformation, joint creation of work and knowledge.
One–time events and projects.

Enos and Morton (2003) noted that one–time events and projects, such as painting, clean-ups, and grant writing require partners to disclose little about themselves. These projects are characterized by few risks and limited accountability. Additionally, there is hardly any disagreement or conflict with the perceived powerful partners, and the definition of the collaborative work is rarely challenged. Accordingly, it is less likely that such relationships would lead to the generation of new knowledge or transformation of the partners. The public facets of such events usually come in the form of celebrations and confirming common views rather than diverse and open dialogues. Enos and Morton explained that one–time events and projects could be a drain on the resources of agencies; the time spent in planning and co-ordination could be greater than what agencies get in
return. Yet, these projects could be a way of recognizing each partner’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. Such projects could also be a means for partners to learn about opportunities for future collaborations and whether or not their interests and missions align. Before getting involved with such projects, it is important for institutions of higher education to initiate conversations with community-based organizations to see if the goals of this partnership are only short-term or whether there is a likelihood for future sustained collaborative work (Enos & Morton).

*Short-term placements.*

Enos and Morton (2003) observed that service-learning partnerships that are based on short-term placements usually last for an academic semester. They explained that similar to one–time events and projects, short-term placements require limited accountability that continues until the end of the academic semester, and there is usually little change to existing structures within universities and community-based organizations. Yet, these placements provide community partners with free labor for a reasonable period of time that could rationalize the time spent in training and supervising service-learners. The interactions that occur in short-term placements can generate simple problems for partners to think about and learn from their way of addressing these issues. Yet, managing placements of relatively short periods can be a burden on the resources of universities and communities. In such arrangements, faculty members often utilize student service experience to demonstrate or confirm existing academic knowledge. Enos and Morton maintained that short-term placements may push both faculty and students to become sympathetic, but they will remain politically neutral.
spectators of the public issues experienced by the service sites. Although the cost-benefit proportion of short-term placements may allow partners to sustain them, it is less likely that such relationships would generate new knowledge or transform partners.

**Ongoing placemats, mutual dependence.**

According to Enos and Morton (2003), ongoing placemats and mutual dependence describe what takes place when short-term placements are sustained over time. Therefore, the members involved in campus-community partnerships are able to reap benefits while reducing costs of their collaboration. In this stage, it is likely that partners will begin to understand how their respective institutions and organizations operate around mundane or critical issues, such as scheduling and funding. Partners may also start to appreciate the various constituents that each serves and the moral dilemmas with which each of them struggles. In this stage, partners feel satisfied that their interests and perceptions, which led to the establishment of the partnership, are both similar and different; they realize that their commonalities and differences can lead to mutual learning and a shared definition of the work they plan on undertaking. This stage is characterized by the development of a thorough understanding of the interests and missions of all partners involved, establishment of dependable resource commitments by all of them, a noticeable increase in the expectations for accountability, and close relationships among the key stakeholders of the partnership.

Enos and Morton (2003) maintained that students, faculty members, and community representatives get together to learn about their relationship; thereby, the partnership is experienced and inferred with sufficient depth that allows the partners to
appreciate the complexity of the specific challenges they tackle and promote their understanding of broader issues. As these partnerships proceed over time, the common claims about the academic expertise may be challenged by the collective experiences of students and community members, and it becomes difficult to maintain academic neutrality as partners begin to empathize with each other. According to Enos and Morton, there is also a potential for significant learning and transformation to occur in this stage. That is, partners start to challenge the common held views, namely that the community is the source of problems while the university is the domain of solutions. Rather, partners begin to consider the possibility that they both share a common domain. Still, other partners may disdain from this new understanding, preferring to stay within the traditional definitions of their roles and choosing not to initiate change at their institutions or organizations.

**Core partnerships, interdependence.**

Enos and Morton (2003) explained that core partnerships and interdependence expand and deepen the energy and synergy of ongoing placemats. At this level, partners sympathize and appropriately respect the interests of each other. There is a likelihood that they develop genuine interests in understanding the contexts in which each works, deepen their interpersonal relationships, and take significant risks as the leadership in both institutions is tested. Enos and Morton noted that core partnerships are distinct in that mutual learning is one of their overt or covert goals. They explained that this mutual learning is what Freire (1981) described as learning that helps individuals
develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; come to see the world not as a static reality but as a reality in process, in transformation. (p. 64)

Enos and Morton maintained that as partners recognize that they share a common domain and that they both generate knowledge and experience, interdependence rather than mutual dependence becomes the basis of their relationships. The capacity for action based on this common learning is what validates this new learning. The newly generated knowledge can be tested if it works for both institutions of higher education and community-based organizations by examining whether or not decision makers in the both arenas would trust and act upon this common knowledge. If not, a critical question emerges: What could be done to urge them to do so? (Enos & Morton).

Transformative, joint creation of work and knowledge.

Enos and Morton (2003) pointed out that transformative partnerships do not necessarily grow naturally from any other type of partnerships. Rather, they emerge when the campus and the community realize and encourage the possibility that their collaboration can transform both of them. At this level, partners become aware that they work in a shared context, and thus they engage in developing a mutual redefinition of the issues they are collaborating on and attempt to investigate what transformation means for individuals and institutions. In such partnerships, institutional power plays a key role both as a resource and a challenge. The nature of institutions then becomes significant, and there is a great potential for institutional change.

Enos and Morton (2003) contended that transformative partnerships have the capacity not only to transform the individuals involved in the partnership, but also impact
other constituencies within these institutions and the community at large. For faculty members, Enos and Morton envisioned that teaching would be transformed in ways that shift from teacher-centered to student-focused learning, which is enriched with problem-solving activities. Additionally, the roles of faculty members would be expanded, and disciplinary boundaries would be weakened as the university embarks on complex social problems. For students, colleges would no longer be places where they get filled with facts. Rather, colleges would be venues where they can access various active and rich learning opportunities and “experience in service, citizenship, knowledge construction, and community building” (p. 31). For community members, institutions of higher education would be arenas where they can seek opportunities to mobilize resources, build social capital, and engage in the civic renewal movement.

**Modifying Enos and Morton’s (2003) typology.**

It is worth noting that the researcher applied three modifications (see Figure 2 for modifications) on the graphical representation of this framework; namely the sizes of the five levels were reversed to represent the expected time for each level. As such, “One-time events and projects” became the smallest, whereas “transformation, joint creation of work and knowledge” became the biggest. Also, the directions of the horizontal and vertical axes were reversed to show positive directions. Likewise, the directions of levels were reversed to show the development of each level over time.
Employing Enos and Morton’s (2003) theory.

Enos and Morton (2003) developed their theory of campus-community partnerships based on the premise that institutions of higher education truly committed to service-learning should establish authentic and sustained partnerships with their surrounding communities. As Enos and Morton noted, their theoretical perspective aims to advance the notion of the development of partnerships between universities and their communities, and provides a lens for analyzing the issues that emerge in such partnerships. By distinguishing between transactional and transformative relationships, this theory explores the relationships between university and community, and suggests two broad paradigms for their collaborations. By presenting five different levels for the depth and integrity of partnerships, this theory examines the motives and progression models for the development of university-community partnerships for service-learning.
Given the value of theory in conducting scholarly studies, along with the focus of this dissertation on campus-community partnerships as the unit of analysis, Enos and Morton’s theatrical framework is well-suited as a framework for this study. Specifically, this theory was used as an organizational tool to explore the literature. It also guided the formulation of research questions for the empirical study and the development of the questions for the interview protocols. Additionally, it was used as an analytical guide for examining the service-learning partnerships between the American University in Cairo (AUC) and community-based organizations.

Many scholars called attention to the paucity of research on campus-community partnerships and stressed the need for studying these partnerships both as a process and outcome (e.g., Clarke, 2003; Cruz & Giles, 2000; Dorado & Giles, 2004; Jacoby & Associates, 1996, 2003). For example, Jacoby (2003) called for additional research on service-learning partnerships, noting that “much remains unknown” (p. 327) about what exactly makes up effective service-learning partnerships. To help narrow this gap and advance our understanding of university-community collaborations for service-learning, the second chapter presents a review of the literature pertinent to university-community partnerships for service-learning. This literature review is guided by Enoss and Morton’s (2003) theory and organized around the following questions:

1. What is the rationale for initiating university-community service-learning partnerships?
2. What are the approaches to establishing university-community service-learning partnerships?
3. What are the organizational factors contributing to the success of university-community service-learning partnerships?
Chapter Two: Literature Review

The purpose of this chapter is to present a systematic and thorough review of literature on university-community partnerships for service-learning. Guided by Enos and Morton’s (2003) theoretical framework, this literature review is organized into three major sections; each of which covers one of the three proposed questions concerning the rationale for, approaches to, and the organizational factors contributing to the success of, university-community service-learning engagement. In an effort to present a comprehensive understanding of these areas, this literature review incorporates both theoretical perspectives and empirical evidence. It is worth noting that this review focuses on service-learning partnerships, but it also draws from the broader literature on university-community partnerships in general. The rationale behind this combination is twofold. First, service-learning partnerships are one form of university–community engagement (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Bringle et al., 2001). While recognizing the distinct features of these partnerships, it is logical that what holds true for university-community partnerships in general can be applied to service-learning partnerships in particular. Second, the existing research on the partnerships for service-learning is scant and relatively new (Clarke, 2003; Cruz & Giles, 2000; Dorado & Giles, 2004; Jacoby & Associates, 1996, 2003).

Each section is followed by a critical discussion of the most significant findings that emerged from the literature. This discussion serves three primary functions. First, it
highlights the major themes of each section. Second, it presents the author’s comments and stances on the debatable issues raised in each section. Since theory testing and verification is one goal of conducting research (Creswell, 2009), the third function of the critical discussion following each section is to analyze whether the findings diverge and/or converge with the theoretical framework employed in this study.

First Research Question

What is the rationale for initiating university-community service-learning partnerships?

The differences between town-gown constituents are recognized and highlighted in the literature. For example, Bringle, Games, and Malloy (1999) described community-university partnerships as bringing together different worlds where academicians generally perceive knowledge as “residing in specialized experts, including disciplinary peers who are geographically dispersed; [while] community residents view knowledge as being pluralistic and well distributed among their neighbors” (p. 9). In the same vein, Holland (2002) pointed out that higher education and community do not represent monocultures. Rather, there are distinctions in motivations and perceived benefits of such partnerships among various higher education constituents. Also, Sandy and Holland (2006) expected diverse views with regard to the motives and perceived benefits of these partnerships among individuals from community agencies partnering with colleges and universities. They thus argued that successful campus-community partnerships necessitates attention to, and examination of, the divergent needs and interests of partners, as well as an acknowledgement and appreciation for the underlying similarities and mutual motivations of higher education and community partners.
With this argument in mind, the sections that follow explore the motivations/goals and perceived benefits of service-learning university-community partnerships for both institutions of higher education and community-based organizations. The first part presents an overview of the shared benefits of these collaborations. The second one examines, in greater detail, the distinct motivations, potential benefits of, and the impacts of such partnerships on all the parties involved. The third part provides critical insights into the major themes emerging from this literature review.

**Rationale for service-learning partnerships: university and community.**

This section presents an overview of the literature that addresses the value of service-learning partnerships for both institutions of higher education and communities. Significantly, such collaborations can lead to a win-win-win situation for the university, students, and the community (Jacoby, 1996, 2003; Vernon & Ward, 1999). In this regard, Harkavy (2003) argued that campus-community partnerships offer opportunities for students, faculty members, and community representatives to address real-world problems. Likewise, Philips and Ward (2009) noted that these partnerships offer a means for institutions of higher education to collaborate with their local communities and can help invigorate both the university and the community. For instance, Gelmon (2003) noted that the establishment of campus-community partnerships allows the university to achieve its goals of community-based teaching and learning, and enables community-based organizations to access the resources and expertise of the university, which, in turn, promotes their activities. In discussing the benefits of service-learning partnerships, Holland (2002) contended that successful collaborations between the campus and the
community have the potential to transform students, the institutional quality and spirit, and the community capacity. Also, Jacoby (2003) pointed out that such partnerships provide opportunities of funding that are not possible for partners working on their own. Sandy and Holland (2006) noted that campus-community partnerships have the potential to transform knowledge by bridging the gap between theory and practice and providing opportunities for reflection. They maintained that these partnerships can also advance new theory and alter our current knowledge and practice.

In an effort to appreciate and honor the commonalities and differences between the university and the community, the sections that follow shed light on the distinct motivations and perceived benefits of these partnerships to the partnering institutions and their constituents. Ash et al.’s, (2005) graphical representation of the partners in service-learning used a Venn diagram that includes students, faculty/staff members, and community partners. Following this conceptualization, the subsequent sections discuss the rationale for service-learning partnerships for higher education and community partners.

**Rationale for service-learning partnerships: institutions of higher education.**

Institutions of higher education are motivated to establish partnerships with communities for a variety of reasons. In this respect, Scheibel et al. (2005) observed that academic institutions pursue partnerships with community-based organizations to accomplish the ideals of community revival and civic renewal, as well as to reap tangible benefits. Similarly, Sandy and Holland (2006) reported that institutions of higher
education are motivated to partner with community-based organizations to enhance the image of the campus and to network for academic research.

The review of the literature reveals that higher education benefits from these partnerships in two major ways: gains for students and gains for the entire institution. This section discusses the value of partnerships to academic institutions. Community partnerships provide a range of benefits to campuses. For example, Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, and Goss (2003) noted that such partnerships advance the civic mission of the institution. Holland (2002) observed that these partnerships attract adults and first-generation students, lead to greater and more diverse local enrollment, and increase student retention rates. Additionally, such partnerships engage students, faculty, and community members in work for the public good which, in turn, increases public support to postsecondary institutions. Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2000) emphasized this point, arguing that serving the community is a means for institutions of higher education to address public perceptions that higher education exists to pursue its own good. They even stressed that “done well, it [service-learning] can fulfill the civic mission of higher education” (p. 768).

In the same vein, Scheibel et al. (2005) theorized that partnerships provide many benefits for academic institutions. Examples of these benefits include enhancing the public image of the institution and strengthening its relationships with neighborhoods. This, in turn, promotes the institution’s reputation in the community. Also, a better local community makes the institution more appealing to prospective applicants, be those students, faculty, or staff members, as well as to alumni and donors. Forming
relationships with community partners may enable the institution to reach out to potential applicants from specific populations, such as immigrant students and students from minority and low-income groups. Additionally, partnerships allow academic institutions to be eligible for grants that require institutions of higher education to partner with a community organization. Moreover, Scheibel et al. argued that partnerships increase enrollment, noting that many high school students seek enrollment at institutions of higher education that provide opportunities for service and civic engagement. They also stated that community service or development may be perceived by students, faulty, and administrators—based on a charity, religious, or social justice standpoint—as the right course of action the institution should pursue.

In addressing the rationale for service-learning partnerships, Jacoby (2003) noted that such collaborations direct institutions of higher education toward many partnerships that tackle important societal issues. In the same vein, Smerek, Pasque, Mallory, and Holland (2005) explained that universities enjoy substantial intellectual, human, fiscal, and organizational resources, which are crucial to tackling critical social problems. These institutions are also physically located in their communities; consequently, contributing to the enhancement of their immediate environments is beneficial to the institution and the community as well.

An in-depth consideration of the perceived benefits of service-learning partnerships to colleges and universities reveals that such partnerships can be an effective strategy in addressing present challenges to higher education including students’ declining interest in politics and civic life (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003;
UCLA’s survey of incoming students as cited in Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009), college students persistence and retention in general (Bringle, Hatcher, & Muthiah, 2010), as well as engaging and retaining first generation college students of color from low-income backgrounds (Conley & Hamlin, 2009). The following section focuses on students’ motivations and perceived gains from participating in service-learning partnerships.

_Students._

Colby et al. (2003) argued that institutions of higher education overlook their moral and civic goals. In particular, they expressed a concern regarding the lack of deliberate efforts to integrate moral education, character building, and civic participation into the mainstream discourse of the academy. These scholars, among others, are especially worried about the decline of interest among youth in voting and political participation. They also criticized the gap between the academe and the realities of life, arguing that students became passive learners because of the heavy reliance of the academy on classroom instruction and the separation between campus and community. They thus called for altering these traditional approaches, explaining that globalization, the complexity of world affairs, and the plurality of public opinion require higher education to incorporate more rigorous teaching methods and assessment into their work.

With regard to students’ motivation for service-learning partnerships, Holland (2005) noted that when participating in campus-community partnerships, students want to complete a class with a good grade, better understand themselves and others, and feel that they are bringing about change. Morton (1995) classified student motivations for service
into three approaches: charity, project, and social change. The charity model focuses on identifying deficits and then addressing them by providing direct service to others. The project approach seeks solutions to existing needs and problems. The social change model centers on empowering the campus and community members, and adopts transformational concepts of systemic change.

The perceived benefits of campus-community partnerships to students encompass enhanced learning experiences and various other positive civic, personal, and professional impacts. For example, such partnerships improve students’ learning outcomes, and provide them with opportunities to acquire new skills and increase the possibility of their civic action in adulthood (Leiderman et al., 2003). Likewise, Scheibel et al. (2005) noted that a quality campus-community partnership can provide students with several learning opportunities and other benefits. In particular, they explained that real-life experience is valuable for skill-and résumé-building, and can also be beneficial for students’ career exploration. Students’ engagement with critical community concerns helps them understand the issues influencing their world, develop their passions, and gain the skills to guide their passions in constructive ways. Applying abstract notions or theories to real-life situations helps students comprehend course concepts, and boost their interest in, and raise important questions about, the subject matter under study. Through their involvement in campus–community partnerships, students can gain an enhanced sense of self-efficacy as they see that they can have the knowledge, skills, and self-confidence to make a difference. Scheibel et al. maintained that university–community partnerships can help students become civically engaged, noting that students’
community experience can spark their interest in politics, social issues, and understanding the possibilities of initiating change. In the same vein, Jacoby (2003) argued that service-learning partnerships have the potential to engage students in learning about civic responsibility and in gaining the skills necessary to participate in a democracy.

“Service-learning and partnerships are two sides of the same coin” (Bailis, 2000, p. 5). Logically then, the positive impacts of service-learning can be held true with the partnerships. Significantly, the literature is replete with empirical evidence documenting positive service-learning outcomes for students. For example, empirical research revealed that participation in service-learning courses yields positive impacts on student grades, attitudes, and sensitivities (Ender, Martin, Cotter, Brenda, & DeFiore 2000; Karin & Nurse, 2004; Lansverk, 2004; Mooney & Edwards, 2001). Also students’ participation in service-learning courses has been connected to their personal development, racial and cultural understanding, civic engagement, academic learning, and several other positive outcomes (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Eyler & Giles, 1999). Pertinent research indicated that participation in service-learning positively affects students’ academic persistence and retention in college (Vogelgesang, Ikeda, Gilmartin, & Keup, 2002). Bacon (2002) observed that when students complement their assigned readings with service-learning experiences, they comprehend course concepts more deeply. Washington (2000) complimented service-learning partnerships for providing students with opportunities to engage with people different from themselves. Specifically, she observed that stereotypes are confronted and challenged as students “gain insights into
the depth, humanity, and multidimensionality of a group whom they had previously thought of only in monolithic, unidimensional terms” (p. 108). The conceptual perspectives along with the findings of empirical literature provide powerful evidence of the value of service-learning partnerships to students.

**Faculty members.**

Holland (2005) observed that faculty members participate in campus-community partnerships for various purposes. For example, they hope to assist their students to accomplish learning goals and gain a sense of civic and social responsibility. Faculty members also aim to develop research agendas which promote their intellectual works and aspire to see their work or their institution’s work contribute to community welfare. In discussing the rewards of service-learning partnerships, Bacon (2002) noted that such partnerships provide faculty members with opportunities to tap into a venue of activities and ideas that exist outside of their typical professional arenas. Driscoll (2007) argued that such partnerships enable faculty members to integrate academic goals with their own desire to make a difference in communities or to promote social change.

Empirical research has shown that the motivating factors for faculty who engage in service-learning partnerships are associated with student learning (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Hammond, 1994; Hesser, 1995; McKay & Rozee, 2004), community-centered factors (Abes et al., 2002; McKay & Rozee), and institutional support (Abes et al.). A recent study by Banerjee and Hausafus used a random sample to survey 368 faculty members at institutions of higher education across the U.S. The study examined the characteristics of faculty in the soft, applied, life-based
field human sciences who do and do not integrate service-learning into their teaching. The findings indicated that improving student learning was the most frequent cited motivating factor for faculty to implement service-learning. Faculty participants in this study perceived service-learning as a mechanism to empower students, help them understand the root causes of the pressing problems facing society, gain a sense of responsibility, enhance their appreciation of diversity, and change their attitudes (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). In the same vein, McKay and Rozee (2004) found that the most important motivators for faculty to use service-learning are increasing the relevance of course materials to student lives, advancing self-directed learning, and introducing an effective type of experiential education. Interestingly, this finding is consistent with previous research (Abes et al.; Hammond; Hesser) which indicated that enhancing student learning motivators is the most influential factor in faculty decisions to employ service-learning in their teaching.

Based on the findings of their empirical study that analyzed faculty responses from 32 structured interviews conducted at a large metropolitan, southwestern university in the U.S., McKay and Rozee (2004) reported that faculty perception of the benefits of community service-learning encompasses gains for faculty, students, and community. Faculty benefits include getting an opportunity to work with community partners and other faculty who employ service-learning. Examples of other perceived benefits include receiving encouragement from their departments to study the potential of service-learning, and support from the service-learning center at the institution. Also, faculty acknowledged that service-learning offers them opportunities for combining teaching,
research, and service, as well as evaluating current teaching methods. Moreover, faculty participants reported that their use of service-learning may help their colleagues appreciate the value of this innovative pedagogy.

McKay and Rozee (2004) reported that faculty perception of student benefits includes establishing connections between academic learning and real-world experiences, learning civic responsibility, exploring career options, examining personal values and beliefs, discussing stereotypes while increasing awareness of social issues, as well as enhancing their interpersonal communication, critical thinking, and writing skills. Significantly, faculty participants in this study reported that service-learning enables students to realize that they can make a difference. With regard to faculty perception of community benefits, McKay and Rozee reported that faculty believe that service-learning generates opportunities for the clients of not-for-profit agencies to contribute to student learning, maximizes the use of decreasing resources, helps not-for-profits with grant writing and funding opportunities, provides them with volunteer staff, and enriches them with student expertise.

Zlotkowski (1998) argued that service-learning is faculty development. Empirical studies concerning the impact of service-learning on faculty support this argument. Using semi-structured interviews with 35 service-learning faculty and teaching staff members at a single university in the U.S., Pribbenow (2005) reported that participation in service-learning yields multiple effects on faculty, including increased interactions with students, enhanced sense of connection to other faculty and the institution, and deeper understanding of community needs. Pribbenow found that faculty participation in
service-learning connected them with their students through intimate relationships. Such close ties enabled faculty to see their students more holistically as individuals, as well as learners, which led faculty to become more aware of, and respectful for, their students. Also, faculty became better able to relate to their students, more sensitive to their needs and engaged with them in quality interactions. Increased interactions with students enabled faculty to better understand their students’ learning experience of the course and how students construct knowledge.

Significantly, research on student outcomes has steadily indicated that increased student-faculty interaction yields positive impacts on student learning and persistence in college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Furthermore, participation in service-learning enabled faculty to promote student theoretical and practical learning, assess student learning more effectively, and become aware of the need for approaches that promote progressive pedagogy, namely structivist-development pedagogy (Baxter Magolda, 1999). Key principles of this approach include recognizing students as knowers, situating learning in students’ experiences, and perceiving learning as mutually constructed meaning. A number of faculty in Pribbenow’s (2005) study reported using peer learning strategies to encourage students to learn from each other

As a result of their participation in service-learning, Pribbenow (2005) reported that faculty became more aware of community-based organizations and better understood their needs, which enabled them to use relevant examples and establish contexts for linking theory to practice, as well as enhanced their capability to communicate theoretical concepts. Furthermore, faculty participation in service-learning connected them with
each other, allowed them to become acquainted with more individuals at their institutions, and even helped some to get over the sense of isolation which is associated with much of faculty work (Rice, 1996). This, in turn, led to a sense of community, belonging, collegiality, as well as commitment and pride to be affiliated with the institution.

**Service-learning partnerships: community/nonprofits.**

This section discusses the community motivations and perceived benefits when partnering with institutions of higher education for service-learning. Shaffett (2002) explained that the motivations of agency staff members to work with college student service-learners are fairly complex, including considerations for the immediate needs of their organizations and clients, as well as the long-term interests of society at large. Bell and Carlson (2009) grouped the motives of not-for-profit organizations to collaborate with institutions of higher education in service-learning courses into four major categories:

- **Altruistic motives to educate service-learners:** Some agency staff members believe that they bear a responsibility for helping students understand the issues facing their clients.

- **Long-term motives for their respective organizations and the not-for-profit sector:** Agency staff members are keen on ensuring long-lasting support for their profession.

- **Capacity-building motives:** Agency staff members sometimes welcome service-learners to increase their organizational capacity.
Higher education motives: Some organizations host service-learners to establish, reinforce, or expand their ties with colleges and universities.

There is substantial empirical evidence supporting the above noted motives. For example, the community partners in Sandy and Holland’s (2006) study reported that they are motivated to partner with institutions of higher education to further social justice. They perceive these partnerships as a conduit to foster common values, contribute to their community, and further the greater good. Through campus-community partnerships, Holland (2005) explained that community members seek to enlarge their impacts and leverage their wisdom and expertise so that they encourage students and faculty members to become more engaged in civic issues.

Educating college students is another major motivation for agency staff members’ participation in service-learning partnerships. The conceptual perspectives of several scholars (e.g., Holland, 2002, 2005; Seifer & Vaughn, 2004) and empirical research indicated that community partners are motivated to join university-community partnerships for service-learning because such collaborations provide them with opportunities to participate in educating college students and transform them so that they become informed and engaged citizens. They are motivated to partner with institutions of higher education in order to make a difference in students’ education. Specifically, they aim to raise students’ awareness of the field of community-based organizations and the specific missions of their organizations and spark their interest in a cause or a profession pertinent to their agencies. Through participation in these partnerships, agency staff members also strive to inform students of the public issue pertaining to their
organization and the role of public policy in this issue. Additionally, they want to motivate students to continue volunteering for community-based agencies, encourage them to be activists, and engage them in their local communities (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Leiderman et al., 2003; Tryon, Stoecker, Martin, Seblonka, Hilgendorf, & Nellis, 2008; Worrall, 2007).

In partnering with institutions of higher education for service-learning, agency staff members aim to pursue various other goals including advancing the capacity of their organizations, benefiting their clients, and improving their communities. For example, Holland (2005) noted that community partners are motivated to collaborate with institutions of higher education so that they gain access to academic knowledge to increase economic stability, enhance school and youth outcomes, improve community health and safety, and advance the community capacity in general. Leiderman et al. (2003) explained that community agency staff partner with institutions of higher education to raise the exposure of community residents to the partnering institution, increase their expectations that they can attend and succeed in higher education, and increase the number of neighborhood residents who enroll in the partnering institution. They also aim to advance community capacity to tackle issues at a structural/systemic level, such as economic and small business development, housing, and homeless problems. In addition to their goals of promoting the community, when partnering with institutions of higher education for service-learning, community partners aim to further their organizations’ capacities to achieve their missions, carry out their activities, deliver their services (Leiderman et al., 2003), assist more clients, plan more efficient programs,
raise more money (Holland, 2005), access the skills and expertise available at academic institutions, and benefit their clients, especially youth (Holland, 2002).

Scheibel et al. (2005) noted that university-community partnerships offer multiple opportunities for community organizations to expand their reach and effectiveness. They theorized that the benefits can be particular and short-term, as well as overarching and long-term. The majority of these benefits pertain to increased manpower. Other advantages include access to knowledge, funding, facility, and role models. In particular, they conceptualized a wide range of perceived benefits, including receiving assistance with organizational training, skill building, research projects, and advocacy and other policy-related activities of the organization. The benefits also include access to human and physical resources of the university, additional expertise for community development, and new funding opportunities. Moreover, partnerships provide space for community activities and role models for college-age youth and prospective students. University-community partnerships also offer opportunities for agency staff members to mentor college students and inform faculty and staff members of community concerns and work collaboratively with them to tackle these issues. Additionally, partnerships may enable community agencies to improve their capacities to fulfill their missions. Partnerships can further align the civic mission of universities with their local communities, and promote various efforts influencing the quality of life for community residents.

There are multiple other benefits for community-based organizations associated with service-learning partnerships. In this respect, Bushouse (2005) pointed out that
participating in service-learning provides many practical benefits to community-based organizations, especially not-for-profit agencies “that often must do more with less” (p. 32). Specifically, taking part in service-learning projects provides free labor to help not-for-profits accomplish their missions. In this regard, Bell and Carlson (2009) noted that college student service-learners are a fundamental source of volunteers for some community-based agencies. This help, Bushouse noted, can take various forms, such as direct service delivery or technical/research assistance, which a not-for-profit agency lacks time and expertise to do with its own staff.

Sandy and Holland (2006) conducted a qualitative study with 99 long-term community partners across eight California communities regarding their perspectives on service-learning partnerships with institutions of higher education. They found that the perceived benefits of service-learning collaborations to community partners include benefits to their organizations and clients. At the organization level, such partnerships promote the missions of community-based organizations, enable these organizations to access academic knowledge and research, maximize their resources (Leiderman et al., 2003), benefit from grant opportunities (Jacoby, 2003; Leiderman et al.), provide them with economic benefits (Worrall, 2007), and allow them to access needed resources for program delivery (Bushouse, 2005; Miron & Moely, 2006; Vernon & Ward, 1999). Affiliation with institutions of higher education also increases the credibility of community-based organizations’ activities and their exposure to higher education (Leiderman et al., 2003). Additionally, the prestige associated with the academic
institutions enables the partnering organizations to promote their goals (Sandy & Holland, 2006).

Notably, service-learning partnerships offer professional development opportunities for community-based agency staff. In this regard, Sandy and Holland (2006) found that staff and organizational development is one of the main benefits of these partnerships, explaining that supervising college students leads agency staff members to reflect more on their organizational practices. Also, agency staff benefit from the intellectual wealth of the partnering institution by acquiring new information from students and gaining more access to academic research. Leiderman et al. (2003) also cited this benefit, noting that community-agency staff members gain new perspectives and insights through their interactions with students, faculty members, and other campus representatives. Additionally, such partnerships increase social capital among community partners, especially when institutions of higher education establish connections among the community members with whom they partner (Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, & Kerrigan, 2001; Sandy & Holland). In this regard, Vernon and Foster (2002) noted that service-learning and volunteer programs are channels for developing social capital in a community. Likewise, Sandy and Holland found that such partnerships are catalysts for advancing community relationships and networks.

Campus-community partnerships for service-learning offer direct benefits to the clients of community-based organizations. Worrall (2007) used a qualitative approach to examine the perceived benefits and challenges of 40 representatives from 12 community-based organizations working with the Steans Center for community based service-
learning at DePaul University in Chicago. She observed that such collaborations allow
community agencies to expand their services to a greater number of clients. Student
service-learners have various positive impacts on not-for-profit clients. For example,
college students are greatly appreciated as age-appropriate role models for youth, and
therefore they can raise the ambition and educational results of young people (Bridsall,
2005; Jorge, 2003; Schmidt & Robby, 2002; Vernon & Foster, 2002). Sandy and
Holland (2006) pointed out that service learners can also assist other not-for-profit
clients, such as the elderly and homeless. They maintained that college students help
sustain and expand the capacity of community-based organizations in various other ways.
For instance, they enable agency staff members to undertake new tasks that would remain
on a waiting list without service-learning partnerships. Student service learners can also
advance the partnering organizations by becoming future volunteers, staff, or donors at
these organizations.
Summary

Service-learning is recognized and applauded as an innovative teaching and learning strategy (Butin, 2006b). McKay and Rozee (2004) noted that an innovation should be planned to satisfy particular needs. Likewise, Hassinger and Pinkerton (1986) argued that innovations are more likely to be valuable if they are conceived of as relevant to people’s needs, and harmonious with their attitudes and beliefs. Several scholars, such as Rogers (1971), and Zaltman and Duncan (1977) studied the diffusion and adoption of the innovation model. They explained that an innovation is evaluated by weighing its benefits against its potential costs, noting that the success of an innovation is mostly determined by recognizing and accepting its benefits and the degree to which these benefits outweigh the costs. If benefits outnumber costs, individuals are more likely to try and eventually endorse the innovation (Greene, Harcih, & Kohli, 1996).

This section provided theoretical/conceptual arguments and empirical findings, demonstrating that service-learning partnerships satisfy a myriad range of needs for all the involved partners. Taken together, the conceptual and empirical literature provides a compelling argument for the value of service-learning partnerships to institutions of higher education and communities. It is thus critical that institutions of higher education exert every possible effort to promote service-learning partnerships on their campuses.
Critical Insights

This section presents critical insights into the emerging themes covering the rationale for initiating service-learning partnerships. The literature review illustrates that there are various potential benefits for all the parties involved in such partnerships. The review also indicates that the partners’ goals for pursuing such collaborations vary; some are distinct and serve self-benefits while other goals are joint and yield common benefits. In this regard, Jacoby (2003) argued that although service-learning university-community partnerships are grounded in mutual objectives and goals, it is unavoidable, right, and even encouraged that individual partners pursue their self-interests through these partnerships. She provided examples of how individual partners may gain from these partnerships. For instance, students may hope to gain experience to enrich their résumés. Junior faculty members may be willing to build their tenure portfolios. Agency staff members may hope to benefit their organizations and families. At the institutional level, colleges and universities may aim to improve the image of the neighborhood surrounding the campus to attract prospective students and their families. Likewise, local businesses may be motivated to participate in service-learning partnerships to enhance the security and physical appearance of the neighborhood, and thus attract customers and workers.

Jacoby’s (2003) argument is interesting and merits discussion. Although her conceptualization of the benefits of service-learning university-community partnerships may sound egoistic, Jacoby’s perspective reflects an honest representation of reality and a profound understanding of human nature. This view is supported by Holland (2005) who reflected on campus-community partnerships, noting that our actions are motivated by
some degree of self-interest. According to Ott (2001), theories of giving and philanthropy research reveal that individuals’ motivations to donate time and expertise are similar to the motivations to give money. Also, Frank (1996) explained that individuals are motivated to give by both egoistic and altruistic factors. He asserted that this combination does not mean that one factor undermines the other. Rather, both motivating factors exist, “constituting complex intentions of the giver” (p. 16). Similarly, Wolfe (1998) reported that research findings indicate that “altruism and egoism do not constitute mutually exclusive categories” (p. 42). In the field of service-learning partnerships, Basinger and Bartholomew (2006) found that organizations and staff supervisors are motivated to participate in service-learning by organization-serving and self-interest, as well as altruistic factors.

Jacoby’s (2003) philosophy encourages faculty members to document their work in service-learning courses which, in turn, helps promote university-community engagement as a legitimate form of scholarship. By encouraging community partners to advance their organizations and build the community capacity through service-learning collaborations, this philosophy helps address the paucity of research on the community impact of service-learning partnerships. By highlighting that students can reap personal gains while improving their communities, Jacoby’s argument may encourage a greater number of students to join service-learning courses voluntarily.

A surface consideration of campus-community partnerships may lead some to believe that community partners are primarily motivated to partner with higher education so that they obtain immediate short-term gains for their organizations. Significantly,
several empirical studies indicated that community partners highly value their roles in the educational process (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Worrall, 2007). For example, Basinger and Bartholomew (2006) collected quantitative and qualitative data about the motivations, expectations, and satisfaction of community partners at 98 not-for-profit organizations who participated in service-learning projects with the University of Utah. The majority of community partners in this study were primarily motivated for participation by altruistic motives to enhance student leaning, prepare them for responsible citizenship, and help the university and the community.

Another study by Mihalynuk and Seifer (2002) revealed that agency staff members would like to be involved in the development aspects of service-learning partnerships, such as student recruitment and orientation, faculty development, course design, and program assessment. Miron and Moely (2006) used the partnership as a unit of analysis to assess community agency voice concerning their perceived benefits of service-learning partnerships and the degree of mutually rewarding relationship between their agencies and a university-based service-learning program. They employed quantitative and qualitative methods with supervisors from 40 community agencies. They found that community partners’ perception of the benefits of such partnerships and positive views of institutions of higher education depend on the level of their involvement in program design and implementation. These findings offer powerful evidence that community partners are willing and able to contribute to student learning while gaining from service-learning partnerships. Such findings should lead higher education professionals to perceive agency staff members as equal and strong partners in service-learning.
collaborations. Such a perception can, in turn, promote reciprocal relationships between university and community stakeholders.

Enos and Morton (2003) conceptualized service-learning partnerships as evolving from self- to common-goals in which partnerships operate first as transactional with distinct goals and then move toward transformative relationships in which partners develop shared goals. It is worth noting that empirical studies are mixed in this area; for instance, Worrall (2007) found that community partners, at first, are motivated to join service-learning partnerships by the immediate benefits of expanding their organizational resources. They then maintain their involvement with higher education because they value their educational roles in these partnerships. Whereas Worrall’s study supports Enos and Morton’s conceptual framework, other studies yielded different findings. For example, the community partners in Sandy and Holland’s (2006) study emphasized shared goals with higher education, especially concerning educating students at the beginning of the partnerships. They frequently stressed that educating college students was a more important goal for their involvement in service-learning partnerships than the tangible short-term benefits for their organizations. Such mixed results invite additional studies to further investigate this area and accumulate more evidence. Future studies can also illuminate our understanding of whether or not transactional and transformative relationships are two distinct concepts or they progress on a continuum. If the latter, what are the institutional factors that facilitate the transition to transformative university-community partnerships for service-learning, if partners so choose?
The commonalities and differences in regard to how academicians and community members perceive service-learning partnerships is another significant point that merits discussion. Several scholars (Bacon, 2002; Bringle et al., 1999; Holland, 2005) called attention to the differences between the constituents of higher education and the community. For example, Bacon (2002) highlighted the distinctions in theories of learning between higher education faculty and staff, and community partner agency staff. Likewise, Holland (2005) argued that demographics, race, culture, and language result in ample differences between the perspectives of academicians and community partners. She observed that, often times, faculty members suppose that in a university-community partnership, the faculty role is to teach, the student role is to learn, and the community partner role is to offer a laboratory or a set of issues that requires solutions. She further explained that as most academicians come from privileged wealthy backgrounds. The power dynamics in their collaborations with community partners are then not equal. This, in turn, makes it hard to guarantee a reciprocal interaction between them or to ensure that the partnership will yield mutual benefits to all partners.

In spite of these differences, some empirical evidence suggests that there are similarities in the perceptions of academicians and community partners with regard to service-learning partnerships. For instance, Sandy and Holland (2006) observed that community members’ perceptions of the partnership benefits to students resembles, in large part, the benefits cited by higher education scholars (McKay & Rozee, 2004). Areas of similarity include examining career options, developing competency in diversity and multicultural skills, and gaining a thorough understanding of the not-for-profit sector
in general and a specific issue or profession in particular. Convergent views about student benefits also include learning practical job skills, acquiring the skills of active citizenship and lifelong service, enhancing students’ retention in higher education by providing them with a sense of connectedness in their collegiate experience, and promoting self-esteem and self-exploration. Sandy and Holland also found that the community partners who aspire to advance social justice through partnering with higher education described their motivations in ways akin to how faculty members and students envision social justice. A critical look at the literature on the divergent and convergent views of higher education and community constituents reveals that such similarities and differences present both opportunities and challenges for their collaborations. Committed partners should exert sincere efforts to utilize those similarities to facilitate their work and negotiate the differences in a way that ensures mutual benefits, reciprocity, and respect for all involved parties.
Second Research Question

What are the approaches to establishing university-community service-learning partnerships?

A thorough review of the service-learning literature reveals that the approaches to university-community partnerships are studied in two distinct yet still related ways. One group of scholars explored the development of these collaborations as a process, envisioning various models to the progression of these partnerships over time. Another group examined the approaches to these collaborations from particular moral, philosophical, and practical standpoints. The latter differentiated between two fundamental approaches: traditional versus critical university-community service-learning partnerships. The subsequent sections provide a comprehensive view of these approaches. The first part presents examples of various progression models of university-community partnerships in general. The applicability of these general models to service-learning partnerships is the reason why these models are included. The discussion then focuses on models that specifically conceptualize the development of service-learning partnerships. In the second part, the discussion turns to addressing traditional versus critical university-community service-learning partnerships, highlighting the core concepts associated with each approach and the argument for and against each.
Approaches to Developing University-Community Partnerships

Progression models.

Sockett (1998) explored the concept of partnerships through studying various levels of trust and complexity. He then suggested four levels of partnerships: service, exchange, cooperative, and systemic/transformative. Sockett described each level of partnerships as it pertains to the range and depth of the concurrences and relationships developed by partners in a given setting. The first level, service, describes a partnership where an individual or a group of volunteers provide assistance for one of the school-related missions. The second level, exchange, describes a partnership in which parties barter resources for their mutual gains. The third level, cooperative, describes a partnership in which parties plan their work together and also share responsibilities. The fourth level, systemic and transformative, refers to a partnership in which partners collaborate on all aspects of their relationship, such as activity planning and evaluation, decision-making, and funding. Each participating institution is expected to be transformed through this partnership. Sockett noted that this typology is not a hierarchy, explaining that it is not imperative that partnerships start in a service relationship and then develop to the higher levels.

In the seminal work, Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships (2000), university-community partnerships were described as evolving through three stages: designing the partnership, building collaborative relationships, and sustaining the partnership over time. In the beginning stage, partners discuss shared goals and values, and ensure that the partnership is mutually beneficial. In the intermediate stage, partners
establish interpersonal relationships among each other that are grounded in trust and mutual respect. The collaborative work among partners in this stage is well-organized and led with enthusiasm. In the third stage, partners incorporate their partnership into the mission and support systems of their institutions. In this stage, the partnership is sustained by sharing the process of communication, decision making, and launching change. Also, partners regularly assess their partnership with attention to both processes and outcomes (Torres, 2000).

Dorado and Giles (2004) observed that service-learning partnerships tend to evolve through three paths—tentative, aligned, and committed—depending on the engagement quality between institutions of higher education and community-based organizations. The tentative path describes partnerships that are recently established, involve surface and short-term interactions, and in which learning behaviors dominate. In the aligned path, partners engage with each other in discussing expectations, negotiating mutual goals, addressing shared problems, as well as developing a scheme to avoid these problems, and evaluating and modifying the partnership. In the committed path of engagement, frequent interactions occur among partners who place high value on the partnership beyond the specific service-learning project at hand. In this path, partners also believe that their collaborations should be protected, expanded, and defended.

Dorado and Giles (2004) suggested that some service-learning partnerships may stagnate at the tentative path throughout the life span of the partnerships, noting that partners may be reluctant to build a sustainable relationship because of institutional issues. Similarly, Bringle and Hatcher (2002) argued that some partnerships are doomed
to failure because partners do not build mutually-satisfying relationships. Previous research on intimate relationships (Arriaga, 2001; Surra, 1987) indicates that close relationships develop at different speeds. Yet, Dorado and Giles suggested that partnerships which are likely to progress from the aligned path to the committed one may take a short time to do so as the partners’ commitment motivates them to overcome any initial difficulties.

Enos and Morton (2003) posited that campus-community partnerships could be developed as transactional or transformative relationships. They described transactional relationships as instrumental and designed to accomplish specific tasks. In such relationships, partners work with each other on the basis of an exchange; each one offers something that the other perceives as useful. There are no expectations for profound change or lasting relationships. In transformative relationships, partners reflect on new experiences, and question existing patterns. In such relationships, partners may grow and change because of their deep commitments to each other. Additionally, such interactions can lead to the development of new relationships, values, and identities. Based on this conceptualization of campus-community relationships, Enos and Morton developed a typology which delineates five stages/levels of partnerships: one-time events and projects; short-term placements; ongoing placemats, mutual dependence; core partnerships, interdependence; and transformation, joint creation of work and knowledge (see chapter one for a detained explanation of each level). Clayton, Bringle, Senor, Huq, and Morrison (2010) extended Enos and Morton’s framework of transactional and transformational relationships to include exploitive relationships. Such relationships
operate in a lower level than transactional. Clayton et al. noted that exploitive relationships, even if maintained, are characterized by unfulfilling or harmful outcomes and are not satisfying to one or both partners. In such relationships, mutual gains are missed; while one partner benefits from the relationship, the other does not.

The above sections presented examples of approaches for the development and sustainability of campus-community partnerships. These proposals do not represent an exclusive list nor do they reflect the best practices. Rather, they are meant to illustrate ways to explore and possibly to evaluate such partnerships. Ideally, each institution should align the model of the partnerships with its goals, mission, and unique setting to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of these collaborations. The section that follows explores another perspective of the possible approaches to university-community partnerships for service-learning.

**Traditional versus critical approaches.**

Although traditional versus critical approaches to university-community partnerships for service-learning do not provide a vision of a particular progression of such collaborations, this issue is relevant to the discussion pertaining to the approaches to initiating service-learning university-community partnerships for two major reasons. First, furthering social justice is a fundamental purpose of this research. Addressing the social justice issues associated with establishing these collaborations is then necessary to promoting understanding of these issues. Such an understanding is an essential first step to handling and advancing social justice through these collaborations. Second, including this discussion is also critical as it addresses important issues raised in the framework
(Enos & Morton, 2003) employed in this research. Of particular relevance, sustainable development and transformation are two key goals, envisioned by the authors of the framework, for establishing university-community partnerships; addressing higher education constituents, Enos and Morton noted that the choice of community partners and vision of the possible accomplishments of university-community engagement can open opportunities to become citizens “of communities and of a world of which we would like to be part” (p. 40). The subsequent sections examine traditional and critical service-learning partnerships.

Scholars vary in the attention they give to the issue of social justice associated with service-learning partnerships; some (e.g., Kahne & Westheimer, 1999; Marullo & Edwards, 2000; Mitchell, 2008; Rice & Pollack, 2000; Robinson, 2000; Rosenberger, 2000; Saltmarsh et al., 2009) give it serious attention within the ideological framework of the civic role of higher education; some (e.g., Leeds, 1999; Zlotkowski, 1996) overlook it, arguing that the educational benefits of service-learning—as an innovative pedagogy and a form of experiential learning—should take precedence over its transformative potential; and some (e.g., Colby et al., 2003; Wade, 2001) hold moderate views with an attempt to reconcile the strong opinions that argue for and against service-learning partnerships as endeavors for social justice. Each group of these scholars rests its stance on specific ideological, philosophical, moral and/or practical considerations. While expected, the diversity of opinions regarding service-learning partnerships as acts of charity versus endeavors for social change indicates a lack of clarity regarding what constitutes effective service-learning partnerships. The differing views on this issue also
raises critical questions about the ultimate goals and activities of such collaborations, as well as the choice of partners and the roles of all parties involved. Moreover, the diverse opinions may have implications for important issues pertaining to assessing the outcomes of university-community engagement and/or the impacts of such an engagement on students, faculty, staff, campuses, and communities.

In an effort to clarify these issues, the section that follows is therefore devoted to exploring these diverse views. It begins by providing an overview of the charity versus social change approach to service-learning partnerships. This overview leads to an in-depth discussion of the underlying assumptions, distinct concepts, and concerns associated with each approach. Supported by empirical evidence, the section then sheds light on the approach that has been predominating university-community engagement with an attempt to explain the causes behind its prevalence.

**Charity and social justice approaches: overview.**

Whereas a number of scholars conceived of charity and social justice as existing on a continuum (e.g., Colby et al., 2003; Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990; Elden & Chisholm, 1993; Lackey, Burke, & Peterson, 1987), others perceived them as two separate concepts. For example, Deans (1999) argued that charity and social justice are two distinct paradigms and cautioned against the temptation of the concept of continuum, stressing those educators “should resist the impulse to recruit service-learning practitioners into a single philosophical, theoretical, or pedagogical framework” (p. 26). Within the same vein, Morton (1995) proposed three service paradigms: charity, project, and social change. He argued that these forms of service are distinct and do not
necessarily exist on a continuum of service. Rather, he contended, “Each paradigm is based upon distinctive worldviews, ways of identifying and addressing problems, and long-term visions of individuals and community transformation” (p. 21).

Adopting the terms of anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973), Morton described a “thin” and “thick” version of each paradigm, reflecting the depth or integrity of the service performed within that paradigm. The thin version of the charity paradigm refers to paternalistic or self-satisfying acts that inflict services on unreceptive others. The thin version of the project paradigm refers to the service that enlarges or reinforces inequalities of power, generates outcomes that are worse than the initial problem, or results in impractical or unsustainable dependencies. The thin version of the social change paradigm is only vocal, serves self-interests, and opposes many structural systems without suggesting alternatives. Morton insisted, “Any of the paradigms can raise false expectations, inflame social divisions and leave people tired and cynical” (p. 28). He described the thick versions of each paradigm as,

Grounded in deeply held, internally coherent values; match means and ends, describe a primary way of interpreting and relating to the world; offer a way of defining problems and solutions; and suggest a vision of what a transformed world might look like. (p. 28)

At their thickest, the paradigms can overlap or be complementary to one another. Morton argued that if any of the three paradigms is done well, it can lead to the transformation of individuals and communities. Morton’s central argument is: Regardless of the service model, integrity is the thing that matters the most, explaining that each of the three approaches can be pursued with or without integrity. He contended that the merit of this conceptualization is that it deliberately stimulates discussions among students about the
three paradigms and it also helps educators encourage and challenge students to delve deeply into their chosen paradigm. Such deep discussions, the author believes, may lead students to attain the “thick” version of their preferred paradigm. Furthermore, this conceptualization is inclusive and opens space for individuals from a wide range of orientations and schools of thought to be engaged in service-learning partnerships.

Kahne and Westheimer (1999) noted that charity describes responsible citizens while social change describes critical democrats. They explained that the charity approach stresses the value of altruism and the sense of pleasure associated with giving. On the other hand, the social change approach stresses the importance of active participation in political action and in seeking solutions to the root causes of problems. In a similar vein, Marullo and Edwards (2000) differentiated between the concepts of charity and social justice, arguing that charity refers to providing help or relief efforts to those in need. It describes voluntary work done by well-off individuals or an institution to donate some of their resources to an individual or groups with fewer resources. They explained that when charitable work is well-organized, done efficiently, and directed with compassion and in a respectful manner to people with real needs, it “can literally save lives, prevent misery, and maintain the dignity of the recipients” (p. 899). The social justice model refers to intentional efforts to abolish inequalities and injustices in society. Individuals who seek social justice work to change the institutional practices that result in extreme or unjustified inequalities among individuals. According to Marullo and Edwards, the fundamental distinction between charity and social justice is that the latter pushes students to address the structural or institutional reasons that put people in poverty
or need. They contended that charity work can be vital in handling the symptoms of a problem, but it innocently overlooks or intentionally ignores the root causes of this problem. They thus argued that adopting the social justice approach necessitates allocating some resources to recognize the underlying causes of social problems.

**Service-learning partnerships: charity model.**

Dewey (1908) negatively described the concept of charity as “a superior class achieving merit by doing things gratuitously for an inferior class” (p. 334). Similarly, several scholars expressed a concern that the charity model of service-learning partnerships confirms negative stereotypes and students’ perceptions of poor communities as vulnerable (Brown, 2001; Kahne & Westheimer, 1996; Marullo & Edwards, 2000; Morton, 1995; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000). In this regard, O’Grady (2000) emphasized that unless service-learning focuses on social justice, it “can perpetuate racist, sexist, or classist assumptions about others and reinforce a colonialist mentality or superiority” (p. 12). Similarly, Robinson (2000) argued that service-learning curricula which are guided by charitable principles can yield many benefits to needy individuals yet such curricula “silence the citizen and constitute more of a glorified welfare system than a socially transformational movement” (p. 145). Likewise, Ginwright and Cammarota (2002) cautioned that traditional service-learning can be beneficial to students and provide much needed service in the community, but such service does not lead to transformation nor does it live up to the potential revolutionary movement associated with the rhetoric of service-learning.
The literature recognizes other risks associated with charity work in service-learning partnerships. For example, Marullo and Edwards (2000) warned that in charity work, student service-learners’ sense of self-satisfaction can become an end in itself instead of keeping the interests of the needy as a priority. Also, they argued that service with a charity orientation may fail to satisfy the needs of clients and result in programs that care more about the needs of volunteers and donors than those of the service clients. Furthermore, they contended that “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” (p. 901). For instance, volunteers may get tired or bored with their charity work or may lose interest if they feel that clients are not grateful enough for them. McKnight (1996) also observed that the charity model is problematic in that it reinforces client dependency.

**Service-learning partnerships: social change model.**

Advocates for service-learning with the social change orientation argued that an effective fashion of government demands engaged citizens who challenge and improve current practices (Gorham, 1992; Kahne & Westheimer 1999; Marullo & Edwards, 2000; O’Grady, 2000; Robinson, 2000; Wade, 2000). For example, Kahne and Westheimer contended that “citizenship in a democratic community requires more than kindness and decency; it requires engagement in complex social and institutional endeavors” (p. 34). This type of governance also demands that individuals exert effort to establish, assess, criticize, and alter public organizations and programs. Likewise, Seider (2007) argued that alleviating inequality and suffering in society requires moving beyond small acts of compassion toward formal involvement. Empowerment and addressing structural causes
of societal problems are two core concepts within the social justice framework of service-learning partnerships. The section that follows discusses these concepts and the consequences of overlooking them in such collaborations.

**Concept of empowerment.**

The concept of empowerment is a distinct feature of critical service-learning partnerships. In this regard, Marullo and Edwards (2000) argued that unless the service activity empowers recipients, it further marginalizes the needy and alienates them from their just opportunities in society. They thus explained that work with the justice orientation is empowering in that the needy are treated as equal partners in determining the required type of services and resources, and how they can be gained. They stressed that the aim of the social justice advocate should constantly be “that those in need will no longer face such needs” (p. 901). They further explained that one way to accomplish this goal is to empower service clients so that they become able to meet their own self-determined needs. Marullo and Edwards pointed out that empowerment guards against one of the issues associated with charity work, namely the sense of superiority experienced by the individual providing the service.

**Concept of individual deficits versus structural inequalities.**

Wade (2000) referred to the social justice approach of service-learning as “service for an ideal” as opposed to “service for an individual” (p. 97). Marullo and Edwards (2000) reminded us that while service to those in need is usually provided to an individual or family, the core cause of their problems exists in the institutional or societal system. They intelligently observed:
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. (p. 903).

Accordingly, they noted that if student service-learners attribute the causes of a social problem, such as poverty, illiteracy, or homelessness to deficits or shortcomings in individual characteristics, this could be an indicator that students did not grasp the social justice aspect of the problem.

As a characteristic of their generation, students tend to perceive social problems as issues of individual choice and motivations (Clydesdale, 2006; Keene, 2009). As such, Marullo and Edwards (2000) cautioned: When the social justice component is ignored, student service-learners inevitably observe the differences between service providers and service recipients. Students tend to attribute the miserable conditions of service recipients to these differences. The bigger social problem is then minimized in the student service-learner’s mind on the basis of characteristics of the recipients while ignoring the way society is arranged to perpetuate inequality. Based on this understanding, service learners will then try to solve the problem by improving the individual skills of social service agency clients. For example, they may design and deliver job-training sessions. Such individual-based programs may yield positive impacts, such as increasing the chances of the service clients obtaining a job or becoming self-sufficient. Yet, Marullo and Edwards cautioned that without confronting the structural causes of problems, in this example, the economic ones, “We are merely reshuffling who among the lower classes will be in such programs” (p. 904) at any particular time. They further stressed that charity work which is not informed by a social
justice agenda will perpetuate unjust systems and fail in the long run to abolish inequalities. They also argued that unless some resources are allocated to correcting the underlying causes of social problems, “We exhaust our ability to create the social structures that operate for the greater good and create a permanent underclass” (p. 910).

The importance of addressing the root causes of societal problems rather than focusing on individual shortcomings is also stressed by several other scholars. For example, Pompa (2002) eloquently explained:

If I “do for you, “serve” you, “give to” you—that creates a connection in which I have the resources, the abilities, the power, and you are the receiving end. It can be—while benign and intent—ironically disempowering to the receiver, granting further power to the giver. Without meaning to, this process replicates the “have-have not” paradigm that underlines many social problems. (p. 68)

Within the same vein, O’Grady (2000) contended that addressing private human needs is critical, but unless the structural systems that give rise to these needs are also defined and confronted, “the cycle of dependence remains” (p. 13). Ryan (1971) also warned against placing attention on individuals rather than addressing the structural causes of problems, noting that if we continue to focus on changing individuals, we will end up blaming the victim and strengthening unenviable differences among us.

**Concerns about the social change model.**

As indicated above, many service-learning proponents strongly advocate for social change as the ideal model for university-community service-learning partnerships. Yet, a number of scholars expressed concerns about adopting this model. These concerns are based on various philosophies, ideologies, and beliefs. The sections that follow explore the reservations about adopting a social change approach in university-
community engagement for service-learning. In this regard, Leeds (1999) argued that focusing on social justice restricts how service-learning, its educational merit, and constructive dilemmas are perceived. Although Wade (2000) favored critical service-learning, she acknowledged the practicality of the traditional approach to service-learning. She noted that critical service-learning has a potential to bring about change to many people. Yet, service to individuals is practical and easier to manage with a cohort of students over a limited period of time.

Similarly, Barber (1999) posited that in order for service-learning to accomplish its stated goals of social enhancement, it must adopt an activist philosophy. Yet, still, he noted that such an approach should not be pursued too explicitly or strongly lest service-learning lose its academic integrity or institutional support. Zlotkowski (1996) expressed a similar concern, noting that much attention to the ideological goals of social justice may limit the efforts to institutionalize service-learning among faculty members. He contended that many instructors conceive of service-learning as a pedagogy to enhance classroom teaching and learning without a concern for social advocacy or fostering civic values, especially in less political disciplines, such as biology and engineering. He thus contended that politically charged service-learning is less likely to attract faculty members from a wide range of disciplines, or gain sustainable institutional support. Zlotkowski also argued that the university-community partnership as a unit is less prone to accept the transformational potential of service-learning. He claimed that such a model of service-learning is too politically charged and exposes the university and
community to social risks. Therefore, he concluded that such a type of partnership is less likely to invoke either strong or sustainable institutional support to service-learning.

Based on their conceptualization of the role of higher education, a group of scholars resists the inclination of service-learners’ advocates to focus on the social advocacy model in university-community collaborations. For instance, Finn and Vanourek (1995) believed that the fundamental mission of the university is “transmitting basic skills and essential knowledge” (p. 7). Other scholars responded to this claim, noting that there is a broad agreement that institutions of higher education have civic and public purposes, encompassing preparing enlightened and productive citizens and engaging in scholarship that responds to critical problems and function as a “mirror to society to allow self reflection and correction” (Saltmarsh et al., 2009, p. 3).

Robinson (2000) attempted to reconcile the different views regarding adopting traditional versus critical approaches of university-community collaborations. He acknowledged both the educational and civic missions of higher education. Specifically, he argued that the university has two fundamental missions. One is the generation of knowledge and education of students in a politically neutral manner. The other is to serve as a social conscience, ray of progress, and means to promote the power of reason, tolerance, and justice in the world. Robinson explained that the latter mission becomes particularly critical when these values are opposed by military force or absolute economic power. He intelligently noted that if educators can explicitly justify the pedagogical benefits of social, political, and justice-advocacy models of service-learning, they can
then expect that the aims associated with such models will be easier to realize as the programs are more smoothly maintained.

**Political and non-political approaches.**

Several scholars (Gorham, 1992; Marullo & Edwards, 2000; Robinson, 2000) connect the transformational potential of university-community service-learning partnerships with political acts. In this regard, Robinson (2000) refused “meek acceptance of authoritative guidelines to remain “neutral” and “non-political” (p. 155), noting:

> When they [service-learning programs] turn students away from grass-roots mobilization, street protests, and insurgent defiance politics, then they function to domesticate both service-learning and latent student passion by turning potential activists, social workers and public servants away from the forces of social transformation and toward the forces of stability, normality, and preservation of privilege. (p. 146)

Likewise, Marullo and Edwards (2000) argued that without advancing the politicization of students and the social change agenda for university-community collaborations, students are socialized to accept existing unfair structures and promote cultural beliefs concerning the immutability of these issues. They even expected that unless university-community partnerships adopt a social change approach, then such collaborations are doomed to short duration and failure. They contended that politicization and institutional transformation can be attained by socializing community service learners to comprehend the political aspects of the issues they aim to tackle, and by planning university-community collaborations in a way that makes them a part of greater institutional change endeavors.
While some scholars place a high emphasis on politics as the path to social change, others believe that civic engagement encompasses both political and non-political actions. For example, Colby et al. (2003) perceived political engagement as a specific subset of civic responsibility, stressing that “not all forms of civic involvement count as political” (p. 19). Colby and her colleagues contended that political engagement operates on a continuum along with apolitical types of civic engagement. They believe that both political and apolitical forms of civic engagement can overlap, but still they can be independent of each other with respect to the underlying motivations and forms of involvement.

**University-Community Partnerships: Prevailing Model**

Regardless of the debate concerning university-community partnerships as acts of charity or a struggle for social change, the vast majority of service-learning programs operate through a charity model (Bringle, Hatcher, & MacIntosh, 2006; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Kahne & Westheimer, 1999; Kahne, Westheimer, & Rogers, 2000; Langseth & Troppe, 1997; Rhoads, 1997; Robinson, 2000; Saltmarsh et al., 2009). In this regard, Kahne et al. (2000) observed that most service-learning courses neither raise awareness of social movements nor encourage an examination of social and economic systems and action for systemic change. Rather, they underscore volunteerism and charity. Likewise, Marullo and Edwards (2000) called attention to the pervasiveness of the charity model in university-community collaborations, noting that this model is usually referred to as community service and educational outreach programs. They argued that in order for these programs to solve social problems rather than just alleviating the negative
consequences for the disadvantaged individual, those who perform the service must adopt a social justice approach rather than a charity one. Reflecting on service-learning collaborations, Saltmarsh et al. observed, “With only a few exceptions . . . . what has emerged is remarkably apolitical “civic” engagement” (p. 5). They also lamented that partisan, political, and agency activities are being restricted.

The pervasiveness of the charity model in service-learning partnerships is supported by empirical evidence. Various studies used different approaches to examine student preferences for different types of community service learning: “charity,” “project,” and “social change.” For example, Morton (1995) used a forced-choice survey in which college students were asked to choose one type of service for their current activities, over the course of their lives, and what they think others should do. Morton found “charity” to be the favorite orientation when asked about current activities. The student participants favored “project” when asked about their preferred type over the course of their lives, and as a recommendation for what others ought to do. Likewise, Bringle et al. (2006) surveyed 217 different groups of undergraduate students, ones who are involved in service-learning courses and others who are not, at a large urban campus. They found significant differences among student preference with “charity” being the most favorable type of service followed by “project” while “social change” gained the least preference. Based on their findings, they contended that direct service and projects are the most convenient for all the constituents involved in service-learning. They explained that not all service-learning courses can be appropriate for engaging students in social change activities because of constraints of time, student capabilities, learning
objectives of the course, and faculty interests. They also noted that identifying resources to inculcate civic learning through structured reflection (Gottlieb & Robinson, 2002; Perry & Jones, 2006) and supplementary readings—highlighting figures who have advocated for social change—can be means to connect direct service programs to social change efforts even if service-learning activities are not focused on social advocacy.

Based on the findings of his study, Morton (1995) contended that students’ preference should be honored. That is, the focus on social change should be kept at a minimum in proportion to the two other approaches—charity and projects—in service-learning activities. Similarly, Bringle et al. (2006) contended that educators can continue to include charity and projects types of service since students find them the most attractive. Other scholars opposed these conclusions, arguing that the problem lies in the poor design of service-learning courses. In this respect, Cone (2003) observed that through service-learning, “We are failing to help students understand that civic action involves more than direct service and that systemic problems require systemic solutions” (p. 15). This latter view is consistent with the existing broad consensus: The quality of service-learning courses matters in order for this innovation to achieve its potential. Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2000) articulated the necessity for quality service-learning courses, asserting, “Done well, it [service-learning] can fulfill the civic mission of higher education” (p. 768).

Similar to student preference for charity- and project-based relationships with communities, community agency staff members seem to favor short-term relationships with institutions of higher education. A qualitative study by Bushouse (2005) revealed
that community partners have a strong preference to developing project-based relationships with institutions of higher education. Economic issues were cited as the major reason for community partners’ reluctance to engage with universities in deep and transformational relationships. Specifically, the participants in this study explained that their organizations are limited in terms of the resources which can be allocated to such partnerships and the number of staff who can supervise student service learners. The small sample size of this study, 14, raises questions about the generalizability of its findings. Yet, these findings deserve serious consideration, given the fact that the community partners participating in this study represent a wide range of community agencies. Also, research on the limited capacity of the non-profit sector (Bushouse) increases the credibility of these findings. Institutions of higher education that aspire to reviving their civic mission may then need to find ways to provide their partnering organizations with financial security so as to motivate those organizations to enter into deep and transformative partnerships with their campuses.
Summary

In summary, this section addressed the approaches to service-learning partnerships. The review revealed that these approaches are discussed in the literature in terms of progression models, and critical versus traditional partnerships. The debate in the literature regarding the proper model of university-community partnerships for service-learning revolves around these collaborations as charitable service to communities in need, or partnerships that motivate students to engage in politics and advocate for social change. Scholars use several terms to refer to these two approaches, including critical versus traditional service-learning. Others use charity versus social justice paradigms. In the charity model, social problems, such as poverty, illiteracy, or homelessness are attributed to personal deficits, and thus efforts are exerted to help less competent individuals overcome their own deficits. In the social justice orientation, university-community partnerships for service-learning are designed in such a way as to push student service-learners to dig deeper and probe into the root causes of these problems, which are usually embedded deeply in structural systems of society. The discussion provided arguments and counter-arguments for each approach. Supported by scholarly arguments and empirical findings, the literature review demonstrates that the charity model of university-community partnerships predominates service-learning courses. Internal constraints within institutions and external political factors emerged as primary reasons for the predominance of this model.
Critical Insights

The progression models were presented as examples to draw attention to the possibilities of developing university-community partnerships. The models can also be used as frameworks for evaluating these partnerships. As such, it must be remembered that the author does not advocate for any of these models as the best. Rather, she argues that there is no one-size-fits-all model; the ideal progression model is one that is aligned with the university’s mission, vision, and goals, as well as one which responds to the needs of the particular community with which it partners.

The age of the university-community partnerships emerged as an indicator of the depth and complexity of these collaborations. In this respect, Scheibel et al. (2005) theorized that partnerships take a long time to develop, explaining that most of them start as a single project or a program that evolves into a relationship. When these relationships are strengthened, more opportunities for collaborations emerge. As they grow, partnerships expand in terms of the scope of activities they tackle and the number of partners involved. Similarly, Bringle and Hatcher (2002) posited that a partnership’s age helps understand its stage of development. In Dorado and Giles’s (2004) empirical study, the age of the partnership emerged as an explanatory factor of the type of relation that describes service-learning partnerships.

The age of the partnerships should then be taken into consideration when evaluating university-community partnerships for service-learning. Not only can it help define the type of relationship characterizing these collaborations, but also it can reveal important information about the partners involved and the organizational characteristics
of their institutions/organizations. For example, a well-established university-community partnership could be an indicator that the parties involved take their civic responsibility seriously enough, and thus they exert intentional effort to sustain such collaborations for the overall benefit of their communities.

There is a broad assumption (Enos & Morton, 2003) that moving university-community partnerships for service-leaning toward transformative relationships is the ideal approach and/or the ultimate goal of these collaborations. The literature review revealed that such an assumption cannot be generalized to all partnerships. That is, transformative relationships are neither desirable nor proper for all types of university-community engagement. For example, the community partners interviewed in Bushouse’s (2005) study explicitly expressed their strong inclination to developing transactional relationships with the partnering universities. Likewise, the faculty member participants in Clayton et al.’s (2010) research repeatedly described their relationships with community partners as transactional, with some hoping for transformational relationships. Several scholars (e.g., Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2009; Clayton et al.) explained that time constraints and other obligations of each partner may constitute a barrier for expectations for transformational partnerships. Furthermore, they found that transactional relationships are appropriate in many service-learning courses at the beginning of establishing a university-community partnership, or when such relationships are viewed by partners as mutually satisfying and convenient. Based on the findings of their empirical study, Clayton et al. cautioned that expectations for transformational relationships—if they are neither desired nor convenient to one partner—may paralyze
the relationships which operate successfully at the transactional level. Such expectations may also limit the benefits to all partners. While Clayton and her colleagues believe that transactional relationships could be proper in some service-learning partnerships, they acknowledged that progressing toward transformational relationships could be possible or desirable throughout the development of the partnership.

As educators, we often aspire to make a difference. We thus tend to engage ourselves in transformative work to help bring about positive social change to our communities. That is why many of us may hope to transform our relationships with community partners so that we can tackle issues pertaining to social justice. Yet, we should be mindful of the goals and aspirations of community partners as well. While we should exert our best to eliminate barriers to the development of deep relationships with community partners, we should acknowledge the uniqueness of each university-community collaboration. In particular, we should take into consideration the research findings indicating that small-scale partnerships could be convenient in certain cases. We then should not push community partners into transformative relationships for which they may not be ready or willing.

While the literature is replete with theoretical/conceptual arguments concerning the value of transformative relationships, empirical evidence demonstrates that transactional relationships could be valuable as well. Furthermore, Scheibel et al. (2005) reminded us that “the level of involvement does not make the relationship good or bad” (p. 63), noting that as long as partners respect each other and acknowledge the strengths and knowledge that each contributes, “the partnership is likely to remain strong” (pp. 63-
It is therefore critical that university and community partners discuss the goals and expectations of their partnerships at the initiation phase of their collaborations.

Marullo and Edwards (2000), among other scholars, illuminated the discussion on the charity versus social change models of university-community partnerships for service-learning. Their seminal work, *From Charity to Justice: The potential of University-Community Collaboration for Social Change*, serves as an eye-opener to many of the issues associated with traditional versus critical paradigms of service. Among these issues is the paradox between the rapid increase of volunteerism and the declining interest in civics and politics among college students. They explained that community service is not perceived as political action or considered a sign of democratic participation because most individuals who perform the service do not view it as a component of political change process. Also, they reported that many political activists argued that such service actions neither lead to political outcomes nor do they have the potential to do so. These justifications can be controversial, but they deserve attention; higher education leaders may need to evaluate their engagement effort so as to recognize whether or not such efforts will lead to their desired outcomes of promoting students’ civic engagement.

Marullo and Edwards (2000) also intelligently connected the shallow consideration that attributes social problems to individual shortcomings with the capitalist ideology that holds individuals responsible for whatever life conditions in which they find themselves. They explained that major social problems, such as racism, classism, and sexism, rest on a notion of causality that individuals of color, the poor, and women
are responsible for their disadvantaged situations because of their deeds, conduct, or insufficient effort. This remarkable observation can be beneficial to service-learning faculty members. They can, for example, integrate the capitalist ideology along with other ideologies into the reading assignment of their courses to help students become conscious of the ideologies influencing their thinking while working with community partners and service recipients.

Several scholars called attention to a conflict between thought and action in service-learning. For instance, Robinson (2000) pointed out there is a broad consensus that service-learning has the potential to reinvigorate civic society and communicate the aim of social justice (Rocha, 2000). Yet, only a few of service-learning courses adopt the social-advocacy model, which is necessary to accomplish such goals. Specifically, he, like many other scholars (e.g., Carpini & Keeter, 2000; Saltmarsh et al., 2009), observed that the number of service-learning courses operating with the charitable model is more than those that operate with the social-advocacy model. Robinson noted that the majority of service-learning courses have two common characteristics. One is that these programs place students in well-established, professional, and mainstream organizations. The other is that students are typically assigned non-politicized roles, such as offering direct services and technical assistance to individuals and communities. In a similar vein, Butin (2006b) highlighted the tension between the ambitious goals of service-learning and the efforts to have it institutionalized in academe, noting:

Service-learning thus finds itself in an extremely uncomfortable double-blind. If it attempts to be a truly radical and transformative (liberal) practice, it faces potential censure and sanction. If it attempts to be politically balanced to avoid such an attack, it risks losing any power to make a difference. (p. 58)
This tension raises daunting questions to the parties involved in university-community partnerships for service-learning. Examples of these questions include the following: How can such collaborations be planned in a balanced manner so that they address institutional injustices without taking the risk of losing academic legitimacy? What type of organizational change is needed to support such efforts? And what knowledge and skills do partners need to gain so that they can successfully navigate such a conflict?

The General Counsel for the Corporation for National Service stated:
National service has to be nonpartisan. What is more, it should be about bringing communities together by getting things done. Strikes, demonstrations and political activities can have the opposite effect. They polarize and divide. (as quoted in Walker, 2000, p. 647)

This quotation clearly shows that pursuing a political agenda while performing service will be neither endorsed nor supported by government bodies. Given the fact that this statement is issued by representatives from the U.S.—which claims to honor democracy and encourages common people’s participation in politics—a series of tough questions emerge: How would government officials in less democratic societies react to university-community service-learning partnerships with a social-advocacy model? In the regimes that neither invite nor welcome ordinary citizen participation in politics, what price will the parties involved in service-learning partnerships have to pay if they choose to adopt a social justice model?

The author intentionally raises these questions in an attempt to help the reader appreciate the difficulty of adopting a social change approach when initiating such collaborations. She also wants to stress that the concerns about pursuing an explicitly political agenda in these collaborations are, sadly, legitimate and must be taken seriously,
if we want service-learning to secure legitimacy in academe. Yet, such concerns should not intimidate higher education and community leaders from addressing societal problems. Rather, the author argues that the parties involved in university-community service-learning partnerships should be equipped with the required political knowledge and skills before embarking on tackling systematic injustices. Gaining such an expertise is especially critical for students because they are subject to higher levels of risk compared with higher education faculty and staff members who enjoy academic freedom, a degree of authority, and other types of institutional protection. Examples of the necessary skills include the art of persuasion, techniques of building coalitions, strategies for community organizing, and multiple ways to empower others and disseminate information. Carpini and Keeter’s (2000) argument supports the author’s above stated viewpoint. They explained that political knowledge is critical to understanding the connection between societal problems and the role government can play to address these problems. They also noted that political knowledge is important to understand how to affect existing systems.

A sound understanding of social problems must take into consideration that unfair systems have been in place for many decades, and that there are some individuals who enjoy unearned privilege, and thus benefit from maintaining the status quo. Being equipped with relevant political knowledge and practical skills is then necessary for those who aspire to initiate a positive social change in their communities. For example, political knowledge can help those individuals clearly see that the root causes of social problems are deeply imbedded in existing systems. Practical skills can enable them to
protect themselves and others from the harsh treatment they may experience as a result of
their struggle to correct injustices. Such an expertise may also enable them to inspire
their colleagues, build alliances, and sustain their work. Simply put, it is necessary for
parties involved in university-community service-learning partnerships to gain relevant
expertise so that they manage to confront and challenge social injustices, if they so
choose.

Mohandas Gandhi (as cited in Marullo & Edwards, 2000) insisted that it is not
sufficient to do the right thing for the wrong reason. Likewise, Bacon asserted that the
first principle of progress is “know thy goals,” arguing that “it is not possible to run a
course alright when the goal itself is not rightly placed” (as cited in Harkavy, 2009, p.
285). Harkavy thus insisted that service-learning should be assessed by the degree to
which it truly promotes democracy in the classroom, community, and society. Following
the advice of these eminent thinkers, the author devoted a sizable portion of the literature
review to address the traditional versus critical paradigms of university-community
partnerships for service-learning. Including such a discussion was necessary to reveal the
underlying motivations for initiating such collaborations, which influence the perceptions
of community partners. For instance, a charity model reinforces the common notion of
community as needy whereas the critical/social justice approach conceives of community
representatives as equal partners in identifying and solving problems (Ward & Wolf-
Wendel, 2000).

Also, this discussion was included because each of these service paradigms has
important and different implications for several issues associated with these
collaborations, such as the design and implementation of service-learning courses, choice of partners, duration of collaborations, and resource allocations for these partnerships. Furthermore, the social justice approach of university-community partnerships was discussed in depth to call attention to the necessity of institutional commitment to social justice rather than depending solely on delegating the responsibility to a few highly dedicated individual faculty members. Therefore, the author concurs with Feldman, Moss, Chin, Marie, Rai, and Graham (2006) who asserted that the social agenda of service-learning cannot be achieved by individual faculty members and a few groups of students. Rather, enactment necessitates an institutional commitment. As such, the discussion turns into exploring the organizational factors leading to the success of university-community collaborations for service-learning.
Third Research Question

What are the organizational factors contributing to the success of university-community service-learning partnerships?

“Even as the idea of service-learning moves into the academic mainstream, its actual institutional footprint appears uncertain” (Butin, 2006a, p. 474). Butin further explained that in spite of the positive impacts associated with service-learning, its implementation and sustainability face sizeable impediments. In this context, Holland (2000) argued that the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education depends, to a great extent, on our improved understanding of organizational changes which are often required so that service becomes a chief component of academic work and study. She explained that several of the questions posed about the roles, experiences, motivations, concerns, and expectations of faculty, students, and community can be connected, in part, to institutional and organizational issues. Given the critical importance of the organizational aspects to the integration and sustainability of service-learning in higher education, it becomes necessary to investigate the factors leading to the promotion of university-community service-learning partnerships. This investigation draws on the literatures exploring organizational/institutional change in higher education, institutionalization of service-learning in higher education, characteristics of an engaged campus, and the scholarship of engagement in general.

The pivotal pieces of literature reviewed for this academic quest included Holland’s matrix (1997) for institutional commitment to engagement, Bringle and Hatcher’s (1996) Comprehensive Action plan for Service-Learning, along with the
Comprehensive Assessment of the Scholarship of Engagement they developed in 2001, as well as Furco’s (2002) Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education. Based on a thorough review of these pieces and an extensive review of other relevant sources, twelve organizational factors emerged as the most critical issues to advancing university-community collaborations for service-learning: institutional mission, institutional definition, institutional culture, community voice and involvement, diversity, administrative and academic leadership, institutional infrastructure, institutional funding and budget allocation, institutional policies (faculty promotion and tenure guidelines), discipline-based departments, curriculum, and partnership assessment. Each of these factors merits a detailed discussion.

**Institutional mission.**

The role of an institutional mission as an organizational factor that helps advance engaged scholarship in general, and in service-learning in particular is highly emphasized by many scholars (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Furco, 2002; Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Holland, 1997, 1999, 2000; O’Meara, 2002; Ramaley, 2005; Scheibel, et al., 2005; Votruba, 2005). For instance, Kendall (1990) cautioned service-learning proponents: Unless institutions of higher education were committed to integrating service-learning into their central missions and goals, the future of service-learning will be short. Likewise, Franz (2009) asserted that engaged scholarship should be incorporated as much as possible across the institution’s missions to respond to the purposes of higher education more holistically and efficiently.
Chaffee (1998) remarked that a mission statement states intentions, as well as identifies constituents and shapes behaviors so that goals of an organization and its individuals may be fulfilled. He argued that missions can become powerful tools to stimulate and sustain institutional action and transformation. Holland (1999) posited that while an institutional mission mainly reflects the relative attention paid to research, teaching, and service by faculty, it must also encompass and represent the interface of these activities with the student experience, and with societal needs. She put it concisely, “A campus mission should reflect both internal and external relationships and expectations” (p. 56). Holland encouraged colleges and universities to employ a broad participatory process when revising their mission statements, noting that following such a process can provide a new and strengthened sense of direction and priorities, and thereby functions as a powerful institutional mechanism for change. Dill (1997) addressed the relationship between clarifying the mission, and the process of institutional planning and change. He stressed that a powerful mission connects an institution to its environment, represents campus culture and values, and provides strategic criteria for program planning, resource allocations, and other decision-making. In this manner, the institution mission “addresses the means by which a college or a university defines the niche in which it will choose to compete and the social values by which it will shape its scale, scope, and core competencies” (p. 188).

With respect to reinvigorating the civic mission of higher education, Boyer (1990) noted, “What we are faced with, today, is the need to clarify campus missions and relate the work of the academy more directly to the realities of contemporary life” (p. 13).
According to Singleton, Burack, and Hirsch (1997), building connections among teaching, research, and service is what makes engagement a part of the mission of an institution. Holland (1997) conducted a set of case studies in which she investigated the relationship between organizational factors and levels of commitment to community engagement. Based on the findings, Holland (1999) called attention to the crucial importance of matching institutional rhetoric to its actions across all components of the institution mission. She reported:

It was less important how much of a role community service was deemed to play in an institutional mission than it was for each institution to make a clear, candid, fact-based choice of its appropriate level of commitment and then organize, support, and evaluate its faculty and students in light of that commitment. In the absence of such a planned linkage between mission and performance, institutions were found to have significant internal and external conflicts over the role of community service. (p. 59)

In discussing the principles of institutional process, Holland (1999) noted that the mission must be used as the framework and criterion for all the decision making and must represent the cultural values of the institution in all actions and at all stages of change. For most institutions, this is translated into a commitment to broad participation of all academic and administrative units, as well as of key external constituents in building a new “field of vision” (p. 70) that is infused into the institution as it seeks to fulfill its mission. She insisted that in so doing, trust must be built between the institution and the community, as well as among the members of the campus community. According to Holland, setting a mission generates more than a vision and a target. It generates a map by which goals can be set and measures can evaluate progress on the way toward fulfilling these goals. She pointed out that institutions that aspire to adopt the identity of
engaged campuses should articulate the specific implications of the mission for all elements of their organizations and their constituents, noting that committing the institution to community engagement builds complex relationships with the academic community and between the campus and its many external communities. As a result, the institutional mission becomes an effective touchstone for informing interactions and choices. Holland provided the sobering observation that mission-based change is an endless process because it depends on a commitment to communication, assessment, and enhancement.

**Institutional definition.**

Statham and Schnaubelt (2007) observed that service is difficult to define within a scholarly context. They quoted Boyer who stated, “Colleges and universities have recently rejected service as a serious scholarship, partly because its meaning is so vague and often disconnected from serious intellectual work” (as cited in Statham & Schnaubelt, p. 20). In this respect, Holland (2000) noted that various terms are currently in use: “Service-learning,” “service,” “outreach,” and “engagement.” (p. 53). She acknowledged that the lack of uniform definitions may be helpful for institutions at an early stage because those campuses can then internally craft their initiatives in accordance with institutional history and customs. Yet, she cautioned: “Without a clear definition and set of standards for service-learning, assessment of effort and evaluation of quality are obfuscated” (p. 53). Holland further explained that given the academy’s traditions for standardization of performance criteria, clear definitions of related terms seem to be essential to [establishing] new and equitable models for faculty rewards and evaluation that would translate across institutional lines. (p. 53)
Moreover, she noted that sustainability and national impact may necessitate the development of a basic framework of common conceptualization.

In the context of service-learning, Sigmon (1994) emphasized that a precise definition of service-learning will allow institutions to establish clear goals and then work effectively and efficiently to fulfill these goals. Likewise, Hinck and Brandell (2000) contended that the campus service-learning mission and goal statements must include a clear definition of the term, noting that developing an institutionally agreed upon definition of service-learning—one that distinguishes service-learning from other forms of experiential education and extracurricular volunteer work—is critically important. They explained that generating a common definition of service-learning will help establish consistency across service-learning classes, motivate faculty to provide quality service-learning experience for students, and allow faculty to compare the effects of their service-learning experiences with other faculty who employ service-learning as a pedagogical method.

**Institutional culture.**

Several scholars (e.g., Bringle et al., 1999; Holland, 2002; Vogelgesang, 2004) observed that there exist substantial differences between academic and community cultures. In this respect, Holland (1999) noted that academicians are socialized to prefer certainty, clear roles, and complete accountability. . . . explore all the possible implications and ramifications, minimizing all risks, before proceeding with a new strategy, pedagogy, or paradigm. (p. 70).

She cautioned that these stringent expectations for strategic planning block imagination and can hinder change efforts. In a similar vein, Walshok (1999) expressed her
dissatisfaction with the current culture characterizing higher education. Specifically, she observed that the present attitudes intimidate faculty members to collaborate with community members, organizational leaders, and professionals in developing shared agendas. She contended that although new projects and programs may be informed by the institution’s understanding of community needs, these ventures are seldom built upon genuine community input. Walshok also analyzed conventional modes of knowledge dissemination and communication, such as lectures, panels, and symposiums, and concluded that such forms do not represent community knowledge very well.

In their seminal work, *Democratic Engagement Framework*, Saltmarsh et al. (2009) criticized the expertise model of knowledge generation that alleges “an exclusionary position relative to other forms of knowledge and other knowledge producers” (p. 7). They also expressed concerns about the current model of civic engagement that promotes the flow of knowledge in one direction from the academy to the community, as well as values the expert-based knowledge more than the community-based knowledge. Furthermore, Saltmarsh et al. analyzed the prevalent framework of engagement, noting that it is biased toward the knowledge generated by university experts. They explained that the knowledge produced by academic experts rests on “hierarchies of knowledge generation and knowledge use” (p. 7) and establishes a divide between knowledge producers in the academy and knowledge consumers in the community.

As described above, the prevailing culture in higher education paralyses effective university-community engagement. It thus follows that profound changes must occur to
advance service-learning partnerships in higher education. In this regard, Holland (1999) called for a new context for change in higher education that is “dynamic, iterative, improvisational, and adaptive” (p. 70) and encouraged academic institutions to adopt a “philosophy of risk and experimentation, rather than one that avoids risk though control” (p. 70). Likewise, Kecskes and his colleagues (2006) called for shifting faculty culture from private to public and from an individual to a collective focus on the common good. This review reveals that reciprocity, respect, ongoing dialogues, and collaborations between institutions of higher education and communities are indispensable characteristics of the institutional culture that can facilitate and advance service-learning partnerships in higher education.

**Community involvement and voice.**

According to Holland (1999) who is a senior scholar and has written extensively about the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education, the integrated participation of the community is a curial principle that contributes to institutional progress toward inculcating civic engagement on campuses. She explained that adopting a commitment to community engagement as a dimension of institutional mission depends on the ongoing and genuine participation of the community in the decisions and actions of the institution, stating “the institution is opening itself to community influence and critical feedback important to continuous improvement” (p. 69). In her institutionalization rubric, Holland (1997) indicated that each level of commitment requires a different level of community involvement, emphasizing that at each level, building a trusting and mutually beneficial relationships between the university and the
community is dependent on consistent and proper levels of communication and engagement.

Walshok (1999) noted that in order for university campuses to become the engaged knowledge centers that serve society needs, they must organize and play their role in the knowledge discovery, development, and integration process differently in the future. Specifically, she called for a cultural shift in which campuses must see themselves as one center of expertise, rather than the center of expertise, and that they must learn how to listen and exchange knowledge, not just reach out and transfer knowledge. (p. 83 italics in the original)

She also explained that this cultural shift means that the academy and the community become more interdependent with respect to how community-based problems and opportunities are defined, clarified, and resolved. She therefore noted that universities should engage with communities in ongoing dialogues and interactions to increase the use of new knowledge throughout society, noting that the relationships between universities and communities “must be more fluid, more interactive, and more activist” (p. 85). In order for this to happen, Walshok argued that campuses must initiate creative institutional structures which can support these novel forms of intellectual discussions and civic engagement.

Similar to Walshok’s (1999) conceptualization of knowledge generation, Saltmarsh et al. (2009) proposed a democratic engagement framework that involves an overt and deliberate emphasis on the democratic dimension of university-community partnerships. Specifically, this framework positions the university within an ecosystem of knowledge construction. In this system, the university interacts with other knowledge producers outside the academy in order to generate new
problem-solving knowledge through a multidimensional flow of knowledge and expertise. (p. 10)

The democratic engagement framework embraces the ideals of collaboration, inclusiveness, and problem-centered work in which academicians share knowledge construction with the public and engage community partners in solving public problems.

Saltmarsh and his colleagues called for:

Collaborative knowledge construction that brings together academic knowledge with the local knowledge of community stakeholders in defining the problem to be addressed, a shared understanding of the problem, and designing, implementing and evaluating the actions taken to address the problem. (p. 9)

Inclusion of other sources of knowledge and problem solving to academic knowledge is central to the idea of knowledge construction as envisioned by the democratic engagement framework. According to Saltmarsh et al., the capability to learn in the company of others rather than depending exclusively on the academic expertise is an indicator of democratic engagement purpose and processes.

The concept of reciprocity in university-community collaborations is repeatedly emphasized in the literature (see for example, Battistoni, 2006; Jacoby, 2003). In this regard, Walshok (1999) asserted that the partnership between universities and communities must take the form of authentic dialogues between “two equal parties” (p. 88) in which partners teach and learn much from one another. In order for university-community partnerships to progress toward more reciprocal relationships, Saltmarsh et al. (2009) called for an epistemological shift that values not only expert knowledge that is rational, analytic, and positivist, but also values a different kind of rationality that is relational, localized, and contextualized and favors mutual deference between lay persons and academics. (p. 10)
In this conceptualization, students gain collaborative and innovative problem solving strategies in learning environments in which they, along with faculty and community partners, work intentionally with one another.

**Diversity in service-learning partnerships.**

Boyer (1990) among other scholars advised colleges and universities to practice “diversity with dignity” by developing distinct missions that respond to community needs. In his pivotal work, *Scholarship of Engagement*, Boyer (1996) called attention to the importance of diversity to university-community engagement. In defining engaged scholarship, he stated:

> I’m convinced that ultimately, the scholarship of engagement . . . means [establishing] a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other, helping to enlarge what anthropologist Clifford Geertz describes as the universe of human discourse and enriching the quality of life for all of us. (p. 20)

A long time before Boyer’s statement, Dewey (1916) highlighted the importance of engaging diverse groups through associations and discourse that advance democratic principles. While Dewey acknowledged the difficulties of so doing, he stressed the value of connecting the academy and the community, the academician and the practitioner, and the theoretical and the applied theory and practice.

Walshok (1999) highlighted the substantial differences between the academy and the community, thus justifying the importance of attracting diverse groups into university-community collaborations. In particular, she explained that the “academization” of knowledge led to the generation of distinct terminologies and methodologies that are often vague comparing to the language and spontaneous problem-
solving means that exist in the world of practitioners and citizens. She also noted that only few individuals possess the capacity to function simultaneously in the world of obscure academy and that of common people. Among the examples of these individuals, Walshok included “thoughtful journalists, specialty magazine writers and editors, research librarians, documentary filmmakers, art and culture curators, and community and extension educators” (p. 90). She explained that such professionals act as “interlocutors and interpreters of ideas, values, and cultural forms to selected publics” (p. 90). In so doing, they connect between specialists and generalists, merge both the intellectual and civic traditions of discourse and analysis, and explain the main ideas and concerns of each community to the other. Walshok explained that such types of mentality and communication skills are necessary for generating shared agendas and acquiring the diverse resources of knowledge required to tackle complex human and community issues. She thus encouraged institutions of higher education to involve people with these qualities into university-community partnerships, noting that doing so will enable colleges and universities to design learning experiences and seek activities which are “neither exclusively academic nor exclusively pragmatic” (p. 90). These professionals can, for instance, “Facilitate meetings, roundtable discussions, advisory committees, and expert input into the development of agendas, curricula, research initiatives, and community forums” (pp. 90-91) that genuinely reflect the intersection of the distinct cultures of the university with the principles of the community with which it partners. According to Walshok, this type of work requires mission-based programs and financial resources to ensure that cross-disciplinary offices or community-related
programs that include professionals with these specific skills exist in departments or schools. Therefore, it becomes necessary to explore the role of institutional leadership, mission, infrastructure, and resource allocation in promoting university-community collaborations for service-learning. The sections that follow examine each of these factors.

**Institutional leadership.**

Votruba (2005) noted that the majority of campus presidents endorse public engagement and argued that the issue is not lack of presidential commitment to public engagement. Rather, it is how to act on that commitment in a manner that translates into campus action. He observed that public engagement thrives under the leadership of a certain dean, provost, or president, but that commitment fades away when that leader leaves. Votruba thus asserted that the significant leadership challenge is to “weave public engagement so deeply into the fabric of the campus that it remains strong, even when key leaders move on” (p. 265). In discussing the organizational characteristics necessary for supporting the multidimensional forms of community engagement, Walshok (1999) noted that there should be efficient and credible individuals who articulate and advocate the institutional mission, as well as facilitate partnerships and program development. In his view, these individuals should be full-time, academically competent, and intellectually engaged with an emphasis on community. She described such persons as, “The champions, the visionaries, and the catalytic agents in the academic/civic partnership” (p. 91).
The important role of campus leaders in promoting service-learning is supported by not only theoretical arguments, but also by empirical evidence. For example, Hinck and Brandell (2000) conducted a quantitative study to investigate issues pertaining to service-learning practices and support in higher education. Employing a random sample, they surveyed 225 colleges and universities. The study’s participants were higher education professionals from various types of institutions: public, private, and religious. The results indicated that effective service-learning programs must have strong presidential and administrative support. The results also revealed a positive relationship between how much university administrators value service-learning and how much faculty would value it. Hinck and Brandell thus concluded that embracing service as a critical element of an educational institution’s mission can only happen “if the institution’s president is supportive” (p. 871). They also noted that if administrators seek to build effective service-learning programs that will thrive, then administrators should act in ways that reflect their support for service-learning.

The paramount importance of senior administrators’ support of institutionalizing service-learning in higher education is also put into relief by other theoretical perspectives and empirical studies. For example, Vogelgesang (2004) conducted four case studies of small and medium-size private institutions to investigate their institutional commitment to service and diversity efforts. The findings revealed a widespread agreement among the study participants regarding the importance of the institution’s formal leadership in carving out a place for their work in the surrounding community. Vogelgesang therefore stressed the indispensable role institutional top leadership can play
in supporting service-learning and diversity initiatives on their campuses, noting that
provosts, for example, can be a source of inspiration and passion for these efforts.
Examples of other types of support senior administrators can offer to help promote
service-learning at their institutions include financial support (Hinck & Brandell, 2000;
Vogelgesang), verbal recognition (Vogelgesang), formal and informal rewards (Rhoads,
1997).

In discussing the role of institutional leadership in promoting service-learning,
Novak and Johnston (2005) highlighted the important role of trusteeship in this regard.
They noted that one of the biggest obstacles to faculty engagement in the community is
faculty policies that do not reward such an activity. Since trustees often approve faculty
policies pertaining to tenure and promotion, the authors encouraged them to approve
faculty policies that promote civic engagement, and to take a careful look at these
policies to recognize how effectively they support the institution’s civic engagement
efforts. Furthermore, Novak and Johnston noted that if there is discrepancy between
faculty policies, the institution’s mission, and strategic priorities, the board of trustees
should call for a revision of the policies so that the much needed social entrepreneurship
by the faculty can be recognized and rewarded.

**Institutional infrastructure.**

There need to be places where people can meet, converse, learn, research, create,
and even park, and that are regularly available, not just after hours and on
weekends. There need to be people who answer phones warmly, who schedule
events, set up meetings, keep notes and records, follow up on promises made,
supervise students, attend events, and are involved in the community. (Walshok,
1999, p. 92)
Institutions of higher education need to establish an academic and administrative infrastructure that enables them to fulfill their responsibilities as citizens in a substantially interactive way (Walshok, 1999). The review of literature on service-learning revealed that there is a debate about the value of establishing a central organizational structure, such as an institute, center, or an office for applied research and public service programming to support engagement (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Wade & Demb, 2009). The vast majority of scholars emphasize that the establishment of an infrastructure is crucial to institutionalizing engagement efforts (e.g., Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Scheibel et al., 2005). For instance, Hinck and Brandell noted that a centralized office with a hired faculty facilitator would promote the development of service-learning. Similarly, Scheibel et al. (2005) called for establishing a sustainable structure, explaining that one of the challenges of sustaining university-community partnerships is that they are often built based on close personal relationships. They argued that while such relationships are important for fostering trust and reciprocity among parties, partnerships suffer when these individuals depart, retire, or change careers. They therefore noted that establishing a physical structure or center for partnerships is one way of sustaining campus-community partnerships. In spite of this seemingly widespread agreement on the importance of a centralized approach or office to support engagement endeavors on campuses, Wade and Demb (2009) cautioned that the establishment of a specialized office, in some situations, may give rise to “a ‘that is what they do over there’ mentality” (p. 10). They maintained that this conceptualization limits the extent to which other units on the campus take personal responsibility for developing
the initiative that, in turn, may result in slowing the process of adopting engagement as an integral part of an institution’s culture.

Establishing a centralized engagement/service-learning office can support university-community partnerships in several ways. For instance, Walshok (1999) noted that colleges and universities need offices and professional staff members who are able to work with faculty to build academic programs that develop effective social and economic partnerships with their communities. Based on the findings of their study, Bringle and Hatcher (2000) suggested initiating and developing a centralized office to recruit and develop the institution, its faculty, students, and community partners, as well as to increase institutional budget commitments to support the development of service-learning, and grant the commitment to service-learning with leadership that establishes and sustains its academic integrity. Zlotkowski (1999) noted that the majority of support structures assist faculty in selecting suitable partners and projects, facilitate student transportation to and from community sites, and monitor student participation, as well as stakeholder satisfaction.

Hinck and Brandell (2000) stated that there should be public awareness of these centers. They explained that faculty, students, and community agencies should be aware of the goal of the office because opportunities for collaboration are essential for a successful service-learning program. They thus suggested that the professional staff of these offices meet with community agencies to identify community needs, as well as clarify the definition and goals of service-learning. Doing so could help publicize the existence of the service-learning office and its purposes. They maintained that
publicizing faculty involvement with service-learning is another useful means to promote the service-learning office, noting:

Faculty involvement can be highlighted in the office newsletters, university and community newspapers, and through public recognition ceremonies. In all circumstances, community agencies, faculty, and the service-learning office must all be brought to the attention of the academic community” (p. 880).

Several scholars addressed the required competencies of the personnel of service-learning offices. For example, Zlotkowski (1999) noted that successful programs almost always require the leadership of a professional staff member who is familiar with both the institution’s faculty and the local community. This professional must be able to work with off-campus groups in a knowledgeable, respectful manner yet still feels internal to the culture of higher education. He noted, “If the mutuality that must characterize service-learning partnerships is to be cultivated and maintained” (p. 114), then such a type of “Bilingualism” is necessary. He emphasized the critical importance of having several staff members, arguing that the presence of only one professional staff member—no matter how skilful and vigorous—is insufficient to handle all the logistical needs of a comprehensive service-learning program. In the same vein, Hinck and Brandell (2000) argued that the service-learning director should be a faculty member who is well-regarded by fellow faculty, has a track record of research and publication, and demonstrates leadership skills. They also pointed out that the service-learning director should be available to assist faculty in identifying sites, contacting site supervisors, and acting as a liaison between the community agency and the campus. Significantly, Morton (1996) stressed the importance of institutional infrastructure, noting that in the absence of
that kind of support, faculty may feel as if they are distracted from other professional responsibilities. Thus, they may become less inclined to engage in service-learning.

Hinck and Brandell (2000) called attention to an important yet often overlooked point about the placement of the centralized office within the organizational structure of an institution. Specifically, they observed that the institutional organizational structure may impact the effectiveness of the service-learning office, noting that whether the campus service-learning office reports to the provost or to the dean of students may have a considerable influence on the success of campus service-learning initiatives. In this regard, Morton (1996) argued that including service-learning in the division of academic affairs may influence faculty acceptance of service-learning as a feasible pedagogy. Empirically, the results of Bringle and Hatcher’s (2000) research supported the notion that placing a centralized office under the chief academic officer is helpful to the institutionalization of service-learning. In Hinck and Brandell’s view, what is most important to remember is that faculty will be receptive to service-learning only if they conceive of it as vital to the academic mission of the institution. Overall, it seems that institutional infrastructure is necessary for supporting all forms of community engagement including service-learning.

**Institutional funding and budget allocation.**

The availability of institutional internal funding is another organizational factor that appears to predict engagement (Holland, 2005; Ward, 1996). Holland hypothesized that if engagement were part of the institution’s mission, and the institutional funding process were firmly connected to the mission, engagement would be more prominent on
campuses. Within the context of service-learning, funding has been found to be critical to its institutionalization (Ward). Seeking funding from various resources to support engagement efforts on campuses is a common theme in the literature. In this regard, Vogelgesang (2004) advised institutions of higher education to intentionally search for alternative, diversified, and sustainable sources of funding for promoting community engagement and diversity efforts on their campuses. Likewise, Walshok (1999) argued:

The engaged campus cannot be the pet project of a single department, function, or dean. It cannot be exclusively financed by a short-lived foundation grant or special legislative allocation. It cannot be wholly dependent on fees for services or market needs that too often overshadow the intellectual agenda. . . . It must have many sources of financial support. (p. 92)

Walshok suggested three major diverse sources of funding for the engaged campus: public sources, private sources, and fees for services (see p. 93 for a complete list). Examples of the public sources include campus budget allocations, special purpose public allocations, and internal research and training grants of public agencies. Examples of the private sources include gifts and contributions from individuals, corporations, and foundations; commercial funds for business development or public relations, memberships, sponsorships, and underwriting; exclusive rights, such as franchising, licensing, and royalties. Examples of the fees for services include tuition from students, employers, and special aid programs; technical assistance and consulting to groups, organizations, and enterprises; contract research; technology network services; memberships and subscriptions; reports, workbooks, and videos.
Institutional policies.

Institutional policies and procedures, especially those pertaining to faculty hiring, promotion, and tenure emerged as prominent organizational factors to promoting university-community engagement. Since faculty promotion and tenure guidelines are one of the most recurring themes in the literature, this issue warrants special attention.

Faculty development and reward structures.

While it is critical that senior administrators show support for inculcating service and diversity work on campus, it is equally important that faculty support this work, as they are in charge of the curriculum (Vogelgesang, 2004). Likewise, Ward (2005) argued:

No matter how clear the mission statement or presidential proclamation to connect the campus with the community, if efforts to the public good are unrewarded or seen by faculty as distracting from the pursuit of the kind of things that will count on a dossier, either those public service efforts will be set aside, or the faculty member will be. Either way, community approaches to the scholarship will not be strengthened. If engagement is not supported, it becomes either altruism or an obligation, and either way it’s seen as professionally compromising for faculty. Faculty reward structures need to be aligned with institutional priorities for engagement of the public good. (p. 228)

Banerjee and Hausafus (2007) even argued that efforts to link campuses with communities will remain unrealized without attention to faculty reward systems and other issues facing the service movement in general.

Significantly, faculty reward and promotion systems are often cited as key organizational characteristics to institutionalizing community engagement and service-learning in higher education (e.g., Driscoll, 2007; Franz, 2009; Novak & Johnston, 2005). For instance, Scheibel et al. (2005) explained that because the tenure process is extremely
challenging, it can be difficult for faculty members to secure time for community work unless such work is acknowledged in the institution’s tenure guidelines. Such recognition, they lamented, is uncommon in many institutions. In the same vein, Hinck and Brandell (2000) observed that faculty who are recently hired or fresh graduates who have had experiences in or exposure to service-learning may be enthusiastic to be involved. Yet, promotion and tenure requirements in major universities discourage faculty members from investing the necessary time in designing and teaching a course using a service-learning approach. They thus emphasized that novel teaching strategies including service-learning should be recognized through formal reward structures.

Diamond (1999) repeatedly called attention to the need to adjust faculty reward systems in order to accommodate emerging forms of scholarship. He suggested seven characteristics for a sound and effective promotion and tenure structure: It must be consistent with the institution’s mission, be attentive to disciplinary differences, be considerate to individual differences, include a convenient, fair, and practical evaluation program, acknowledge departmental needs and priorities, and articulate the features of scholarly work. In Ward’s (2005) view, institutions of higher education should reshape faculty reward structures in a way that values the complexity of faculty work, including important and distinct contributions to teaching, research, and service that focus on the public good.

Hinck and Brandell (2000) noted that if institutions seek to encourage their faculty to engage in service-learning, then administrative leaders, service-learning directors, and other faculty should persuade faculty that service-learning is worthy of
faculty time and energy. They theorized a three-step process to do so: situating service-learning within academic disciplines, providing development and constant support for faculty to engage in service-learning, and connecting service-learning endeavors to faculty reward structures. According to Ward (2005), campuses that want to connect their faculty work to the community must describe in their promotion and tenure guidelines and faculty handbooks what this work looks like, and how it will be assessed and rewarded. Similarly, Colbeck and Wharton-Michael (2006) called upon institutions of higher education to evaluate faculty members in an integrative way, cautioning:

> The more institutional evaluations separate faculty activities and products into mutually exclusive categories, the less faculty are likely to enrich their teaching with their research, and inform their research with lessons learned from the community, or involve their students in research with community partners for the benefit of the public good. (p. 23)

Ward noted that the majority of promotion and tenure guidelines include examples of kinds of teaching innovation that are encouraged and rewarded. At institutions seeking to address the public good, this might mean a careful examination of the guidelines and adding examples that accomplish this type of work, such as service-learning. He argued that adding the example of service-learning as a type of teaching innovation is one way to attract faculty’s attention to this kind of work. Since institutions vary in mission, type, and definition of what constitutes faculty work, Ward suggested forming committees or task forces whose responsibility is to restructure promotion and tenure guidelines to ensure that they are representative of the campus mission statement.

Another way of aligning campus reward structures with campus missions for the public good is faculty development (Ward, 2005). Since faculty integration of service-
learning is cited as critical to institutionalization, establishing faculty development programs can have a remarkable impact (Harwood, Ochs, Currier, Duke, Hammond, Moulds, & Stout, 2005). Faculty development is especially important given Driscoll’s (2007) observation: except for the role of the researcher, few faculty members have been prepared for the main responsibilities of their professional role, namely that of a collaborator with community partners. Other types of faculty development may include fellowships, grants, release time, and cash awards for involvement in community-oriented work and are powerful motivation for faculty involved (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). Similarly, the faculty participants in Vogelgesang’s (2004) study highlighted the importance of institutional support mechanisms, such as small grants to redesign syllabi, as well as administrative assistance from the service-learning office to facilitate community partnerships, provide students with information about service opportunities, and co-ordinate placements. Overall, Ward (2005) insisted that tangible support of efforts to realize mission statements and serve the public promotes the importance of, and participation in, these activities. Zlotkowski (1999) contended that recognition and support may achieve little unless there exist structures available to faculty that facilitate establishing and maintaining community partnerships. The section that follows thus explores the infrastructure required for building university-community partnerships for service-learning.

**Discipline-based departments.**

Presidential leadership and institutional mission are critical to institutionalize civic engagement in higher education. Yet, in most cases, they cannot attain even modest
goals without taking into consideration the culture of discipline-based departments (Zloktkowski, 2005). Given this emphasis on the role of academic disciplines in institutionalizing service-learning in higher education, the following two sections explore this role in some detail and explain the critical importance of integrating service-learning into the curriculum.

Being the locus of curricular decisions, the academic department is the central organizational level where service-learning must be accepted and incorporated if it is to be sustained (Holland, 2000). Butin (2006b) concurred with Holland, noting that disciplining service-learning may help it become institutionalized in higher education more strongly and constructively. In explaining the consequences of not disciplining service-learning, he argued:

If service-learning cannot discipline itself, and if it cannot gain the professional and social legitimacy to control its own knowledge, develop its own disciplinary boundaries and norms, and critique its own practices, it will be unsustainable as a transformative agent within higher education. (p. 59)

Drawing on examples showing how some social movements, such as Black Power and Feminism, were turned into intellectual ones, such as Black Studies and Women Studies, Butin (2010b) contended that by hosting service-learning in academic departments, it can be conceived of as an intellectual movement as it is commonly perceived as a social movement. Following Butin’s advice can motivate more faculty members to participate in service-learning, thus promoting its partnerships.

Butin (2010c) also called for developing service-learning certificates, majors, and minors. His call is built on the premise that the critical “unit of analysis for knowledge construction, legitimation, and transmission in higher education is the academic program,
and, more specifically, the academic department” (p. 3). Significantly, Butin’s argument is supported by others. For example, Gumport and Snydman (2002) noted:

The ritualization of knowledge categories occurs through the creation and maintenance of departments and degree programs. In these settings, the knowledge categories and their labels contribute to what counts as knowledge. They not only provide a location where participants generate local knowledge of departmental procedures and program completion expectations, but they also designate the knowledge most worth knowing within the field. (p. 379)

As such, it becomes evident that the academic department is a key organizational factor in institutionalizing service-learning in higher education, and consequently in promoting its partnerships. Future studies are therefore needed to investigate this factor thoroughly. Examples of the questions that should be investigated include the following: What facilitates/hinders the development of service-learning certificates, majors, or minors? What is the role of the department chair and/or faculty in incorporating service-learning into their respective disciplines? Does integrating service-learning in higher education require restructuring already-existing courses? Should service-learning be introduced as core, or required, or elective courses? How many credit hours are convenient to a service-learning course? Does the allocation of credit hours vary depending on the discipline and nature of the course? Should service-learning courses be introduced only at the undergraduate level? Or, is it convenient to offer service-learning courses to graduate students as well? Should incentives be offered to faculty who teach those classes? What assessment tools are appropriate for evaluating students’ performance and/or the effectiveness of the class for all the involved partners? Answers to such questions will better illuminate the role of the academic departments in promoting service-learning partnerships.
Curriculum.

Boyer (1990) argued that service “is not something students do in their spare time; it connects back to the core curriculum and the search for shared values” (p. 26). Likewise, Jacoby (1996) noted that the introduction of service-learning into the curriculum, as opposed to co-curricular or extracurricular community-based learning activities is crucial to sustain service-learning. Similarly, Holland (1999) observed that successful enactment of community engagement as a serious element of the institutional mission most often occurs through the medium of the curriculum. She explained the value of the curriculum as a path to increasing the acceptance of community service learning as a form of scholarship in three ways. First, she argued that teaching is often perceived as a safe context for faculty to learn about the power of community engagement for their scholarship. Specifically, faculty can explore the notions of community engagement without deviating from their already developed research agendas; they can develop relationships with community partners who may direct them to new opportunities to engage in applied research, consultation, or mutual explorations of issues relevant to their research agendas and the interests and needs of the community partners (Holland, 1999; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003). Holland also noted that introducing the concepts of community service into the curriculum enables faculty to discuss the individual and collective implications of community service for their roles.

Second, the introduction of service-learning in courses leads to forming a cohort of students who may petition for additional community-based experiences and service-
learning opportunities in other courses. These students can then exercise pressure on faculty to integrate community-based experiences into the curriculum. Holland (1999) argued that such students often inspire and encourage more faculty members to acquire experience in engaged scholarship. This, in turn, enables the institution to build a critical mass of faculty for whom service-learning is an important component of their professional agendas. Third, institutional commitment to community engagement through the curriculum has a profound impact on university-community relations. According to Holland, when community service is introduced into the curriculum, the university and the community gain experience in collaborating on projects that yield specific outcomes and are relatively short-term. They can then seize these opportunities as ways to assess the benefits and consequences of the partnerships on their respective organizations. This, in turn, can build trust and confidence between the university and the community. Intelligently, she noted that the public perceives and defines higher education through the curriculum, explaining that they look for consistency between higher education’s rhetoric and actions to see if it is able to move beyond the traditional notion of the superiority of the expert knowledge in the academy and become a partner in mutual exploration of community challenges and opportunities.

Holland (1999) forcefully argued that—at the abstract level—the notion of community engagement as a legitimate scholarship is not compelling to faculty as a means to promote the quality of student learning and research, asserting: “Until community service is integrated into the curriculum, the idea of service in the mission is not perceived as real to most faculty, students, and external communities” (p. 65). She
even cautioned that if inconsistency exists between the institutional mission and the curriculum, involvement in community service-learning is usually limited to altruistic individuals and subject matters in which community engagement is already accepted as a feasible pedagogy. Holland contended that aligning the curriculum and faculty work with the institutional mission is the best way to demonstrate institutional accountability to the public while protecting academic freedom and autonomy.

**Partnership assessment.**

Independent of the type of partnership, constant assessment is critical to success (Scheibel et al., 2005). Scheibel and his colleagues explained that evaluation helps recognize potential issues before they become problems, and provides a tool for constant improvement of the quality of the partnership. Additionally, it cultivates open communication among partners. This, in turn, fosters relationships and endorses various views. In discussing the benefits of partnership assessment, Holland (1999) noted that assessment data on outcomes to faculty, students, institutions, and communities can be convincing to many faculty members who are apprehensive about the scholarship of engagement or the value of service-learning as a pedagogical approach to learning. For example, she noted that several institutions were able to document improvements in external image and community support, and in fundraising. Holland thus contended that assessing community impact of partnerships can lead to increased trust and sustained relationships.

Driscoll (2007) highlighted the indispensable importance of evaluating university-community partnerships, calling for developing an assessment plan that carefully
examines the impact of these partnerships on students, faculty, community partners, and the institution. In a similar vein, Scheibel et al. (2005) suggested two types of evaluation: evaluation of the partnership itself and its activities, and evaluation of how the partnership impacts the organization. Examples of the questions pertaining to the first type of evaluation include what works well? What requires improvement? Are there mechanisms through which any emerging issues can be tackled? Examples of the questions related to the second type of evaluation include the following: Do the [partnership] benefits surpass the costs? If not, what changes could be applied so that benefits outweigh costs? In addition to the questions suggested by Scheibel and his colleagues, investigating participants’ level of satisfaction with the partnership(s) and willingness to engage in future collaborations may also be useful in assessing service-learning partnerships.

Scheibel et al. (2005) postulated that evaluation should include assessment of both ongoing and completed projects, and of the partnership itself. Furthermore, they noted that sustained partnerships are evaluated regularly with attention to both the methods and outcomes. Likewise, Torres (2000) noted that effective evaluation of university-community partnerships is one that is incorporated into daily routines and long-term goals and becomes a means to enhance the partnership rather than merely a report on its successes and failures. Furthermore, they explained that the process of assessment plays a critical role in convening partners and encouraging them to reflect individually and collectively on their methods and goals. Significantly, they claimed that “assessment institutionalizes critical analysis. For this reason, it is most useful when viewed as a
continuous process that begins when the partnership does” (p. 34). Bringle and Hatcher (1999) noted that regardless of the specific method, conducting any worthwhile assessment procedure should encompass the characteristics of sound reflection: (a) Analyze the success of the bridge between the abstract and concrete, and the academy and communities, (b) be structured, (c) happen regularly, (d) allow feedback from stakeholders, and (e) provide an opportunity for the institution to analyze and clarify its values.
Summary

To recap, this section began with the premise that institutions of higher education can help facilitate and promote service-learning partnerships and other initiatives for promoting engaged scholarship through reshaping their organizational structure. Since many scholars (Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Walshok, 1999) argued that the prevailing organizational structure at most colleges and universities at the present time constrain such partnerships, this section examined the most common organizational factors identified in the literature as essential to institutionalizing and sustaining service-learning partnerships, among other facets of the engaged campus. It is worth noting that these factors are presented as suggestions for initiating the required organizational change that helps colleges and universities engage with their communities in addressing societal needs. In this regard, it is helpful to be reminded of Holland’s (1999) note: “Institutions do not experience transformation uniformly” (p. 67). Rather, organizational units within an institution will be at different stages and progress at different paces. It is thus important that each organizational unit on a campus carefully articulates the meaning and implications of promoting the engagement effort for its particular stakeholders, and then supports the overall efforts of the institution toward fulfilling the community engagement goal.
Critical Insights

Institutional commitment appears to be critically important in supporting the promotion of service-learning in higher education. For example, Hinck and Brandell (2000) reviewed the incentives the campus compact schools used to facilitate public service activities. Examples of these incentives included granting academic credit for service, as well as incorporating service-learning into the institution’s mission statement and graduation requirements. Based on their review, they concluded that institutional commitment seemed to be the best incentive for community service irrespective of the structural form of commitment. Similarly, Zlotkowski (1999) observed that institutionalizing service-learning or any other reform effort in higher education takes time, commitment, and persistence. Furco (2002) thus asserted that it is only through the sustained commitment of the institution over time that a real sustained institutionalization of service-learning can be attained. Given the importance of institutional commitment to supporting service-learning, a logical question comes to mind: What are the characteristics of such a commitment? Bringle and Hatcher’s (2000) statement can provide a good answer to this question: “When transformation of the work of colleges and universities on the scholarship of engagement occurs that is integral, enduring, and meaningful to all stakeholders, then service-learning will be institutionalized” (p. 274). In order for institutional commitment to be “integral, enduring, and meaningful,” institutions must not attempt to adopt a civic initiative and/or a particular model simply because it worked well on another campus without a careful examination of whether or not it is suitable for their own respective institutions. Rather, each institution should
inform its civic strategies and service-learning partnerships by its history, culture, and the unique needs of its stakeholders and local communities.

Not only can organizational factors help advance university-community partnerships, but these factors can also advance the progress of these partnerships toward transformational relationships. In this regard, Dorado and Giles (2004) posited that institutional and individual factors influence relationships among partners in university-community partnerships. Based on the findings of their study, they concluded that “indeed institutional factors mediate service-learning partnerships, most particularly, the mission of the community partners involved affects the likelihood of a partnership progress to a nurturing path” (p. 32). This finding is supported by another piece of empirical evidence. Specifically, Sandy and Holland (2006) found that the smoothness of the partnership experience influenced whether community partners perceived the benefits of their collaborations with institutions of higher education as short-term or altruistic. The partners who faced logistic issues in their collaboration experiences seemed to lean toward transactional exchanges to ensure that their organizations receive immediate short-term benefits that justify their involvement with higher education. Conversely, partners who experienced less difficulty with logistics leaned more toward transformational relationships, underscoring their motivation and goals to advance the public good. These findings provide additional evidence of the critical importance of organization structures in advancing service-learning partnerships. Those leaders who have genuine interest in effective partnerships with their communities must then carefully
examine and change the organizational structure of their institutions in such a way that facilitates these collaborations.

As indicated above, there is a widespread agreement on the importance of the support top administrators can provide to the engagement effort at institutions of higher education. There can be various reasons justifying the repeated stress on the role institutional leaders can play in fostering this work; one plausible explanation is that senior administrators substantially influence structures and policies in their institutions, including staff and faculty promotion and tenure guidelines, as well as budget and resource allocation. While campus leaders can play important roles in aligning all the aspects of institutions of higher education to advocate for public engagement as an important institutional priority, Votruba (2005) reminded us, “Colleges and universities do not exist in a vacuum” (p. 268). As such, he argued that senior administrators cannot fulfill this work alone, noting, “Absent the recognition of campus public engagement as a major policy priority,” (p. 271) university engagement with community is not likely to increase. He even went further, suggesting that “having key campus and public policy leaders advocate on behalf of public support is necessary, but far from sufficient” (p. 271). In his view, in order to advance university-community collaborations, leaders at all levels must support this work.

Votruba’s (2005) argument that promoting university involvement in its community requires both internal campus support and alignment, as well as external support and alignment from leaders at all levels implies an important message: Fostering university public engagement is a collective responsibility for all leaders at all levels.
Examples of these leaders include university senior administrators, government officials, and public policymakers. While the author agrees with Votruba and many other scholars who emphasize the role of leadership at all levels in supporting engagement efforts on campuses, she argues that ordinary people at the grass-roots level can play critical roles in initiating and sustaining university-community service-learning partnerships. For instance, students can raise their voices, calling for service-learning classes and curricula that address real issues facing their communities. Likewise, community representatives can reach out to university officials and faculty, proposing ideas of collaborative work for the benefit of all. Engaging ordinary people in encouraging university-community partnerships is indeed critically important, as it speaks to the core goals and democratic purposes of such a type of engagement. Among the fundamental purposes of promoting university-community engagement is challenging traditional notions that the community is the domain of the problem whereas the university is the domain of the solution (Benson et al., 2000), deconstructing who generates and what constitutes legitimate knowledge, and disrupting prevailing models of power (Saltmarsh et al., 2009). The author thus calls upon ordinary people to organize themselves, play leadership roles, and take initiatives that can advance university-community collaborations for the welfare of our local, national, and international societies.

Involving all forces in society in supporting university public engagement can be advantageous to this cause. Yet still, institutions of higher education should select their partners with due care. Walshok (1999) offered some strategies for building the infrastructure necessary for supporting the engaged campus. One of these strategies is to
diversify sources of funding and political support. She included corporation and the military as examples of this type of support. Obviously, these two entities have powerful financial and human resources that might be beneficial to promoting university involvement in community. Yet, the author raises a red flag about soliciting support from military and corporations. Specifically, she is reminded of the argument made by Giroux’s (2007) in his eye-opening book, *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex*. In this book, Giroux called attention to the growing relationship between higher education and forces of militarization after the horrific events of September 11, 2001. He asserted that the militarization of education establishes a culture of consent, fear, terror, paranoia, and blind obedience. He also raised concerns about the corporate gains in the university curriculum, policy, and personnel. The author concurs with Giroux that the interference of these two forces poses serious threats to academic freedom and integrity, as well as to higher education’s use of critical pedagogy. She therefore cautions institutions of higher education from allowing these two entities to impose and/or promote their own self-interest agendas on university-community collaborations.

If, however, the involvement of these entities becomes inevitable, institutions of higher education must convey the following messages in a clear way. First, the university will take every possible action to protect its academic freedom and integrity. Second, the university takes its responsibility for promoting a participatory democracy seriously. Third, the university protects freedom of expression for all its members regardless of their status, demographic backgrounds, and/or ideological orientations, as
long as they express their opinions in a respectful manner. Fourth, the university encourages dialogues and critiques of societal structures with the aim of bringing about social justice, and improving the quality of life for all.
Chapter Three: Method

The term, “methodology,” refers to an overall approach to inquiry typically connected to specific theoretical frameworks. A related term, “Method,” refers to the strategies for sampling, data collection, and data analysis with which methodologies are conducted (Sandelowski, 2008). This chapter provides a detailed description of the method employed in the empirical study of this dissertation research. In particular, this chapter is organized into eight major sections. The first part explains the rationale for the study, highlighting the research problem, as well as the purpose and significance of the study. The second part provides background information about the mixed methods approach informing this study, such as its definition, historical evolution, philosophical assumptions, uses, and challenges. The third part describes the Concurrent Transformative design employed, and justifies the reasons why it is well-suited for this study. The fourth part highlights the procedures followed in this study with respect to time, weight, and data analysis and integration. The fifth part specifies the scope of the study by elaborating on the research site, events, and processes. The sixth and seventh parts describe the quantitative and qualitative procedures, respectively, laying out the research questions and hypotheses, sampling strategies, data collection and analysis strategies, as well as discussing the researcher’s role along with the reliability and validity measures as they pertain to each method. The last section of this chapter discusses the strategy of data interpretation and a number of ethical considerations.
Statement of the Problem

The author’s choice of the empirical study of this dissertation research is largely informed by her synthesis of the literature and an understanding of its limitations. The literature review on service-learning partnerships in higher education conducted for this study revealed five major deficiencies in the past research: little attention to partnerships, absence of the voices of students, underrepresentation of senior administrator voices, paucity of empirical research that assesses community impact and community partners’ perceptions, scant research in international settings, and heavy reliance on qualitative approaches. The sections that follow elaborate on each of these deficiencies in greater detail.

Paucity of research on service-learning partnerships.

Following Cruz and Giles’ (2000) suggestion to focus research on service-learning on partnerships as the main unit of analysis, a few studies examining these partnerships were conducted (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Dorado & Giles, 2004; Leiderman et al., 2003; Kecskes, 2006; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Tryon et al., 2008; Worrall, 2007). Yet, the need for more research on university-community partnerships for service-learning has been identified by many scholars (e.g., Clarke, 2003; Dorado & Giles, 2004; Jacoby & Associates, 1996, 2003). For example, Bringle and Hatcher (2002) and Clarke (2003) called attention to the paucity of empirical research on campus-community partnerships and stressed the need for studying these partnerships both as process and outcome. Likewise, Jacoby (2003) called for additional research on service-learning partnerships, noting that “much remains unknown” (p. 327)
about what exactly makes up effective service-learning partnerships. Jacoby highlighted the need to learn more about the specific factors that allow partnerships to develop and expand over time so that they could realize the goals of the partnerships and those of the individual partners.

**Missing voices of college students.**

There is an abundance of studies examining the impacts of service-learning on students (e.g., Astin et al., 2000; Bringle et al., 1999; Ender et al. 2000; Eyler & Giles; 1999; Eyler, Giles, & Schneider, 2000; Karin & Nurse, 2004; Lansverk, 2004; Mooney & Edwards, 2001; Vogelgesang et al., 2002; Washington, 2000). What remains to be explored, however, is how students perceive these partnerships. Since students are primary constituents of service-learning partnerships, informing the strategic planning of these partnerships with students’ perspectives is critical to the success and effectiveness of these collaborations.

**Under-representation of senior administrator voices.**

Despite the repeated stress on the importance of the institutional leadership role in promoting service-learning partnerships (e.g., Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Vogelgesang, 2004; Vogel, Seifer, & Gelmon, 2010; Votruba, 2005), the voices of senior administrators at institutions of higher education are under-represented in the literature. As the literature review revealed, senior administrators have decision-making power over the major policies and resources of their institutions. Thus, they can help sustain service-learning partnerships by cultivating an encouraging and supportive culture to all partners engaged in these collaborations. If research continues to neglect the perspectives of
senior administrators, the quality and sustainability of service-learning partnerships may be subject to a great risk.

**Neglect of community impact.**

The community impact of service-learning and community partners’ perceptions of their partnerships with institutions of higher education continue to be an underrepresented area in service-learning literature. Specifically, there exist only a handful of studies that pay critical attention to the motivations, benefits, and outcomes of service-learning from community partners’ perspectives (Bridsall, 2005; Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Bushouse, 2005; Cruz & Giles, 2000; Edwards & Marullo, 2000; Ferrari & Worrall, 2000; Jones, 2003; Vernon & Ward, 1999; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000). Recently, some attention has been paid to theoretical models and principles for developing service-learning partnerships (e.g., Clarke, 2003; Enos & Morton, 2003; Saltmarsh et al, 2009). Yet, the empirical research documenting community partners’ perspectives is relatively new and scant (Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). Bridsall (2005) emphasized that community input is key in assessing the true value and impact of service-learning on the community.

**Scare research in international settings.**

Significantly, service-learning in contexts outside of the U.S. is relatively unexplored. The vast majority of service-learning research has been conducted in the U.S. reflecting Western thought and traditions, whereas substantially less is known about service-learning in non-Western contexts. Moreover, while service-learning is growing in other regions of the world, such as Asia (McCarthy, 2004), Australia (Holland &
Bennett, 2003), Ireland (McIlrath & MacLabhrainn, 2007), Europe, Latin America, South America, Mexico, and the Middle East (Annette, 2003; Perold, 2005; Perold, Stroud, & Sherraden, 2003), there remains a dearth of studies exploring service-learning in these contexts. This, in turn, demonstrates a critical need for conducting research in international settings.

**Methodological limitations.**

Past literature on service-learning partnerships suffers from methodological limitations as well. A careful examination of this body of literature reveals that the vast majority of empirical studies (e.g., Pribbenow, 2005; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Tryon et al., 2008; Vogelgesang, 2004; Worral, 2007) employed pure qualitative methods except for a few that used either mixed methods approaches (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Miron & Moely, 2006) or quantitative data (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Hinck & Brandell, 2000). Although the tendency to rely on qualitative approaches in examining these partnerships can be justified in light of the exploratory nature of past inquiries, as the literature grows and matures, various other types of methods should be employed to promote our understanding of these partnerships.

**Purpose of the Study**

Informed by Enos and Morton’s (2003) theory for the development of university-community partnerships, the purpose of this concurrent mixed methods research was to study service-learning partnerships at the American University in Cairo. Assessment of both the processes and impacts of these partnerships is necessary to examine the extent to which each partner benefits (Cruz & Giles, 2000; Gelmon, 2003). Furthermore, there is a
growing body of literature, indicating that programmatic characteristics of service-
learning and participant characteristics may affect the degree to which service-learning
yields positive outcomes for the parties involved (Moely, Furco, & Reed, 2008). As
such, this research aimed to study service-learning partnerships at AUC, as well as the
impact of the nature of service-learning courses and service-learners’ demographic
backgrounds on specific civic and social skills. In so doing, the perspectives of
community partners, senior administrators, faculty members, and students were solicited.

In particular, a survey instrument was used to measure the impact of course
experiences and student demographics on specific service-learning outcomes for students,
as well as solicit student perspectives of service-learning partnerships. Students’
perceptions of these partnerships were also explored using individual interviews. The
 perspectives of faculty members, senior administrators and community partners were
investigated through in-depth qualitative interviews. The reason for combining
quantitative and qualitative data was to develop a holistic and rich understanding of these
 partnerships. The quantitative and qualitative methods are described in detail in the
subsequent sections. An important question then raises itself: What is the importance of
this study? The following section explains the significance of this study.

**Significance of the Study**

A study can contribute to the literature by addressing a topic that has not been
analyzed, expanding the discussion through incorporating new components, or by
replicating a study in new settings or with new participants (Creswell, 2009).
Significantly, the study contributes to the field of service-learning in higher education
and the scholarship of engagement by employing all the strategies to which Creswell referred. In particular, this study adds to an emerging body of literature that focuses on the partnerships between university and community as the unit of analysis. More specifically, this study answers the calls for conducting more research on university-community partnerships for service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Clarke, 2003; Dorado & Giles, 2004). The findings of this study can then add knowledge to the literature and further our understanding of these partnerships.

Also, this study extends the discussion about university-community partnerships for service-learning by addressing both the rationale for initiating, and the organizational factors influencing, these collaborations. In so doing, it undertakes the challenge highlighted by Dorado and Giles (2004) who noted that the challenge of examining service-learning partnerships “is to approach research with a view that is neither exclusively focused on the development of relationships nor solely concentrated on organizational factors” (p. 33). The results of this study provide empirical evidence for the value of service-learning partnerships to all involved partners, thus strengthening the case for institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. Also, the study’s outcomes can inform the future strategic planning for these collaborations, as well as provide useful data for the purposes of internal review and institutional accreditation, especially after the initiation of the Carnegie Foundation’s new elective classification for Community Engagement.

Most importantly, the proposed study breaks new ground in two distinct ways. First, the site of the study, Egypt, is not a U.S. setting, and thus the findings of this
research can increase the knowledge base about, and promote our understanding of, university-community engagement in international settings. Conducting this study in Egypt is auspicious in many other ways. For example, the findings of the study can shed light on the impact, if any, of geographic locations on partnership’s nature, process, and progress toward transformation. Also, being an Arab country with venerable history and unique geographic location, choosing Egypt as a location for the study is an important step toward redressing the paucity of research on service-learning partnerships in Eastern cultures, and addressing the bias in the literature toward Western traditions.

Furthermore, undertaking this study in Egypt may encourage scholars to conduct research in other international settings. The accumulation of knowledge about university-community partnerships in various geographic locations may lead to the emergence of a new body of literature that focuses on comparative studies. In highlighting the similarities and differences between partnerships in different parts of the world, this body of literature will provide the field with valuable opportunities to extract important lessons about what works and does not work in these partnerships in different settings. This information can then inform research and enhance practice, as well as allow us unique opportunities to learn and benefit from each other’s experiences. Also, increasing the knowledge base about university-community collaborations in different parts of the world can facilitate the development of partnerships that cross borders and involve institutions of higher education and communities from multiple nations. Moreover, the development of international partnerships may remind us of our human ties and allow us opportunities to work collaboratively to address our common and persistent global challenges.
Second, the study breaks new ground not only by undertaking the research in an international site, but also by incorporating the under-represented voices of students, senior administrators, and community partners. In so doing, this study adopts a transformative approach. Mertens (2008) noted that transformative research overtly recognizes that certain voices have been absent, marginalized, or misrepresented, and that “inclusion of these voices is necessary for a rigorous research study” (p. 76).

Specifically, the study examined the perspectives of AUC’s students, senior administrators, and community partners regarding the service-learning partnership nature, process, and outcomes. By accounting for multiple voices, the study can provide a more comprehensive picture of these partnerships, thus promoting our understanding of service-learning university-community collaborations in profound ways. Furthermore, the study employed a mixed-methods design, thus better capturing the complexity of service-learning partnerships and enriching our understanding of these partnerships through both quantitative and qualitative data.

**Mixed Methods Research: Background**

Since this study employed a mixed methods design, this section provides background information about this design, including its definition, historical evolution, philosophical assumptions, uses, and the challenges associated with its implementation, as well as a notation system for describing the procedures of mixed methods research.

**Definition.**

Several different terms are used to refer to this approach, such as integrating, synthesis, quantitative and qualitative methods, and mixed methodology. Recently, the
term, “mixed methods” has become more common (Bryman, 2006; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). In this study, the mixed methods approach is defined as,

Research in which the investigator collects and analyses data, integrates the findings, and draws inferences using both quantitative and qualitative approaches or methods in a single study or a program of inquiry. (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007, p. 4)

The section that follows provides an overview of the historical evolution of mixed methods research.

**The emergence of mixed methods.**

A paradigm can be defined as the worldviews or belief systems that guide researchers. The positivist paradigm underlies quantitative methods while the constructivist paradigm underlies qualitative methods (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). There have been historically heated discussions among advocates of both paradigms regarding several issues, such as the nature of reality and the possibility of casual relationships (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2007). Such discussions are commonly referred to as the qualitative-quantitative debates (Reichardt & Rallis, 1994) or “wars” (Creswell, 1994; Morse, 2008). The core differences between the two paradigms (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990) are summarized in Table 2.
Table 2.

*Core Differences between Positivism and Constructivism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
<td>There is a single reality.</td>
<td>There are multiple constructed realities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td>The knower and the known are independent.</td>
<td>The knower and the known are inseparable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axiology</strong></td>
<td>Inquiry is value free.</td>
<td>Inquiry is value-bound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generalizations</strong></td>
<td>Time- and context-free generalizations are possible.</td>
<td>Time- and context-free generalizations are not possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual Linkages</strong></td>
<td>There are real causes that are temporally precedent or</td>
<td>It is impossible to distinguish causes from effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simultaneous with effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logic</strong></td>
<td>Deductive: There is an emphasis on arguing from the</td>
<td>Inductive: There is an emphasis on arguing from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>general to the particular (theory or on prior hypotheses)</td>
<td>general (grounded theory).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several attempts have been made to reconcile the above noted paradigm debate. In this respect, Datta (1994) offered a five-reason argument for the possibility of “coexistence” between quantitative and qualitative approaches and their underlying paradigms:

- Both paradigms have been employed for a long time,
- Many researchers and evaluators made arguments based on both paradigms,
- Funding agencies have sponsored both paradigms,
- Both paradigms have affected policy, and
- Much learning has been gained through both paradigms.

The attempts for resolving the conflict between quantitative and qualitative approaches are grounded in pragmatic thinking, calling for more coherence in the use of research methodologies (Brewer & Hunter, 1989; Datta, 1994; Patton, 1990). For example,
Brewer and Hunter (1989) called for a more integrated methodological approach that responds to the needs of some researchers to use both methods in their inquiries. The next section sheds light on the major philosophical assumptions underlying mixed methods research.

**Philosophical assumptions.**

Pragmatism (Biesta, 2010; Creswell, 2009; Johson & Gray, 2010) and transformative-emancipatory perspectives (Mertens, 2008) are often cited as the most prominent philosophical assumptions underlying the choice of mixed methods. Each of these philosophies is briefly described below.

**Pragmatism.**

Pragmatism provides a general belief system for the social sciences (Maxcy, 2003) and a justification for combining quantitative and qualitative methods (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2006). Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2008) noted that pragmatism indicates seeking workable solutions through the practice of research to help answer questions that we value and to suggest practical improvements in our world. Morgan (2008) proposed a framework for understanding the value of the pragmatic approach to the social sciences. This framework highlights the distinct features of the pragmatic approach through discussing the three core choices of the qualitative and quantitative methods (see Table 3 from Morgan, p. 59).
Table 3.

A Pragmatic Alternative to Key Issues in Social Science Research Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection of theory and data</th>
<th>Qualitative Approach</th>
<th>Quantitative Approach</th>
<th>Pragmatic Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>Deduction</td>
<td>Abduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first comparative distinction pertains to the connection of theory and practice. Morgan (2008) suggested that the pragmatic approach follows abductive logic, explaining that this type of reasoning moves back and forth between induction and deduction. The second comparative distinction deals with the relationship between the investigator and research process. Morgan speculated that neither “complete objectivity” nor “complete subjectivity” is realistic. Rather, he argued that practitioner scholars should consider various frames of reference, noting that the pragmatic approach encompasses this duality through an emphasis on intersubjectivity, which refers to “processes of communication and shared meaning” (p. 59). Intersubjectivity also provides the pragmatic stance on issues of incommensurability. Specifically, the pragmatic approach denies neither the assertion that there is a single reality nor the arguments that each individual has a unique interpretation of the world. Rather, the pragmatic approach deals with issues of incommensurability as a central component of social life. That is, the pragmatist focuses on generating knowledge through lines of action points to joint projects that different individuals or groups can undertake with each other. Morgan noted that this conceptualization suggests a “reflexive” orientation where
more attention is paid to the social processes that generate both consensus and conflict within the field of study.

With regard to the third comparative distinction, the inferences drawn from the research findings, the pragmatic approach opposes the need to choose between a pair of extremes where research results/findings are either entirely specific to a particular setting or generalizable to other contexts. Morgan (2008) argued that the pragmatic approach focuses on what researchers can do with the obtained results rather than on the abstract arguments about the possibility or impossibility of generalizability. He further explained that the pragmatic approach is more concerned with the extent to which research results/findings in a particular context can be useful in other circumstances, and the factors leading to such claims. These questions, Morgan argued, necessitate moving back and forth between the specific results/findings to the more general implications. That is, researchers should not simply suppose that the use of particular methods would yield context-bound or generalizable results. Rather, they should examine the factors that affect whether or not the results/findings are generalizable.

**Transformative-emancipatory perspective.**

Although, pragmatism is currently accepted as the appropriate philosophical foundation for mixed methods research (Biesta, 2010; Johnson & Gray, 2010; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003b), a number of scholars believe that pragmatism as a stance for mixed methods research is inadequate because it does not answer the question, “Practical for whom and to what end?” (House & Howe as cited in Mertens, 2008, p. 98). Mertens (1999) suggested a transformative-emancipatory perspective as a philosophical basis for
mixed methods. She explained that transformative theory is used as an umbrella term that captures several paradigmatic standpoints, including:

Empancipatory (Lather, 1992; Mertens 1998), anti-discriminatory (Humphries & Truman, 1994; Truman, Mertens & Humphries, 2000), participatory (Reason, 1994; DeKoning & Martin, 1996; Whitmore, 1998) . . . racial/ethnic minorities (Stanfield, 1999; Stanfield & Dennis, 1993; Madison, 1992), people with disabilities (Gill, 1999; Oliver, 1992; Mertens & McLaughlin, 1995), and people who work on behalf of marginalized groups. (p. 4)

Transformative scholars speculate that (a) knowledge is not neutral, but is rather shaped by human interests, (b) all knowledge reflects the power and social relations within society, and that (c) a critical purpose of knowledge construction is to enable people to improve society (Banks, 1993, 1995). The section that follows briefly highlights the growing interest in mixed methods research.

**Growth of interest in mixed methods research.**

Mixed methods research gained popularity in the last decade. This popularity is expressed through several initiatives including books, journals, and funded projects. In particular, the first comprehensive overview of this mode of inquiry was published by Tashakkori and Teddlie in 2003. Examples of other books devoted only to mixed research include (Bryman, 2006; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Greene, 2007; Plano Clark & Creswell, 2008, 2011). The emphasis on this approach is also demonstrated in several journals, such as the *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, Quality and Quantity,* and *Field Methods.* Many other journals, such as the *International Journal of Social Research Methodology,* and the *Annuals of Family Medicine,* encourage this approach as well. In the field of service-learning, a few number of studies (e.g., Basinger &
Bartholomew, 2006; Miron & Moely, 2006) employed a mixed method approach. The section that follows describes different uses of mixed methods research.

**Use of mixed method designs.**

This section describes the reasons why researchers choose to employ a mixed methods design. Greene, Caracelli, and Graham (2008) identified five purposes for the use of mixed methods: triangulation, complementarity, development, initiation, and expansion. Triangulation can be defined as, “The combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon” (Denzin, as cited in Jick, 2008, p. 108). This approach generally seeks convergence, corroboration, and correspondence of results from the different methods (Jick, Greene et al.). Jick noted that the individual strengths of one method counterbalance the weaknesses of the other method. This mix can then lead to greater confidence in the results, better understanding when divergent findings are explained, the use of creative methods, a synthesis of theories, and a critical examination of competing theories.

In a complementarity approach, quantitative and qualitative data are used to measure convergence, as well as different facets of a phenomenon. This combination yields a rich elaborated understanding of the phenomenon. The development approach seeks to use the results/findings of one method to inform or help develop the other method (Greene et al., 2008). Initiation seeks the discovery of contradiction and paradox and new perspectives of frameworks. Yet, in complex and cross studies, both divergent and convergent quantitative and qualitative data can be deliberately analyzed to gain breadth and depth of inquiry results (Greene et al.; Kidder & Fine, 1987). Expansion
seeks to extend the range and breadth of inquiry by using different methods for multiple inquiry components (Greene et al.; Mark & Shotland, 1987).

The complementarity approach provides the rationale for employing a mixed method design in this study. Specifically, the quantitative questionnaire was combined with qualitative individual interviews to measure both similar and different aspects of the service-learning partnerships phenomenon. The convergent aspects include an assessment of the perceived benefits and challenges associated with these partnerships, process, and nature of these partnerships. The divergent dimensions included examining the impact of student demographics and course experiences on specific civic outcomes for college student service-learners. The following section briefly highlights the difficulties to employing mixed methods research.

**Challenges to mixed methods research.**

Employing mixed methods research poses several challenges to researchers. Specifically, this approach requires extensive data collection, intensive time necessary for analyzing numeric and text data, familiarity with both quantitative and qualitative methods (Creswell, 2009). The need to resolve divergent findings, difficulty to replicate complex studies, using each method in a significant way, and connecting the approach to the overall research purpose are other challenges to conducting mixed methods research studies (Jick, 2008). The next section provides a notation system for mixed methods research.
Mixed methods notation system.

Mixed methods notation provides symbols and shorthand labels that describe significant aspects of mixed methods research, and a way through which mixed methods investigators can concisely communicate their procedures (Creswell, 2009). This section presents only the notations that are used in the study:

- A “+” refers to a simultaneous or concurrent form of data collection with both quantitative and qualitative data are collected at the same time (Creswell, 2009),
- Capitalization indicates a weight or priority on the quantitative or the qualitative data (Creswell, 2009),
- “Quan” and “Qual” stand for quantitative and qualitative, respectively (Morse, 2008),
- A Quan(qual) indicates that the qualitative methods are embedded within the quantitative data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Plano Clark & Creswell, 2008).

Research Design

A research design is a “procedure for collecting, analyzing, and reporting research” (Creswell et al., 2008 p. 163). Creswell (2009) classified mixed method into six major designs: Sequential Explanatory, Sequential Exploratory, Sequential Transformative, Concurrent Triangulation, Concurrent Embedded, and Concurrent Transformative. This section describes in detail the research design employed in this study, Concurrent Transformative design. Specifically, it highlights its uses, pros and cons, as well as explains how this design is harmonious with the goals of, and theories informing the study.
Concurrent Transformative design.

This study employed a Concurrent Transformative design with an embedded strategy. This model is distinct in its use of a single data collection phase, during which both quantitative and qualitative data are collected simultaneously. Also, an explicit theoretical perspective is typically employed in this design (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2008; Creswell, 2009). This study was guided by Enos and Morton’s (2003) theory for the development of campus-community partnerships. As explained in the first chapter, this theoretical framework advocates for transformative relationships between institutions of higher education and communities. This study is also informed by the “Charity” and “Social Justice” paradigms of service (Kahne, Westheimer, & Rogers, 2000; Molely & Miron, 2005; Morton, 1995). It is worth noting that the purpose and research questions of the study were shaped by these frameworks.

The Concurrent Transformative/Embedded approach has a primary method that guides the study and a secondary one that provides a supporting role in the study. Because the secondary method—quantitative or qualitative—is less emphasized, it is embedded or nested within the primary method—quantitative or qualitative (see Figure 3 for the Visual Model of the design). Creswell (2009) noted that this embedding may signify that the secondary method investigates a different question from the primary method or seeks information at a different level of analysis. The mixing of data typically occurs in a discussion section of a study. In this study, the qualitative data were used to explore the nature, process, impacts, and challenges to developing partnerships as perceived by AUC’s students, faculty, administrators, and community partners. The
quantitative data were used to examine the impact of student demographics and course experiences on specific civic outcomes of service-learning partnerships for AUC students.

Figure 3. Concurrent Transformative Design

The Concurrent Transformative design with an embedded strategy serves several purposes. For example, this approach may be designed in such a way that one method is embedded in the other “so that diverse participants are given a voice in the change process of an organization” (Creswell, 2009, p. 215). In this study, the qualitative method was employed to allow an opportunity for AUC’s students, faculty members, and administrators, as well as community partners to contribute to the improvement of the collaborations between AUC and community-based organizations in service-learning partnerships. The quantitative method was embedded in the qualitative one to examine the impact of course experiences and student demographics on service outcomes for students. This approach can also be used to gain broader perspectives as a result of employing different methods as opposing to using only the primary method. Also, this design may be appropriate when a researcher aims to use different methods to examine different groups or levels. This study posed different quantitative and qualitative questions to investigate the perspectives of four groups affiliated with AUC: students,
faculty members, administrators, and community partners. Noteworthy, student perspectives were studied quantitatively and qualitatively.

The perspectives of AUC’s students, faculty members, administrators, as well as the community members with whom the University partners in service-learning courses were examined qualitatively through individual interviews. In this design, one method could be employed within the framework of the other. In this study, the quantitative method was used to analyze specific expected outcomes of the partnerships for students. The qualitative method was used to explore how AUC’s students, faculty members, administrators, and community members experienced these partnerships. Moreover, the mixing of data from the two methods may be intended to integrate the information and compare one source of the information to another. Yet, instead of comparing the quantitative and qualitative data, they could reside side by side as two pictures to present a comprehensive assessment of the problem. The latter strategy is appropriate when a researcher aims to examine different research questions or different levels of an organization (Creswell, 2009; Creswell et al., 2008), which is the case in this study as indicated above.

The Concurrent Transformative strategy with an embedded design is auspicious in several ways (Creswell, 2009; Creswell et al., 2008). For example, it is a time efficient strategy; it enables researchers to gather the two types of data simultaneously during one data collection phase. Also, this approach provides the study with the merits of both methods. Additionally, using different methods in this manner allows researchers to gain perspectives from the different kinds of data or from different levels within the study. In
spite of these strengths, this approach suffers from several limitations. For example, discrepancies might arise when comparing the two databases, requiring resolution. Since the two methods are emphasized unequally, this design may result in unequal evidence within the study. This, in turn, could be a shortcoming when interpreting the results (Creswell; Creswell et al.). The next section explains in greater detail the reasons as to why this design was employed in the study.

**Rationale for choosing the concurrent Transformative/Embedded Design.**

The Concurrent Transformative/Embedded Design (see Table 4 for a Visual Model of the Research Design) is well-suited for this study for several reasons. For example, concurrent approaches are less time consuming because both quantitative and qualitative data are collected at the same time. Given the limited time and resources available for the researcher, this design becomes feasible. Also, this model emphasizes a main primary form of data collection and it includes a minor secondary form of data collection. Since both types of data are not equal in size and rigor, this design helps define the scope of the study and makes it manageable (Creswell, 2009; Creswell et al., 2008). Additionally, the embedded strategy allows the investigator to realize the research goal, examining both similar and different facets of university-community collaborations for service-learning at different levels at AUC.
Table 4.

*Visual Model of the Research Design*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Mixing</th>
<th>Theorizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concurrent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Integrating</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Connecting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative first</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Embedding</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most importantly, the transformative orientation of this design is quite harmonious with the theoretical perspectives guiding this inquiry. These perspectives advocate for participatory democratic, reciprocal, and respectful partnerships between institutions of higher education and communities. With conviction of the just cause of these calls, the author raised important questions pertaining to power dynamics, domination, alienation, and inequality in university-community partnerships. Notably, diverse perspectives—students, faculty members, administrators, and community partners—were solicited to illuminate understanding of these critical issues.

Bringing underrepresented voices to the fore is another precious opportunity the transformative design offers the author. Specifically, she is concerned with the consequences of constant under-representation of populations belonging to Eastern cultures, the Arab, and Muslim worlds. An obvious consequence of such an under-representation is the pervasive negative perceptions of these populations; individuals from these cultural groups are typically portrayed in the West as primitive, emotional, and violent, not to mention the common unjust association between Muslims and terrorism. Members of these groups, especially Muslims, are typically perceived as
guilty, in Western countries, until proven innocent. It is the author’s belief that such negative perceptions are perpetuated, in large part, by the lack of representation of these groups in the literature. Accordingly, she chose to adopt a transformative design in her study to give voice to individuals belonging to traditionally underrepresented groups. In doing this modest effort, she hopes to (a) promote anti-discriminatory research, (b) help eliminate the injustice and oppression to which these groups have been subject, and (c) encourage scholars from these different cultural backgrounds to conduct research in their cultural groups. Advancing research in international settings may help portray more realistic pictures about members of historically underrepresented cultural groups.

**Mixed Method Research Procedures**

The procedures of implementing this mixed method study is organized around three factors: timing, weight, and mixing. The sections that follow describe each factor as it pertains to the study under investigation.

**Timing.**

This study employs a concurrent mixed methods design in which both quantitative and qualitative were gathered simultaneously at the same time starting from April 15 until November 25th, 2011.

**Weighting.**

This study was theoretically driven by the qualitative method, incorporating a complementary quantitative component. As such, quantitative data were secondary and employed to play a supportive role to the primary role of qualitative data (see Figure 4).
Integration/Mixing.

Integration can be defined as the “combination of quantitative and qualitative research within a stage of inquiry” (Creswell et al., 2008, p. 173). Deciding on the stage(s) to combine data depends on the goal of the study and the ease with which combination can occur (Creswell et al.). In the study under examination, integration occurred at multiple stages. First, integration occurred within the research questions. Quantitative hypotheses and qualitative questions were posed. Second, integration occurred at the data collection stage through the use of qualitative individual interviews, as well as the use of open-ended questions on a quantitative survey instrument. Finally, since quantitative data played a secondary role in the study, they were embedded in the data interpretation phase to provide supportive information to the qualitative results. It is worth noting that quantitative and qualitative data were not mixed at the analysis stage. The following section explains the rationale for conducting separate data analysis.

Rationale for conducting separate data analysis.

Caracelli and Greene (2008) identified four major strategies for mixed method data analysis: data transformation, typology development, extreme case analysis, and data consolidation/merging. Data transformation refers to the conversion of one type of data into the other so that both can be examined together. In the typology development, the analysis of one type of data leads to the development of substantive categories, typology, which can be used as a framework in examining the other type of data. Extreme case
analysis involves the identification of extreme cases through the analysis of one type of data. These cases are then further investigated through additional data collection and the analysis of the other data type. Data consolidation/merging involves more complex joint use of both types of data to generate new consolidated variables or data sets. The consolidated data can be expressed in either quantitative or qualitative forms and are typically used for further analysis.

While Caracelli and Greene (2008) promoted integrative analysis strategies for initiation, expansion, and development designs, they were reluctant to promote an integrative data analysis approach in complementarity designs—which is employed in this study. They noted that the decision about data analysis strategy is “cloudy,” explaining that in this approach, different methods are used to measure overlapping, as well as unique facets of a particular phenomenon and that,

The greater the overlapping in the conceptualization of the phenomenon, the closer this [complementarity] design is to a triangulation design, for which we believe integrative analysis strategies are not generally useful . . . . The underlying logic of triangulation necessitates independence of methods through data analysis and interpretation. Arguments for convergent validity of findings from different methods are stronger when such independence can be claimed. (p. 244)

Because one goal of this research was to understand the same facets of service-learning partnerships, nature and impacts, the overlapping is quite obvious, thus justifying the implementation of separate data analysis. Conducting separate data analyses in concurrent mixed method designs is also supported by Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2008) who speculated that three conditions hold in these designs:

(A) Both the quantitative and qualitative data are collected separately at approximately the same point in time, (b) neither the quantitative nor qualitative data analysis builds on the other during the data analysis stage, and (c) the results
from each type of analysis are not consolidated at the data interpretation stage, until both sets of data have been collected and analyzed separately, and (d) after collection and interpretation of data from the quantitative and qualitative components, a metainference is drawn which integrates the inferences made from the separate quantitative and qualitative data and finding. (p. 281, italics is in the original)

Since the present study employed a concurrent mixed method design, quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed separately and the integration was conducted at the interpretation stage in the conclusion section of the study.
Bounding the Study

Miles and Huberman (1994) identified four aspects when discussing the research site and participants: setting, actors, events, process. The sections that follow describe each aspect.

Setting.

The study was conducted at the American University in Cairo (AUC) which has an established service-learning program called the Community-based Learning (CBL) program. A detailed description of the program is provided in the subsequent sections.

AUC is a small private institution located in Egypt. The institution has an undergraduate enrollment of 4,760 students, most of whom are traditional college aged, 18-21, and 1,224 graduate students. The full-time faculty body at AUC is comprised from members holding Egyptian and U.S. citizenship status in addition to members from twelve other countries. A large number of adjunct faculty members compliment the full-time ones.

The faculty to student ratio is one to 12 (see Appendix A for AUC Quick Facts). The subsequent sections provide background information about AUC, including its historical development, mission, governance, accreditation, and location. The organizational model of AUC’s civic initiatives is also described below.

Historical development.

AUC was founded in 1919 by a group of Americans interested in education and service in the Middle East. The University was shaped by the vision of its founding president, Dr. Charles A. Watson, for its first 27 years. Dr. Watson aimed to establish an English language university grounded in rigorous academic standards and moral conduct.
He also wanted the university to play a role in the intellectual growth and character of future leaders of Egypt and the region. Additionally, Dr. Watson wished that the University would promote Americans’ understanding of the region (AUC’s website, 2011; Murphy, 1987).

AUC was intended to be both a preparatory school and a university. The preparatory school was opened on October 5, 1920, enrolling 142 students in two classes, which were equivalent to the last two years of an American high school, but was closed in 1951. Initially, enrollment in the University was restricted to males. In 1928, the University enrolled its first female student, Eva Habib El-Masry, in the same year in which the first university class graduated with two bachelor’s degrees in arts and science. Master’s degrees were first offered in 1950 (AUC’s website, 2011; Murphy, 1987).

At first, AUC offered degrees in arts, science, and education. The School of Oriental Studies was added to the University in 1921, and was later integrated into the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which was renamed the Center for Arabic Studies in 1956. The English Language Institute was established in the same year. In 1924, the Division of Extension was founded, which was later renamed the Division of Public Service then the Center of Adult and Continuing Education, and finally the School of Continuing Education (AUC’s website, 2011).

Two applied research units, the Social Research Center and the Desert Development Center, were founded in 1953 and 1979, respectively. The development of professional programs was a notable mark in the history of the University. These programs are organized in various departments, including engineering, computer science,
management, and journalism and mass communication. In 1993, academic programs were offered through 13 departments and were organized into three schools: Humanities and Social Sciences, Sciences and Engineering, and Business, Economics and Communication (AUC’s website, 2011).

In 1960, AUC enrolled around 400 academic students. By 1969, this number increased to over 1,300 students, 450 of whom were pursuing graduate studies. Since then, the enrollment in academic programs has grown to more than 5,000 students with an additional 1,000 at the master's degree level (see Appendix A for Quick Facts about AUC). Similarly, adult education programs have been expanded to serve approximately 40,000 individuals each year in non-degree courses and contracted training programs offered by the School of Continuing Education (AUC’s website, 2011).

Currently, AUC encompasses six schools: Business, Humanities and Social Sciences, Global Affairs and Public Policy, Science and Engineering, the Graduate School of Education, and the School of Continuing Education. Through these schools, AUC offers 30 undergraduate majors and 15 graduate programs, serving roughly 5,000 students. The University also offers educational opportunities to promote the professional and vocational skills of approximately 40,000 non-degree students (AUC’s website, 2011). It is worth noting that the master’s degree is the highest degree awarded by AUC; the University does not grant doctorate/Ph.D. degrees.

**Mission.**

At the present time, the University identifies itself as an independent, nonprofit, and equal-opportunity institution (see Appendix B for AUC’s Mission Statement). The
current mission stresses AUC’s commitment to high standards of teaching and research. It also highlights liberal arts and multiculturalism as ideals of the university. Promoting leadership, life-long-learning, and community service are emphasized as well. The pursuit of excellence and freedom of academic expression are integral to the present mission (AUC’s website, 2011).

**Governance and administration.**

AUC is governed by a board of trustees that is comprised of distinguished individuals in the fields of business, law, education, philanthropy and scholarship; most of whom are Egyptians, Americans, and Saudis. The board meets three times annually, once in Cairo and twice in New York. The President, Provost, and Vice-Provost are in charge of running the daily operation of the University. Additionally, the administration of AUC includes the President's Cabinet, Provost's Council, Senior Administrators, and the University Senate. The President Cabinet includes the Provost, Counselor, Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees, and the University's five Vice-Presidents for planning and administration, student affairs, institutional advancement, continuing education, and finance. The Provost's Council serves as an advisory body to the Provost in all issues pertaining to academic programs. The senior administrators meet on a regular basis with the President to discuss administrative and academic issues and enhancement. The University Senate is the representative constituent of the faculty, the student union, staff body, and administration (AUC’s Website, 2011).
**Accreditation.**

AUC is accredited in Egypt and the U.S. The University holds institutional accreditation from the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools in the United States (MSCHE /"Middle States"). Institutional accreditation status is granted by Middle States for a period of ten years, with a mid-way periodic review. AUC's most recent accreditation was issued by the Commission of MSCHE on June 26, 2008. In Egypt, AUC operates within the framework of the 1975 protocol with the Egyptian government which is based on the 1962 cultural relations agreement between the governments of Egypt and the United States. In the United States, AUC is licensed to award degrees and is incorporated by the State of Delaware (AUC’s Website, 2011).

**Location.**

AUC’s main historic building is located in Tahrir (Liberation) Square at the heart of downtown Cairo. On February 7th, 2009, the University moved to the New Cairo Campus in New Cairo area. The official inauguration took place in the presence of many distinguished guests, such as former Egypt’s First Lady and AUC alumna Suzanne Mubarak, and the U.S. Ambassador in Egypt—Margaret Scobey (AUC’s Website, 2011). Significantly, President Barak Obama sent AUC a message of congratulation on the day of the University’s official inauguration (see Appendix C for President Obama’s Message).
Events.

Using a mixed method design, this study focused on the authentic experiences of AUC’s students, faculty members, administrators, as well as community partners with respect to service-learning partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations.

Process.

Informed by Enos and Morton’s (2003) theoretical framework, this study focused on assessing CBL partnerships in terms of their motivations, relationships, challenges and strategies for enhancement. It also examined the impact of student demographics and courses experiences on civic outcomes for students.

Organizational Model for Civic Initiatives.

Tierney’s (1988) conceptual framework for organizational culture was employed as an analytical guide to analyzing AUC’s organizational model around civic initiatives. Specifically, his synthesis of the environment, mission, strategy, and leadership provided a framework for identifying the organizational structure AUC follows in furthering civic initiatives. The sections that follow provide details of each component.

Environment.

AUC defines itself as an independent, non-profit, apolitical, non-sectarian, and equal-opportunity institution. English is the language of instruction in the University (AUC’s website, 2009). AUC attempts to establish safe and constructive environments in which students can practice the skills of citizenship, such as defining problems and solutions, and organizing for change (Ibrahim, 2005). The University nurtures student
activism and civic engagement through both curricular and co-curricular activities. The John Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Education provides support to all the civic efforts within the University. The Center acts as a link between the academic programs and the other activities of the Office of Student Development Affairs pertaining to civic education and social justice (AUC’s website, 2009). With regard to AUC’s physical facilities, traditional Arabic designs, such as mashrabia (wooden window screen) and malkafs (wind catchers), mark the architecture of AUC’s campuses, reflecting Egyptian culture and character.

**Mission.**

The mission statement of AUC does not include a detailed reference to promoting students’ civic engagement (see Appendix B for AUC’s Mission Statement). Yet, the mission statement of the John Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Education clearly articulates this goal by stating that the mission of the Center focuses on promoting human, material, and institutional resources in support of civic engagement, social justice, and philanthropy in the Arab World (see Appendix D for the Mission and Vision of the center). The specific goals of the Center are described in greater detail in the subsequent sections.

**Strategy.**

AUC furthers its civic initiative efforts through three major strategies: The John Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Education, the CBL program, and the Community Service program. The sections that follow provide detailed descriptions of each strategy.
The John Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Education.

The Center was established in 2008 in honor of AUC’s former President, Dr. John Gerhart. It aims to strengthen the University’s initiatives geared toward promoting service, active citizenship, and philanthropy in the Arab World. By combining learning, research, service, and advocacy, the Center strives to elevate the meaning of philanthropy to move beyond charity to sustainable development and social justice (AUC’s Website, 2009). Six major objectives of the Center flow from this general statement. First, the Center strives to make AUC a model for university engagement with its community by instilling the principles of social justice in public service activities and promoting service-learning programs as an integral component of the educational mission. Second, it enhances a greater understanding of the current state of the field through the compilation of a database, conducting research, and documenting obstacles and best practices. Third, it shares information and disseminates its findings with activists in the field. Fourth, it promotes communication and networking among civic engagement activists, Arab philanthropists, and interested scholars. Fifth, it stimulates discussions around the concepts of civic engagement and social justice to inform the public about these issues. Sixth, the Center provides practical resources for those who aim to establish philanthropic organizations and/or improve existing institutions (Ibrahim, 2005).

The Community-based learning (CBL) program.

AUC defines the CBL program as, “A methodology that advances articulated learning goals through service to a partner community” (A. Elshimi, personal communication, March 24, 2011, AUC’s website, 2011). According to the former
director of the program, Ms Elshimi, the core elements of the CBL program, include alignment with course goal, community empowerment, reciprocity, and reflection (see Appendix E for Program Description). As such, the CBL program at AUC is equivalent to service-learning courses as defined in this dissertation research. Therefore, service-learning and CBL were used interchangeably hereafter. The idea of the CBL program was introduced to AUC by the former President of the University, Dr. Gerhart, and was implemented after the inception of the John Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Education in 2008. Examples of the CBL courses taught at AUC include “Grant Writing: How to Access Donor Funds for Development Activities.” In this course, students examine the needs of not-for-profit organizations and write grant proposals for these organizations so as to help them get funds to better serve their clients. “Writing for Publication” is another example of a CBL course in which students meet with a refugee community and collect their oral histories and write them in a narrative form (A. Elshimi, personal communication, May 12, 2009).

According to Ms Elshimi, the CBL program at AUC officially began in the fall of 2008 with various departments offering CBL courses at four schools: Business, Humanities and Social Sciences, Global Affairs and Public Policy, and Sciences and Engineering. The number of courses has grown from 33 in the 2008-2009 to 46 in the 2009-2010 academic years, increasing the number of faculty involved from 23 to 32. Similarly, the number of participating students rose from 660 to 920 (see Table 5 for the Development of CBL Program).
Table 5.

*Overview of the CBL Program at AUC*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of classes connected to the CBL program</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students involved in CBL projects</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of service hours, averaging 15 hours of service per student</td>
<td>9900</td>
<td>13800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of faculty members integrating CBL in courses</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of departments engaged</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of CBL capstones proposed to the Core Curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of CBL courses are offered at the undergraduate level except for two, Psyc # 530 and 533, are graduate level courses. While CBL courses are mandatory for only a few degrees, such as psychology and community development, student participation in the vast majority of these courses is optional. CBL partnerships engage AUC with various community partners; mostly not-for-profit organizations (A. Elshimi, personal communication, March 22, 2011).

*The community service program.*

AUC’s Community Service Program is composed of fourteen student-based clubs. Each club includes a civic component that advances students’ understanding of active citizenship. In these clubs, students address several social issues and interact with a wide range of underprivileged groups including, the needy, blind, deaf, orphans, and refugees. Participation in these clubs allows students opportunities to contribute positively to, and assume leadership roles in, their communities. The sections that follow describe each club.
Alashanek Ya Balady (For You My Country) Club, aims to engage AUC’s students in contributing to sustainable development in their communities. The activities of this club occur in one of the most economically challenged areas in Cairo, Ain El-Sira. Students design and implement projects that help improve the social and economic conditions of this community. Volunteers in Action Club supports orphans in poor areas in various ways. Examples of this support include providing them with literacy classes and opportunities to start small projects, and distributing new clothes at orphanages (AUC’s website, 2009).

Anti-Cancer Team strives to alleviate the pain from the lives of Egyptian children who suffer from cancer. This team provides psychological and moral support, emotional counseling, and financial aid to cancer patients and their families. The team hosts fundraising activities; the money raised is used to purchase medicine, cover operation costs, and provide essential needs for the Egyptian National Cancer Institute. Anti-Drug Team aims to raise awareness among school children and youth of the negative impacts of narcotics on the individual and society. In so doing, AUC’s students hold regular lectures and workshops, provide support groups, issue newsletters, and show films to ensure that people have a sound understanding of the drug problem (AUC’s website, 2009).

Best Buddies Club attempts to contribute positively to the lives of mentally challenged individuals by providing them with opportunities for socialization and employment. Each student volunteer is matched with a mentally challenged person in a friendship relationship. Clean and Green Association Club calls attention to
environmental issues among students and engages AUC’s community in discussions around sustainable development. *Friends in Need Club* provides children with special needs, both mentally and physically, with financial and psychological support through parties, visits, and other projects (AUC’s website, 2009).

*Hand in Hand Club* attempts to help the elderly in Egypt both financially and psychologically through visits and recreational activities. This club also strives to narrow the generation gap by connecting the elderly with youth and children, and by raising awareness of the needs and concerns of the elderly in Egypt. *The Help Club* aims to enhance the suffering of the needy by providing them with food packages and calling attention to their problems primarily by organizing comedy shows that address social inequalities in society (AUC’s Website, 2009).

*Link to Life Club* focuses on serving the blind, deaf, and mute by organizing fund raising activities. The generated money is then used to purchase essential equipment for these individuals. This club also organizes awareness campaigns in an attempt to urge society to become friendlier to these individuals. *AUC’s Message* aims to improve the quality of life for underprivileged groups through developmental projects. One of the key projects of this club is the establishment of ongoing relationships between students and children living in orphanages. This goal is achieved through the Big Brother/Big Sister program that enables students to assume the role of an elder brother or sister to an orphan child.

*The Rotaract Club* aims to foster leadership and responsible citizenship in youth. This club engages AUC students in projects that encourage high ethical standards in
business and advance international understanding and peace. *The Move Club* raises awareness of the problems facing young females in Egypt. Examples of the issues addressed by the club include early marriage, illiteracy, discrimination, sexual harassment, and circumcision. Additionally, this club empowers females in poor areas to become financially independent by helping them start small projects. *Student Action for Refugees Club* is committed to working with refugees to improve their lives in exile. This club raises awareness of refugee rights, offers refugees English and Arabic classes, and organizes art exhibitions and the World Refugee Day (AUC’s website, 2009).

**Leadership.**

The leadership Dr. John Gerhart provided in promoting civic engagement and public service is one of the lasting legacies of his presidency at AUC. Before starting his tenure as the President of AUC, Dr. Gerhart spent a considerable amount of time working in the field of philanthropy. This experience led him to strongly believe that a fundamental goal of liberal education is to instill values of service and civic responsibility, and that indigenous philanthropy is a critical means to achieve social justice. During his tenure at AUC, Dr. Gerhart encouraged growth in student volunteerism and provided support to faculty to connect academic coursework to community service (Ibrahim, 2005).

The above noted sections reveal that AUC promotes its civic goals through both curricular and co-curricular activities. More specifically, AUC civic efforts are advanced through three main strategies. First, the establishment of the John Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Education which acts as a catalyst and a link between the
University’s curricular and co-curricular activities that aim to promote the civic goals of education. Second, the establishment of the Community-based Learning program which aims to integrate community service into academic courses. This program reinforces the University’s goals of increasing its engagement in the surrounding community and providing students with authentic learning experiences. Third, the establishment of the Community Service program that aims to engage students in addressing social problems in their communities. This program enables AUC’s students to play leadership roles in community development.

**Quantitative Procedures**

This section outlines the quantitative procedures followed in this study. It is organized into six major parts. The first part introduces the research hypotheses. The second part explains the rationale for employing a survey questionnaire, highlighting the process and criteria of selecting the scales used in this study. The third part describes the survey questionnaire employed and discusses the reliability and validity measures of the scales included. The last three parts explain the sampling, data collection, and data analysis strategies.

**Research hypotheses.**

Conducting literature reviews is an initial important step for formulating research questions (Mertens, 1998). The review of literature conducted for this study revealed that most service-learning research has focused on student impact (Karin & Nurse, 2004; Lansverk, 2004; Moely, McFarland, Miron, Mercer, & Ilustre, 2002, Eyler & Giles, 1999), but much less research exists that examines relationships between student
outcomes, and student demographics and course characteristics (e.g., Heffiner & Beversluis, 2002; Moely et al., 2008). Given the critical lack of scholarly attention to these relationships, the research hypotheses below were designed to investigate the impact of course experiences and students’ demographics on specific civic outcomes for students. Exploring these relationships can be an effective strategy for improving service-learning partnerships. In particular, understanding how course experiences and student demographics may influence student outcomes can generate useful information which can be used for designing specific interventions for enhancing service-learning partnerships.

1. There is a statistically significant relationship between the number of CBL courses and students’ scores on
   a. The Community Awareness scale.
   b. The Interpersonal Effectiveness scale.

2. There is a statistically significant difference by type of participation in CBL courses (optional versus mandatory) and students’ scores on
   a. The Community Awareness scale.
   b. The Interpersonal Effectiveness scale.

3. There is a statistically significant relationship between the number of hours students spend at their community-based organizations per week in CBL courses and their scores on
   a. The Community Awareness scale.
   b. The Interpersonal Effectiveness scale.
4. There are statistically significant differences based on the departments in which CBL courses are offered and students’ scores on
   a. The Community Awareness scale.
   b. The Interpersonal Effectiveness scale.

5. There is a statistically significant relationship between students’ involvement with community activities (other than CBL courses) and their scores on
   a. The Community Awareness scale.
   b. The Interpersonal Effectiveness scale.

6. There is a statistically significant relationship between students’ demographic characteristics (age, gender, citizenship status, ethnicity/race, GPA, class level, major) and their scores on
   a. The Community Awareness scale.
   b. The Interpersonal Effectiveness scale.

**Measure.**

Bringle and Hatcher (2000b) called upon higher education practitioners to allocate more resources to conducting systematic, scientific assessment of service-learning outcomes across students, faculty, institutions, and communities. They explained:

Although the experiences and anecdotes of service-learning practitioners, students and community partners are meaningful and persuasive to some audiences, conducting systematic, scientific research with meaningful indicators of educational outcomes represents a public, peer-reviewed, and replicable exercise that is important for increasing confidence among practitioners and for providing a justification to those who are in positions to support its expansion and recognition. (pp. 2-3)
Rationale for the use of survey questionnaires.

The use of survey questionnaires as a tool for scientific inquiry is advantageous in several ways. For example, surveys eliminate all sources of variability attributable to the characteristics of the interviewer and the expenses associated with conducting interviews, such as time and training (Bringle, Phillips, & Hudson, 2004). Standardized scales are especially useful when conducting program evaluation, research, and multi-campus studies (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000b). Although the return rate of survey questionnaires may be low, high rates of participation are possible, particularly when good procedures are employed (Dillman, 1978).

As indicated in the introductory chapters, this study focuses on service-learning partnerships as the main unit of analysis. Accordingly, the researcher spent a considerable period of time, from March of 2010 until February of 2011, searching for a scale that serves the purpose of her study. Surprisingly, only one scale was found suitable for the purpose of the study. Although Clayton, Bringle, Senor, Huq, and Morrison’s (2010) survey focuses specifically on university-community partnerships, it suffers from several limitations. For example, when assessing the outcomes of, and the level of satisfaction with, the service-learning partnerships, the scale includes nine choices, which could be confusing to participants. Further, the scale includes double-barreled items. These items should be avoided because they convey two or more ideas (DeVellis, 2003). Examples of items that address two ideas include, “Both of us are dissatisfied and both of us have been changed for the worse.” Examples of items that address three ideas include, “Both of us are satisfied and both of us are changed for the
better, the relationship itself is changed for the better, and the world around us is changed for the better.”

In addition to these limitations, the survey addresses sophisticated concepts; since the CBL program at AUC started in 2008, CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations are fairly new. At early stages of partnerships, involved partners may not have ample opportunities for interactions. Thus, reflecting on deep issues pertaining to these partnerships, without facilitation, might be rather difficult. As such, the researcher decided not to use this survey. She then contacted a few notable scholars in the field of service-learning research, requesting references for suitable instruments. These scholars responded that the research pertaining to the areas under investigation in this study is still in its infancy, and thus valid and reliable instruments are yet to be developed (D. Giles, personal communication, January 20 2011).

After receiving these responses, the researcher seriously considered the possibility of designing an original survey. Yet, the committee members of this dissertation research advised against developing an original survey because of the insufficient time and resources available for ensuring the construction of a high quality instrument. Similar to the perspectives of the committee members, other scholars stressed the advantages of using existing scales over generating original ones. These scholars explained that although designing an original scale enables researchers to investigate the specific areas under study, this task requires time and resources. More importantly, existing scales are usually developed by researchers with professional expertise, have a known record of psychometric properties, and take less time to integrate in research (Bringle et al., 2004).
Given the limited time and scarce resources available for the researcher to accomplish her dissertation research, she concluded that using one of the existing surveys measuring service-learning outcomes for students would be the most feasible option, especially that “service-learning and partnerships are two sides of the same coin” (Bailis, 2000, p. 5).

**Criteria for selecting scales.**

In considering scales to measure the impact of service-learning on college students, the researcher reviewed many of the published instruments on service-learning in higher education (e.g., Eyler & Giles, 1999; Moely & Miron, 2005). Three primary criteria were used in selecting the two scales employed in this study: relevance to college student service-learners, the quality of supporting evidence, and importance to Egyptian context. The sections that follow shed light on each of these criteria.

**Relevance to college student service-learners.**

Although measures of volunteerism might be relevant, the researcher determined to focus exclusively on service-learning scales. Thus, scales assessing volunteer activity, such as the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Syder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Miene, 1998) and the Motivation to Volunteer Scale (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991) and the Public Service Motivation Scale (Perry, 1996) were disregarded. Since this study focused on service-learning in higher education, all the scales developed for measuring outcomes in K-12 service-learning courses were also excluded. Because the motives for, and challenges to, service-learning constitute two primary areas of this research, all the scales that measure student satisfaction with a service-learning course were excluded as well. The researcher looked for scales of constructs that measure
specific motives for, and outcomes of, service-learning for college students. She found only a few.

The quality of supporting evidence.

To ensure valid and reliable results, it was imperative to select scales with acceptable psychometric characteristics. Although several multiple-item measures exist in published literature, only a few report sufficient supporting evidence. For example, the author had a keen interest in the Community Service-Self-Efficacy Scale (Reeb, Katsuyama, Sammon, & Yoder, 1998), but there was no information on either convergent or discriminant validity. Furthermore, no information was reported about gender differences nor the scale’s correlation with social desirability or acquiescent response bias.

The two scales used in this study were developed by Moely, Furco, and Reed (2008). These scales are superior to other scales because they demonstrated higher internal consistency reliability, compared to other scales (Moely et al. 2002; Moely & Miron, 2005). According to Nunnally (1967), reliability coefficients above .80 are considered acceptable, reliability coefficients in the .70 are considered marginally acceptable, and reliability coefficients less than .70 are considered suspect and will miscalculate the true relationship between two variables. The internal consistency of the Community Awareness and the Interpersonal Effectiveness scales were .92 and .89, respectively. As such, the internal consistency of each of these scales is acceptable. 
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Importance to Egyptian context.

As the literature review indicated, participation in service-learning is associated with a wide range of positive impacts on college students’ learning (Ash et al., 2005; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Strage, 2000), social, and attitudinal outcomes (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, Yee, 2000). Among this wide range of cited outcomes of service-learning, the researcher chose to focus on assessing civic and interpersonal outcomes of service-learning on students; most of whom were Egyptians as shown by the demographics of the student body at AUC (see Appendix A for Quick Facts about AUC).

Past research indicated that there is increasing individualism and declining interest in politics and civic engagement among college students (Cone, Cooper, & Hollander, 2001; Hahn, 2001; Levine, 1994; Sax, Astin, Korn, & Mahoney, 1999). Similarly, Egyptian youth were typically perceived as cynical and remote from the political affairs in their communities. For example, the results of a national survey of Egyptian adolescents in 1997 showed that fewer than 2% were involved with not-for-profit or civil society originations (as cited in Ibrahim, 2005). Yet, the uprising that occurred in Egypt on January 25th, 2011 challenged these claims in that Egyptian youth were the primary champions for this uprising. They were the ones who provided vision and leadership for that revolution. Of all segments of Egyptian society, youth were the ones who made the most major sacrifices; many of them were killed and seriously injured during clashes with police forces and beneficiaries of the previous government. Not only did youth provide momentum to the revolution, but also they exercised pressure over the transition government to interrogate officials of the previous government, and put them
on trials. Moreover, youth took practical and serious steps toward political, economic, and social reform. Significantly, young people demonstrated high levels of interpersonal skills, such as leadership, responsibility, independency, and creativity during the revolution. Examples of their actions included establishing on site medical centers to provide first aid help for the injured, establishing check points to ensure security within Tahrir (Liberation) Square, and forming community committees to clean up the streets and restore order in neighborhoods after the withdrawal of police forces, just to name a few. In acting in such ways, youth exhibited high levels of civic engagement in, and critical awareness of, the issues facing their communities. The researcher speculated that CBL courses may be an effective strategy to advance college students’ interpersonal skills and allow them opportunities to stay engaged in their communities. As such, the Community Awareness and the Interpersonal Effectiveness scales were specifically selected for this study.

**Instrument: survey questionnaire.**

**Goals.**

The goal of the survey questionnaire was twofold. The first purpose was to assess the relationships between students’ scores on both the Community Awareness and Interpersonal Effectiveness scales, and (a) the nature of CBL courses, (b) students’ involvement with other community experiences, and (c) students’ demographic characteristics. The second purpose of the survey was to examine students’ perceptions of CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations.
Description.

The survey questionnaire employed in this study comprised 39 questions (see Appendix F for Survey Questionnaire). The first set of questions, four closed-ended items, asks about students’ community service experiences in CBL courses. The second set of questions, 17 closed-ended items, measures two key constructs associated with the experiences of college students in service-learning courses: Community Awareness, and Interpersonal Effectiveness skills. The third set of questions, three closed-ended items, asks about students’ community involvement experiences at AUC other than CBL courses. The fourth set of questions, nine closed-ended items, asks demographic questions, including students’ age, gender, race/ethnicity, citizenship status, class standing, enrollment status, grade point average, study major, and religious orientation.

The fifth set of questions, five open-ended items, asks students to elaborate on their experiences with CBL partnerships. The first question asks about the activities in which students have been involved in their CBL courses. The second one asks about students’ motivations to enroll in CBL courses. The third one invites students to make suggestions for improving CBL partnerships. The fourth one encourages students to provide additional comments, and share their positive and negative perceptions of CBL partnerships. Finally, the fifth and last section of the questionnaire includes one open-ended question, asking students to describe any current or past community service experiences that are not connected to AUC. It is worth noting that the electronic version of the survey starts with two qualifying questions to ensure that participants are 18 years or older and that they had taken courses with a CBL component at AUC.
Significantly, the open-ended questions allow respondents to express their thoughts in their own ways. This, in turn, enables researchers to analyze the way people think, and not merely what their opinions are (Weisberg, Krosnick & Bowen, 1996). It is worth noting that the survey does not ask for any identifying information, and thus students’ responses were anonymomus. The survey includes clear directions for each set of questions. The two scales employed were tested and used by Moely et al. (2008). Each of the scales included in this questionnaire is a multiple-item measure of only one construct. The sections that follow provide an overview of the constructs and their psychometric qualities.

**Content validity.**

The two scales employed in the survey questionnaire—in the present study—were developed by Moely et al. (2008). Empirical content validation for the survey instrument was obtained from six experts in the field of service-learning. The section that follows briefly describes the qualifications of these scholars, thus demonstrating their expertise in the field of service-learning.

One of the experts was a Professor Emerita in Psychology at Tulane University and a Research Affiliate of Tulane’s Center for Public Service. Previously, she served as the Director of the Office of Service-Learning at Tulane University. Her research focused on service-learning in higher education, especially on student attitudes and retention, as well as on the impact of service-learning on community agencies. Another expert was a Professor of Higher Education Administration at the University of Massachusetts-Boston and a Senior Associate at the New England Resource Center for
Higher Education. His research addressed the outcomes of service-learning for students, faculty, and community partners.

Another expert was a Professor of Public and Community Service and American Studies at Providence College. Prior to holding this position, he worked as a director of Campus Compact's national project on Integrating Service with Academic Study. His scholarship focused on the historic and present meanings of community and service in people's lives. He was especially interested in youth and sustainable community development and worked regularly as a workshop leader and trainer for educational and community-based organizations. Another expert was an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Colorado Denver. His scholarly writings challenge traditional service-learning practices and urge the field to adopt a social justice orientation in connecting universities with communities.

Another expert was the Pro Vice Chancellor of Engagement at the University of Western Sydney and Director of the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. She also served as the Executive Editor of Metropolitan Universities, a quarterly Journal. Her publications and presentations reflected her expertise in institutionalization and assessment of service-learning, civic engagement programs, and university-community partnerships. Another expert was a Professor of English at Bentley College and a Senior Faculty Fellow at Campus Compact. He was also a Senior Associate at the New England Resource Center for Higher Education. From 1995 to 2004, he served as the general editor of the American Association for Higher Education’s twenty-two volume series, examining the relationship between service-learning academic disciplines. He had
written extensively and led international, national, and regional workshops on various topics pertaining to service-learning.

Based on the feedback obtained from these scholars, one question, asking about the discipline in which CBL courses were offered, was added. Also, the sequence of the open-ended questions was revised and two of these questions were deleted.

_Cognitive interviews._

In addition to obtaining content validity from experts in the field, the author conducted three cognitive interviews with individuals from different demographic and disciplinary backgrounds. One of these individuals was the Faculty and Operation Director at the Westminster Law Library, University of Denver (DU). This woman earned two master’s degrees in Applied Communications and in the Library Information and Sciences from DU. She received a bachelor’s degree in Speech Communication from Metropolitan State College of Denver. Another interview was conducted with a woman who worked as a Circulation Desk Staff Member at the Westminster Law Library. Her previous title was an Attorney for the Colorado Law Group, Limited Liability Company. She had a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Denver Sturm College of Law and a Bachelor’s of Arts in History from the University of Oregon. The third cognitive interview was conducted with a man who worked as a Part-time Mathematics Instructor at the Community College of Denver and was pursuing a master’s degree in Higher Education at DU. He had a bachelor’s degree in Mathematics from Saint Petersburg College, Florida. In light of the cognitive interviews, the wording of the introductory section was modified to be more inclusive, the sequence of the questionnaire
items was revised, and one of closed-ended and two of the open-ended questions were reworded.

**Pilot study.**

To ensure that the online version of the survey was free from technical problems, a small pilot study was conducted in which the survey was administered to a few scholars, the committee members of this dissertation study, and a number of the author’s acquaintances. Based on the feedback received from these individuals, the font of the front page of the survey was made bigger. These efforts, obtaining content validity from experts, conducting cognitive interviews, and implementing a pilot study, added to the validity and quality of the survey questionnaire.

**Constructs.**

The Community Awareness and Interpersonal Effectiveness scales were derived from factor analysis of a larger set of items (B. Moely, personal communication, March 15, 2011). The Community Awareness scale measures awareness of community issues. The scale includes ten items, which can be organized into two groups: the nature of service-learning course experience (course quality), and community awareness. Examples of the items of the first category include, “Learned to apply concepts from my service-learning course to real situations” and “applied things I learned in my service-learning activity to my college course.” Examples of the items of the second category include, “Become more aware of the community of which I am a part” and “changed the way I think about societal problems.” The Interpersonal Effectiveness scale measures interpersonal qualities, such as ability to interact with others and leadership skills. The
scale includes seven items. Examples of these items, include “Learned how to work with other effectively” and “practiced my ability to lead and make decisions.” The two scales included five-point Likert-like items for which respondents indicate their agreement or agreement on a 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree” (Moely et al., 2008).

**Psychometric properties of the scales.**

*Reliability.*

*Cronbach’s coefficient alpha* is the estimate of reliability that considers the number of items on a scale and the degree to which items are correlated with each other (Cronbach, 1951). The internal consistency of the Community Awareness scale was .92, N = 1,626. The internal consistency of the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale was .89, N =1,622 (Moely et al., 2008). Table 6 provides the reliabilities of the scales in this study and the ones that were reported by the developers of the scales (Moely et al., 2008). While lower than those reported in the development study, internal consistency reliabilities were adequate.

Table 6

*Reliabilities of Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha in Moely et al. (2008) Study</th>
<th>Alpha Current Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Awareness</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N =1,626.</td>
<td>N = 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Effectiveness</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N =1,622</td>
<td>N = 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Criterion-related validity.*

In response to a question about the validity of the scales, Professor Moely explained, “The scales do correlate with attitude scales to which they should be related--
Andy Furco and I have an unpublished study in which we show relationships of these measures to some of the CASQ and Andy's HE-SL scales” (B. Moely, personal communication, March 15, 2011).

**Discriminant validity (Social Desirability).**

Twelve items from Crandall, Crandall, and Katkovsky (1965) and Crowne and Marlowe (1960) were used to measure the degree to which the respondent attempted to present him/her-self in a favorable manner based on conventional social norms. In response to a question about how the scales were influenced by social desirability, Professor Moely noted,

We did find the scale responses to be related to social desirability, but generally the relationships of the scales to other indices were not much affected by whether or not social desirability was controlled, so I would not worry about it. (B. Moely, personal communication, March 21, 2011)

In an effort to minimize the effect of social desirability on student responses, the author did not the names of the scales in the survey questionnaire were not included. Also, the items of the two scales were mixed and arranged in a random order.

**Sampling strategy.**

A non-random sampling technique, a purposive sample, was used in this study. Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003a) noted that purposive sampling techniques involve selecting certain units or cases “based on a specific purpose rather than randomly” (p. 713). The target population was AUC students who have taken CBL courses, especially the ones enrolled in the spring of 2011. The majority of the participants were undergraduates while the others were graduate students. Student participants reflected
the demographics of the student body at AUC; most student participants were Egyptians and the others were international students from the U.S. and other countries.

**Data collection techniques.**

After consultation with staff members at the Gerhart Center, data were initially collected via an online survey. Electronic surveys are efficient because responses can be received quickly. They are also cost effective because no postage or fees are required. Additionally, they increase accuracy in recording responses because data entry errors can be eliminated by automatically building responses into a database (Lazar & Preece, 2001). After deciding on the final version of the survey (see Appendix F for survey), a collective message that explains the purpose of the study with the embedded link to the survey was e-mailed to all faculty members teaching CBL courses. The researcher identified these faculty members based on a list sent to her by the Center. In this message, faculty members were requested to post the link of the survey on the blackboard site of their respective CBL courses. To increase the response rate to the survey, faculty members who taught CBL courses in previous years were asked to e-mail the link of the survey to their students. Upon sending this message, two faculty members responded, noting that they would not circulate the link of the survey among their students. One of them did not justify his rejection while the other explained that she was conducting research with her CBL students and that she was afraid that inviting her students to complete the survey might interfere with the results of her research.

Additionally, hard copies of the survey were distributed among students who did not complete the electronic version of the survey. Three weekly reminders in addition to
thank-you notes were sent to each of these faculty members. Survey responses were received for 65 days, starting from April 25 until July 1. The survey questionnaire was closed on July 2nd, 2011.

Sample characteristics.

Demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 7. Forty-seven (77.0 %) of the students were female and thirteen (21.3 %) were male. Participants’ ages ranged between 18 and 29 years ($M = 21.24, SD = 2.143$). Fifty-four (88.5 %) were (Egyptians and dual citizens including Egyptian citizenship) and six (9.8 %) were from other countries including the U.S., Saudi Arabia, and Kenya. For race/ethnicity, fifty-four (88.5 %) were Arabs and 9.8 % were from other racial backgrounds. Forty-six (75.4 %) were undergraduates and fourteen (23.0 %.) were graduates. The sample characteristics are consistent with the demographics of the student body at AUC (see Appendix A for Fact Sheet). Of particular relevance, the percent of female students at AUC is higher than that of male students. The overwhelming majority of the student body is Egyptian. Also the institution enrolls a substantially higher number of undergraduate students than graduate students.
Table 7

Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizenship Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptians</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time in a Degree Program</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point Average (GPA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4-4.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous semesters</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of CBL Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department offering CBL courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of hours spent at service sites per week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 hours</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 hours</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Characteristics (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Orientation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual but not religious</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Engagement other CBL courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero courses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 courses</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 courses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extracurricular Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once each academic year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice each semester</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly every week</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-five (90.2 %) of the participants were enrolled full-time in a degree program and two (3.3 %) were in non-degree programs. This characteristic is also consistent with the type of course offerings at AUC; the number of degree programs is significantly higher than that of non-degree programs. Twenty-nine (47.5%) reported having a grade point average of 3.5-4.0, twenty-four (39.3 %) reported a grade point average of 3.0-3.5, six (9.8 %) reported a grade point average of 2.5-3.0, and one reported a grade point average of 1.5-2.0. These frequencies reveal that students who are enrolled in CBL courses tend to be in a good academic standing.
Thirty-six (59.0%) of the participants took CBL courses in the spring of 2011 and twenty three (37.7 %) took CBL courses in previous semesters. These frequencies reveal that the number of survey respondents who took CBL courses in the spring of 2011 is considerably higher than that of those who enrolled in CBL courses in earlier semesters. Based on advice from the program administration, the study mainly targeted students who were enrolled in CBL courses in the spring of 2011. As such, these frequencies can be understood in light of the participants to whom the survey was administered. Fifty-one (83.6%) took one or two CBL courses, nine (14.8 %) took three or four CBL courses, and one (1.6 %) took five or more CBL courses. This characteristic shows that the overwhelming majority of the students took only one or two CBL courses. These frequencies can be attributed to the relatively young age of the program and the obstacles facing it, as revealed in the qualitative findings.

Twenty-seven (44.3 %) of the participants took CBL courses in the Rhetoric department and thirty-two (52.5 %) took CBL courses in departments other than Rhetoric. This characteristic demonstrates that a substantial number of CBL courses were offered by the department of Rhetoric. The director of the program was a faculty member in this department. Accordingly, she might have promoted CBL courses in her department. Forty-seven (77.0 %) reported having worked one to five hours at their respective community-based organizations per week, ten (16.4%) reported five to ten hours, three (4.9%) reported ten to fifteen hours and one (1.6 %) reported fifteen to twenty hours. This sample characteristic reveals that the vast majority of students spent short periods of time at their community-based organizations, only one to five hours per
week. This number is quite alarming. In CBL courses, students typically spend ten hours per week at their service sites.

Thirty-two (52.5 %) of the participants reported that they did not enroll in courses with a community component other than their CBL course(s), twenty-six (42.6 %) reported that they had enrolled in one or two courses, and three (4.9 %) reported that they had enrolled in three to four courses. These frequencies indicate that AUC offers a number of courses other than the CBL ones that incorporate a community component. In response to a question about the frequency students have participated in a community activity as part of their student experience at AUC, thirteen (21.3 %) reported “never.” The exact percent was true for those students who have participated “once each academic year,” “once or twice each semester,” and “nearly every week.” Nine (14.8 %) reported having participated in a community activity as part of their student experience at AUC “about once a month.” Given the number of student-run clubs that address community issues, 52, the frequencies of student engagement in community activities as part of their extracurricular experiences are lower than expected.

In response to a question about the extent of their overall participation in community activities, both inside and outside the classroom, at AUC, twenty-five (41.0%) reported that they seldom (one to two times per semester) participated, fourteen (23.0%) reported that they sometimes (once a month) participated, eleven (18. %) reported that they always (each week) participated, eight (13.1%) reported that they often (two to three times a month) participated, and three (4.9 %) reported that they “never” participated in such activities. These frequencies may indicate that AUC tends to engage
students in community activities through both curricular and extracurricular activities. Thirty-eight (62.3 %) of the students reported that they were religious, nine (14.8 %) reported that they were spiritual but not religious, seven (11.5 %) reported having no religious orientation, and three (4.9 %) reported being very religious. Students’ religious orientation represented in this sample is also harmonious with the realities in Egyptian culture where religion has a major influence on the way people think and behave.

**Data preparation.**

Before discussing data analysis techniques, it is important to note that a major limitation of this sample is that it is highly diverse in the sense that it includes students from a wide range of majors who took CBL courses in many different disciplines. However, the number of cases representing these diverse majors and disciplines is very small. To address this limitation, departments were grouped into two major categories: Rhetoric and others. Likewise, majors were grouped into three categories: Natural Sciences, Arts and Humanities, and Business. Similarly, the variable, semester, was grouped into two categories: students who took CBL course in the spring of 2011 and those who took CBL courses in earlier semesters. Since the overwhelming majority of survey participants were Egyptians, the variable, citizenship was recoded into two categories: Egyptians or dual citizens including Egyptian citizenship and others, including students from the U.S., Kenya, and Saudi Arabia. Likewise, the variable, race/ethnicity, was grouped into two categories, Arabs and others.
Data analysis.

A deductive approach was employed in the data analysis process. Deduction refers to the process of moving from general, abstract constructs to specific concrete demonstrations of the construct (Creswell, 2009). The SPSS software was used to compute descriptive statistics, providing frequency distributions, means, standard deviations, and the range of scores for the variables. With respect to inferential analysis, several statistical tests were employed in analyzing the quantitative data: Pearson Product moment correlation, t-test, and one-way ANOVA.

Assumption of normality.

The assumption of normality was tested for the scales employed and the continuous variables. As shown in Table 8, results of skewness and kurtosis tests show normal distributions for the Community Awareness and Interpersonal Effectiveness scales, as well as the number of CBL courses other than CBL ones, and extracurricular activities. The distributions for the number of CBL courses, the number of hours spent at service sites per week, age, and GPA, are however, not normally distributed. Analyses that generated histograms showed that there were not distinct outliers in the data for any of the variables. Variables were not transformed despite normality.
Table 8

Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Awareness scale</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Effectiveness scale</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CBL courses</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours spent at service sites per week</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses other than CBL</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular activities</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall participation</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Procedures**

The characteristics of qualitative research are distinct from those of quantitative research. Qualitative research occurs in natural settings, employs various methods of data collection, is inductive and based on participants’ meaning, emerging, interpretive, and holistic. Researchers serve as the instrument for data collection (Creswell, 2009). Qualitative research focuses on the process that is happening, as well as the outcome or the product. Researchers are especially interested in understanding how things occur (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990; Merriam, 1988). Since the intent of this dissertation research was to study both the process and the outcomes of CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations, qualitative research is well-suited to study these partnerships. This section delineates the procedures followed in conducting the qualitative component of this study. In so doing, the first part introduces the research questions. The second one describes the sampling strategy, highlighting the sample size and the selection criteria. The third one provides a detailed account of the data collection
method. The fourth part outlines the data analysis procedures. The last two parts of this section describe the procedures followed to address the reliability and validity measures of the qualitative component of this study.

**Research questions.**

The main research question deriving the qualitative component of this study was: How do AUC’s students, faculty members, administrators, and community partners perceive CBL partnerships between AUC and community based-organizations? To help answer this question, the following sub-questions were raised:

1. What motivates service-learning partnerships?
2. What does the nature of service-learning partnerships look like in terms of Enos and Morton’s (2003) transactional and transformative relationships?
3. What are the challenges facing service-learning partnerships?
4. How can service-learning partners help promote their partnerships?

**Sampling strategy.**

The qualitative component of the study utilized a special type of purposive sampling approach, special/unique cases. This sampling type is used when an individual case or a specific group of cases is a main focus of the investigation. The overall purpose of this technique is to generate a sample that will address specific goals associated with the research questions; investigators select cases from which they can learn the most. These samples are typically small, 30 cases or less, and seek a specific type of generalizability, transferability. Purposive sampling focuses on the depth of information generated by the cases and the selection is based on expert judgment (Teddilie & Yu,
In this study a group of students, faculty members, administrators, and community partners were the unique cases for this inquiry.

**Sample size and selection criteria.**

In qualitative research, appropriateness is determined by how well the sample can represent the phenomenon of interest. Put another way, a sample is deemed appropriate by the extent to which the participants have experienced the phenomenon and are able to articulate their experiences. The sample size becomes sufficient when saturation of information is reached (Morse, 1987). The samples were selected based on recommendations by staff members at the John Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Education, the researcher’s intuition, and the expert advice of the committee members of this dissertation research. Following Strauss and Corbin’s (1998) advice, data saturation was the standard for determining the sample size. That is, individual and interviews were conducted until saturation of information was attained in the sense that the author was not getting new ideas.

More specifically, this study included 79 participants, 77 of whom had participated in CBL partnerships. The reason for including two individuals—one student and one community partner—who did not take part in the CBL partnerships was that these individuals were affiliated with an important community-based organization called Message. This organization had not had a formal collaboration with AUC in the CBL program until the time of this study was conducted. However, the perspectives of these two participants were deemed valuable to the study for a number of reasons. First, Message played an extremely influential role in supporting the disadvantaged and
underprivileged groups in Egyptian society; it provided a wide range of services to suffering individuals and groups in Egyptian society. Second, youth—most of whom were college students—held primarily responsibilities for running this organization. Third, Message was represented through student clubs on many higher education campuses in Egypt including AUC, the site of this study. Fourth, the author served at the organization as a volunteer and a co-chair of a sub-committee for orphan children in 2005 and 2006, respectively. Thus, she had a thorough understanding of the organizational structure and the dynamics of relationships within the organization. Fifth, since the primary mission of the organization was to promote volunteerism, the researcher thought that the perspective of these individuals might illuminate the discussion on the models of service-learning partnerships as charity acts or endeavors for social change.

**Data collection.**

Following Cruz and Giles’ (2000) recommendation, this study focuses on university-community partnerships as the unit of analysis. Specifically, it assessed the partnership perspectives of AUC’s students, faculty members, administrators, and community partners. As such, the research participants were asked to reflect on the motivations and goals of these partnerships, as well as the challenges of such collaborations and the factors contributing to their success. Data were collected through in-depth individual qualitative interviews.

**Individual interviews.**

Conducting interviews are useful when it is difficult to observe the participants directly. The use of this data collection method enables researchers to focus on the
particular questions of interest and gain historical information from the participants
(Creswell, 2009). Yet, researchers should be mindful of the fact that such a technique
provides indirect information filtered through the interviewees’ perspectives. Following
the guidelines suggested by Creswell (2007), individual interview protocols (see
Appendices G, H, I, and J for Interview Protocols) included headings that specify the
date, names of interviewee and interviewer, instructions, and questions.

The interview questions were intended to elicit the views and opinions of
students, faculty members, administrators, and community partners regarding the nature,
process, and outcomes of CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based
organizations. The individual interview protocol included semi-structured questions.
The development of the questions were informed by Enos and Motron’s (2003)
thoretical framework employed in the study, as well as other pertinent literature (Bringle
et al., 2009; Clayton et al., 2010; Cruz & Giles, 2000; Dorado & Giles, 2003; Morton,
1995). The protocol included a total of 16 questions. The first question was an ice-
breaker and the last one allows interviewees to provide additional comments and/or
revisit any issue discussed during the interview. The other items of the protocol were
developed to answer the four sub-qualitative research questions. As such, the purpose of
items 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 was to address the first research question about the
motivations for establishing CBL partnerships. The goal of items 4, 5, 11, 12, and 13
was to address the second research question about the nature of CBL partnerships in light
of Enos and Morton’s framework of transactional and transformative relationships. The
purpose of items 14 was to answer the third research question about the challenges facing
CBL partnerships. The intent of item 15 was to address the question about the roles service-learning partners can play in promoting CBL partnerships. It is worth noting that these questions were reviewed by the same experts who provided content validity for the survey questionnaire.

The protocols ended with a final thank-you statement as an acknowledgement for the insights the interviewees provided into the topic under study and for the time they invested in the interviews. Following Stanfield’s (1999) recommendations that researchers should balance their research questions so as to cover both the positive and negative aspects of the phenomenon under study, one of the questions, 12, asks about the costs associated with CBL partnerships. Another question, 15, invited participants to provide suggestions for improving CBL partnerships.

Participants were first invited to participate in the study via e-mails. Phone calls were then used to provide additional details about the study and to schedule the interviews. Interview sessions were scheduled at the participants’ convenience and sessions averaged 90 minutes. Interviews took place on both the old and new AUC campuses, as well as at community-based organizations. Interviews were recorded using Olympus digital voice recorder (VN6200 PC) and a few notes were taken manually during the interviews. After each interview, the author developed a Microsoft Word file in which she wrote little information, such as the date of the interview, its duration, and her reflections on both the interviewee’s responses and her interaction with him/her. Recorded interviews were then transcribed using professional audio player software, Express Scribe. This software was particularly useful because it included variable speed
playback, which assisted with capturing the details of the interviews accurately. As a precautionary measure, she e-mailed all word and audio files to herself. After that, data corpus were coded. The codes were then grouped into categories, allowing themes, patterns, and analytic questions to arise. The section on data analysis provides a detailed description of the coding methods and their rationales. The sections that follow describe the details of the individual interview procedures for each group of partners.

Students.

In the field of service-learning, several researchers argued that using pencil-and-paper measures solely is insufficient for capturing the full range of the outcomes of service-learning experiences (e.g., Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Eyler, 2000). Thus, they insisted that quantitative methods should be supplemented with qualitative data. Similarly, Moely et al. (2002) recommended the use of additional methods to support the scales’ validity. Accordingly, a sub-sample from the students who took CBL courses was selected to participate in in-depth qualitative interviews to complement the survey questionnaire data.

Individual interviews were conducted with four students. Based on the participants’ preferences, interviews took place in both open and closed spaces on the New Cairo Campus. All interviews occurred on weekdays. These interviews occurred at different times of the day: early morning, afternoon, late afternoon, and in the evening. To achieve gender balance, two females and two males were included. The participants were traditional college aged students, 18-21 years old. Based on self-report, one of the participants came from a middle class family while the other three belonged to upper-
middle income backgrounds. Two of the participants were Egyptians, one was a dual citizen (Egyptian and Austrian), and the fourth one was a U.S. citizen. All participants were undergraduate and full-time students; one was a freshman, one was a sophomore, one was a junior, and the other was a senior. The participants majored in different areas: Anthropology, Electronics Engineering, and Political Science. Since one of the participants was a freshman, he had not declared his major yet. Two of the participants were enrolled in one course with a CBL component in the spring semester of 2011. One of them took three courses with CBL components in previous semesters while one had not taken any courses with a CBL component, but was heavily involved in community service at the University and served as the 2010/2011 Club President of the most active and well-known NGO in Egypt, Message. To minimize the effect of instructors’ demographic characteristics on students’ perceptions, the sample was carefully chosen from courses taught by Egyptian, and U.S. female and male faculty members. These students were taught CBL courses by instructors who had previous experiences teaching CBL courses, and ones who were teaching these courses for the first time.

Faculty members.

Individual interviews were conducted with five faculty members. Based on the participants’ preferences, interviews occurred at both open and closed spaces on the New Cairo Campus. Specifically, three of the interviews took place at faculty offices. One of the interviews happened in an open space while another interview took place in a closed area on campus. One interview happened on the weekend while the four others took place during weekdays. One of the interviews occurred in the morning while the other
four happened in the afternoon. Faculty participants varied in terms of gender, age, citizenship status, academic title, work load at AUC, and disciplinary background. In particular, three female and two male faculty members were included. Three of the participants were Egyptians and two were U.S. citizens. Three of them were Assistant Professors. One was an Associate Professor while another one was an Instructor. At the time of data collection, four faculty members worked full-time at the University while one worked on a part-time basis. These faculty members had different disciplinary backgrounds: Rhetoric and Composition, Sociology, Psychology, Public Policy, and Physics.

Administrators.

Individual interviews were conducted with four administrators, most of whom held positions of leadership and had decision-making power at AUC: The Director of Core Curriculum, the Director of the Center for Learning and Teaching, and the former Director and the current Coordinator of the CBL program. Interviews were conducted on the New Cairo campus. Based on the participants’ preferences, all interviews occurred on weekdays. Two of the interviews were conducted at the offices of the administrators while the other two were conducted in closed spaces on the new campus. One of the interviews was conducted in the morning while the other three occurred in the afternoon. Three females and one male participant were included in the sample. In terms of age, two of the participants belonged to the middle-age group while the other two were over 50 years old. As for citizenship status, two of them were
Egyptians and two were U.S. citizens. Three of the participants had extensive work experience at AUC while one had little familiarity with the University.

Community partners.

Individual interviews were conducted with five community partners, all of whom were Egyptians. One interview happened on the weekend while the other four took place during weekdays. All the interviews were conducted in the afternoon. Two of them were conducted on the old campus; one was conducted on the new campus of the University, while the other two were conducted at the respective community organizations of community partners. The researcher strived for a maximum possible variation of community partners, in terms of gender, age, organization type and size, and period of collaboration between their organizations and AUC in CBL courses. As such, the sample included three males and two females, middle-aged and older individuals, and representatives of small, medium, and large not-for-profit organizations. Also, the community member participants represented organizations with different missions. Examples of the issues addressed by these organizations include low-income assistance, healthcare, food/nutrition, seniors/elders, disabilities, education, literacy, housing, crisis response/assistance, unemployment, vulnerable youth, work force development, environmental issues, and music/performing arts.

Before describing the data analysis processes employed in this study, a discussion of potential sources of bias is warranted.
Sources of bias.

Identifying sources of bias—tacit and formative theories—is the initial step in qualitative data analysis (LeCompte, 2000). Tacit theories should be identified to minimize bias in data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Formative theories should be identified to design research questions and inform data collection and initial analysis (Schensul, Schensul, & LeCompte, as cited in LeCompte, 2000). Given the importance of recognizing one’s bias before embarking on analyzing qualitative data, this section addresses how the literature might influence the researcher’s thought process while pursuing this dissertation research. To start with tacit theory, she recognized that being a higher education professional, she might have a tendency toward perceiving communities as “pockets of needs, laboratories for experimentation, or passive recipients of expertise” (Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999, p. 9). In other words, there was a likelihood that the author would focus on the negative sides of the community—its needs and problems (Eyler, 2001) and overlook its strengths. This perception might lead her to conceive of service-learning partnerships as more beneficial to community-based organizations than to the AUC. Additionally, focusing on the weaknesses of communities might push the author to promote these partnerships using a charity model rather than a social justice one. Nadler (2002) explained that charity occurs when one community gives resources to another community while justice happens when resources are conceived of as mutual and are shared among the members of the same community.

On the other hand, this dissertation research was guided by several bodies of literature and theoretical/conceptual perspectives constituting the formative theories that
informed this study. For instance, literature that informed the development of the research questions (Enos & Morton, 2003; Kahne, Westheimer, & Rogers, 2000; Morton, 1995) indicated that university-community partnerships for service-learning are beneficial to both institutions of higher education and communities (see a complete discussion in the second chapter). Moreover, social exchange theory (e.g., Kelley & Thibaut, 1987; Rusbult, 1980, 1983) examines the motivations and benefits of each party within a relationship and calls attention to the factors leading to imbalanced power structures among the various parties constituting a relationship. Equity theory posits that satisfying relationships must be fair and equitable. This theory also explains that the consequences of inequitable relationships include attempts to readjust investments or end these relationships (Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978). These formative theories urged the author to pay attention to the distinctive motivations, benefits, and challenges of all the partners involved in service-learning partnerships between the AUC and community-based organizations. Clearly, there is a tension between the tacit theories and the formative ones; the section that follows explains how the author’s bias for the formative theories might have influenced her data analysis, and describes the steps she took to minimize this bias while analyzing the data.

**Influence of theory/literature on data analysis.**

The formative theories and literature on campus-community partnerships resonated with the author more than tacit theories did. Therefore, she aspired to have findings/results that would support the formative theories. The researcher’s bias for formative theories might have influenced her data analysis in the sense that she might
look for evidence to confirm the formative theories. In particular, she might have tried to show that both the AUC and community-based agencies gain from their service-learning partnerships. She might also have investigated the factors leading to successful collaborations between universities and communities to show that the success of such partnerships requires investments from both parties. Additionally, she might examine the relationships among the various stakeholders of these collaborations so that she could better understand the influences of issues, such as respect, trust, reciprocity, and power structure, on the development and effectiveness of these partnerships.

Various strategies were followed in order to ensure reliable analysis and interpretation of the collected data. For example, the author kept an analytic memo in which she regularly recorded her feelings and thoughts about the data (Saldaña, 2009). She also discussed her thoughts with the committee members of this dissertation study, and with doctoral colleagues in the HED 4216 Research Process class. Additionally, she conducted member checking with the study’s participants and provided them with opportunities to check her interpretation of the data.

In qualitative research, the researchers act as the main research instrument (Creswell, 2009). As such, they make many choices. One of the choices the researcher had to make pertained to the best order of presenting the four groups and the order of participants within each group. Possibilities included presenting the research participants in alphabetical order by last name, or simply in a random order. With regard to the groups, the researcher chose to start with the group whose voice is the least heard in the literature. As such, community partners and administrators were presented first before
faculty members and students. Within each group, participant names appeared in the text according to the chronological order, from past to recent, in which the interviews were conducted in each group. The author thought that this order would be useful in two ways. First, this order might help account for the impact previous interviews might have had on the author while conducting the subsequent ones. Also, this order would ensure a fair representation of the participants and break conventional cultural norms. That is, it helps minimize the author’s bias for any of the participants on the basis of their demographic characteristics, such as gender, age, educational credentials, or socioeconomic background. Specifically, following such an order might help her avoid the influence her culture might have had on her; the author belongs to the Eastern culture where elder individuals and those who come from middle- and upper-middle social classes are typically treated with higher levels of respect.

Although the author strived to provide demographic information about research participants, it is important to remind the reader that the unit of analysis for this study is the partnership itself. More specifically, this study was concerned about the perspective of each group as a whole rather than the views of individual participants. As such, investigating the impact of participants’ demographic characteristics on their perspectives is beyond the scope of this study. The rationale of providing this demographic information was twofold. First, presenting demographic information helped create a context for analysis, enrich the text, and portray vivid pictures about participants. Second, this information was intended as an effort to provide guidance to scholars who would be interested in conducting future studies that examine how participants’
demographic characteristics may influence their perceptions of service-learning partnerships.

**Data analysis.**

In order to ensure a thorough and systematic data analysis of the data gathered from each group under study—community partners, administrators, faculty members, and students—the analysis was conducted in three major phases: initial stage, within group, and across group. Noteworthy, students’ responses to the open-ended questions in the survey were integrated into the data from qualitative interviews. Both sources of data were then coded and analyzed simultaneously. The sections that follow describe each of these analytic processes.

*First phase: initial stage.*

*Journal.*

The data analysis process of this qualitative inquiry began during the data collection phase. During that period, the researcher kept a journal in which she documented her thoughts and reflections on the research site, the people with whom she interacted, and the interviews she conducted. This journal was also a space where she expressed her emotional reactions to her overall data collection experience. Some of these thoughts were analyzed in analytic memos.

*Pre-coding.*

While transcribing recorded interviews gathered from the research site, the researcher jotted down her thoughts for analytic consideration when conducting data analysis. In order to ensure that these thoughts were distinct from the body of the data,
she bracketed and bolded them. Following the advice of Layder (1998) to never miss the opportunity to “pre-code,” the author printed the interview transcripts and read them thoroughly several times. While reading, she circled, highlighted, and colored significant quotes, as well the ones that stroke her. Also, she jotted in the margins noticeable patterns and tentative ideas for codes.

**Second phase: within group analysis.**

In this phase, within group, the data corpus of each group of participants was studied separately. This phase involved multiple analytic processes, including coding, analytic memo writing, categorizing, and thematic analysis.

**Coding.**

Qualitative research literature offers several definitions for codes. For example, Saldaña (2009) noted that a code is “a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data” (p. 3). According to Seidel and Kelle (1995), codes connect the raw data, such as interview transcripts or field notes, and the researcher’s theoretical concepts. Similarly, Richards and Morse (2007) explained that coding is not merely labeling; rather it is also linking: “It [coding] leads you from the data to the idea, and from the idea to all the data pertaining to that idea” (p. 137). Coffey and Atkinson (1996) perceived coding as a series of approaches that assist the organization, retrieval, and interpretation of data. They explained that coding is a combination of data reduction and data complication that is used to segment the data into simpler general categories. Coffey and Atkinson maintained that coding is also used to expand the data for the sake
of generating new questions and reaching new levels of interpretation. These definitions imply that coding is an analytic process which assists qualitative researchers in the initial process of organizing and interpreting raw data. As recommended by Auerbach and Silverstein (2003), the researcher developed a sheet of paper that included a copy of the main research question, sub-questions, and theoretical framework on one page in front of her while coding the data. Auerbach and Silverstein explained that such a paper focuses researchers’ attention, alleviates their anxiety, and informs their coding decisions.

Coding decisions were primarily guided by the research questions. In addition to these questions, the question, “What strikes you?” (Creswell, 2007, p. 153) also informed the author’s coding decisions. That is, she coded both the expected and unexpected data pertaining to the questions under study.

*Manual and electronic coding.*

Basit (2003) reflected on personal experiences with respect to manual and electronic coding and concluded that the choice will depend on “the size of the project, the funds and time available, and the inclination and expertise of the researcher” (p. 145). In this study, both manual and electronic coding was performed. The sections that follow explain the rationale for the use of each coding method and detail the implementation process of each. Saldaña (2009) advised researchers new to qualitative data analysis and those with small-scale studies to first perform manual coding, noting that such a technique allows for “more control over and ownership of the work” (p. 22). Likewise, Graue and Walsh (1988) recommended initial manual coding: “Touch the data . . . . handling the data gets additional data out of memory and into the record. It turns abstract
information into concrete data” (p. 145). Following these recommendations, the researcher conducted manual qualitative data analysis and coding using paper and pencil on hard copies of data during the second phase of data analysis, within group. Data obtained from each group of participants was relatively small-scale, and thus manual coding was manageable.

Manual coding helps researchers gain a feeling for the data and develop a basic understanding of the essentials of qualitative data analysis. However, qualitative software efficiently “stores, organizes, manages, and reconfigure” data to allow human analytic processes (Saldaña, 2009, p. 22). One of the most useful features of qualitative software is its search and querying functions. These functions allow researchers to group, link, and compare data, and thus identify patterns, and relationships, as well as make connections, and build theory (Lewins & Silver, 2007). Another valuable feature of qualitative analysis programs is that they enable researchers to quickly move back and forth between various analytic activities, such as coding, writing analytic memo, and examining emerging patterns. Also, some software displays code labels in different user-assigned colors for a quick reference and visual classification (Saldaña). As noted above, the author first coded the data within each group on hard-copy printouts. After reviewing the manual codes several times, she transferred the codes onto electronic files on the qualitative software, MAXQDA (version ten). Among different software available, MAXQDA was chosen based on recommendations by Creswell (2009); it has all the features found in other software with the added advantage of being user-friendly. Using
qualitative software was especially critical during the third phase of analysis, across group, which encompassed multiple groups of participants.

Patton (2002) contended, “Because each qualitative study is unique, the analytic approach used will be unique” (p. 433). Many methodologists argued that more than one coding method and at least two different analytic approaches should be employed in each study to advance accountability as well as the depth and breadth of findings (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2005; Mello, 2002). As such two coding cycles with two different coding methods were employed in this study. The sections that follow detail each coding cycle

First cycle coding.

The structural coding method was employed in the first cycle coding. This method is one of the elemental methods which are foundation approaches to coding qualitative texts (Saldaña, 2009). Structural coding can be defined as a question-based code that “acts as a labeling and indexing device, allowing researchers to quickly access data likely to be relevant to a particular analysis from a larger data set” (Namey, Guest, Thairu, & Johnson, 2008, p. 141). This method applies a content-based or conceptual phrase representing a topic of investigation to a portion of data that pertains to a specific research question used to guide the interview (MacQueen, McLellan-Lemal, Bartholow, & Milstein, 2008). According to Saldaña, structural coding both codes and initially categories the data corpus. Noteworthy, this method is convenient for almost all qualitative studies, especially those involving multiple participants, structured or semi-structured data gathered via protocols, hypothesis testing, or exploratory inquiries.
Structural coding is more appropriate for interview transcripts and open-ended survey responses than other types of data, such as field notes.

The choice of employing structural coding in the first cycle coding was informed by Flick’s (2002) checklist for considering and selecting an analytic approach in qualitative research and Saldaña’s (2009) recommendations in the same regard. That is, the choice of this method was deemed appropriate based on the goals and methodological needs of the study, as well as conceptual/theoretical frameworks employed. More specifically, the study’s data—interview transcripts—lent themselves nicely to this method. Also, this coding method was harmonious with the conceptual/theoretical framework (Enos & Morton, 2003) informing this study; it helped identify initial categories that might account for the several issues pertaining to university-community partnerships for service-learning identified by these frameworks. Most importantly, the choice of the structural coding method was driven by specific research questions, thus enabling the researcher to address the four questions posed by the qualitative component of the study in an organized and focused fashion.

Second cycle coding.

Second cycle coding is an advanced way of reorganizing and reexamining the data using the first cycle coding methods. If needed, the major goal of second cycle coding is to generate a sense of categorical, thematic, and conceptual/theoretical organization of the first cycle codes (Saldaña, 2009). Focused coding was employed in this study as a second cycle coding method. In using focused coding, researchers look for the most frequent or critical codes to construct the most important categories in the
data corpus (Charmaz, 2006). This method categorizes the coded data according to thematic or conceptual similarity. Focused coding is proper for almost all qualitative studies, especially those aiming to develop primary categories or themes from the data (Saldaña, 2009).

**Third phase: across group analysis.**

In the third phase, across group, the codes, categories, and themes developed within each group were reexamined to identify common themes across these four groups of participants. The author identified recurring themes as well as similarities and differences across the four groups.

**Reliability.**

Hammersley (1992) defined reliability as the “degree of consistency with which instances are assigned to the same category by different observers or by the same observer on different occasions” (p. 67). Spencer, Ritchie, and O’Conner (2003) noted that reliability pertains to the issue of whether or not future researchers will be able to repeat the research study and reach the same interpretations and conclusions. The sections that follow describe several reliability procedures employed in this study.

- **Transcript Checking:** Transcripts were checked several times to ensure that they were free from mistakes made during transcription.

- **Code Accuracy:** Codes were checked several times to ensure that there was no drift in their definitions. This was done by constantly comparing data with the codes and by writing memos about the codes and their definitions (Gibbbs, 2007).
**Triangulation:** In this study, data were collected using multiple sources, including a survey questionnaire and qualitative interviews. The collected data were then analyzed using rigorous quantitative and qualitative procedures. Triangulation of multiple methods of data collection and analysis adds to both the reliability and internal validity of qualitative research (Merriam, 1988).

**Inter-Rater Reliability:** To satisfy the inter-rater reliability criterion, the researcher followed several steps. During the coding process, the key words in significant quotes were highlighted and written on index cards. These cards were sorted into groups based on similarity. Then, each group of index cards was assigned propositional statements that describe the data included in that group. After that, each group of index cards was reviewed and assigned a provisional statement that describes and specifies the rules of including data in that group. Next, the researcher shared her analysis with the co-chair of this dissertation. The perspective of this committee member was then compared with the author’s analysis. In light of his feedback, the provisional statements of the constructed categories were refined.

**Internal validity.**

In qualitative research, validity is based on determining the accuracy of the findings from the standpoint of the researcher, participant, or the reader of the study (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Several other terms are used in the literature to refer to the same idea, such as trustworthiness, authenticity, and credibility. Following Creswell’s (2009)
recommendations, multiple validity strategies were employed in this study to ensure the accuracy of the findings:

- **Triangulation**: Data were collected from multiple sources, including a survey questionnaire and qualitative interviews. The analysis of evidence from these sources was then used to build a coherent justification for the emerging themes thus enhancing the validity of the study.

- **Member Checking**: The study’s participants were requested to review transcripts of recorded interviews for accuracy and for providing clarifications, if they so chose. Also, participants were consulted during analysis. Furthermore, the findings were shared with some participants, allowing them an opportunity to comment on the findings and determine whether or not they perceive them as accurate.

- **Rich and Thick Descriptions**: The findings of this study were communicated through rich and thick descriptions. Such a type of description may transport the reader to the setting and enrich the discussion with a component of shared experiences (Creswell, 2009). In this study a detailed description of the setting was provided and themes were explained from several perspectives. This, in turn, led to developing a rich and realistic portrayal, thus enhancing the validity of the findings.

- **Reflexivity**: Reflecting on the biases the researcher brings to the study helps establish an open and honest narrative that resonates well with the reader (Creswell, 2009). In this study, the researcher provided detailed comments on
how her personal and professional background, as well as biases may have affected her interpretation of the findings.

- **Negative/Discrepant Information:** Both evidence supporting emerging themes and contradictory evidence were presented and discussed. This, in turn, led to portraying a more realistic and complex picture, thus adding to the validity of the findings.

**External validity.**

Maxwell (1992) noted that generalization refers to the degree to which the findings of a particular context, situation, or population can be applied to other contexts, settings, times, or individuals. He differentiated between internal and external generalizability, noting that the former pertains to the generalizability of a conclusion within the underlying group or setting. The latter refers to the generalizability beyond the study’s context, situation, population, setting, or time. Maxwell also argued that qualitative investigators are typically concerned more with the internal generalizability than the external generalizability. The external validity of this study was enhanced by providing rich, thick, detailed descriptions, thus establishing what Merriam (1988) called a solid framework for comparisons, in case researchers are interested in transferability.

**Generalization.**

This section discusses the generalizability of the findings of this study. According to Lewis and Ritchie (2003), generalization addresses the question of whether the findings from a particular study can be relevant beyond the sample and setting of this study. In light of their definition, they proposed three approaches to generalization for
qualitative studies: representational, inferential, and theoretical. These types are well-established in the qualitative component of this study.

**Representational generalization.**

Representational generalization pertains to the extent to which the findings of a particular qualitative study can be inferred to the parent population from which the sample is drawn (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003). The findings of this study can be generalized to the parent population that was sampled. That is, the perspectives of the study’s participants regarding service-learning partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations can be similar to the perspectives of other service-learning partners in Egypt regarding the same topic. Assessing the representational generalization of this study followed Lewis and Ritchie’s framework in which they identified two principles as essential for claiming representational generalization. The first one pertains to the accuracy with which the phenomenon was captured and analyzed. The second one relates to the extent to which the sample represents the parent population. As noted in the methods chapter, the study followed a systematic and rigorous approach of data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Also, the study is well-grounded in relevant theory and literature. Although the sample size, \( n = 79 \), is relatively small, the study’s participants are representatives of four groups: community partners, administrators, faculty members, and students. Additionally, the study is heavily supported by the local language of the participants. Of note, this is the first study on service-learning partnerships in Egypt. Thus, there is no confirmatory evidence from other research
conducted with the parent population. Nevertheless, many of the study’s findings are consistent with those of past research in other contexts.

**Inferential generalization.**

Inferential generalization refers to the extent to which the findings of a particular qualitative study can be inferred to other contexts beyond the sampled one (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003). Lincoln and Guba (1985) contended that the transferability of the findings of one study to other settings depend on the similarity between the context within which the study is conducted and the context to which the study is to be applied. The concept of “thick description” (Geertz, 1993) is particularly important to this approach of generalization. This concept requires researchers to provide extensive description of the study’s setting to enable readers to capture the meaning associated with the phenomenon under examination. This, in turn, may allow them to make informed decisions about the congruence of the two contexts. Since AUC grants bachelors and master’s degrees and is physically located in Egypt, there is a good chance that the findings of this qualitative study can be held true in similar institutions of higher education in the Country. Moreover, since AUC is a U.S. based university, the CBL program is harmonious with the principles of service-learning in the U.S. Therefore, the qualitative component might have yielded findings similar to the current ones were the study captured service-learning partnerships in an institution of higher education in the U.S. Despite these probable similarities, one should be mindful of unique characteristics of each university. Thus, caution must be taken when transferring the findings of this study to other institutions of higher education. It is therefore up to the judgment of the
reader to assess the similarity between the two contexts and make informed decisions accordingly.

**Theoretical generalization.**

Theoretical generalization generates theoretical propositions or principles from the findings of a study for broader application (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003). As detailed in the above noted sections, this study largely confirms the findings of prior research and adds nuances to existing literature as well.

**The researcher’s role.**

Since qualitative research is interpretive and investigators are typically involved in experiences with participants, a range of ethical and personal issues influence the qualitative research process (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 2007). As such investigators overtly reflect on how their biases, values, and personal background, such as gender, history, culture, and socioeconomic status, may influence their interpretations formed during the study (Creswell, 2009). The researcher’s perception of university-community partnerships for service-learning has been shaped by her personal background and professional experiences.

The researcher is a middle-aged heterosexual, Egyptian, Muslim female from a middle-social class background. The researcher’s religion, Islam, has played an initial and influential role in her sense of responsibility for, and interconnectedness with, others. Specifically, the ethics of care is strongly stressed in both the holy Qur’an and in Prophet Muhammad’s teachings. For example, Muslims are encouraged to provide help to others, especially the needy, and promised that as long as a person aids others, Almighty God
will always assist him/her. Examples of Prophet Mohamed’s sayings that motivate people to care about one another include, “None of you believes (completely) until he/she loves for his/her brother/ sister what he/she loves for himself/herself,” And “whoever believes in God and the Last Day (the day of Judgment) should do good to his/her neighbor” (as cited in Ibrahim, 1997, pp. 49-50). The researcher’s sense of interconnectedness with others is probably one of the main reasons why she strives to connect universities with communities.

The researcher started to become aware of social inequalities during her early childhood. She was especially struck by the disparity between the poor and the rich, and the consequences of poverty on children’s lives. More specifically, child labor and the harsh treatment of servants, most of whom were children, received by the aristocratic class used to arouse intense emotions in the researcher. As a child, she asked herself naïve questions, such as, why are there very rich people and very poor ones? Why should poor children be punished for their poverty? How can some parents let their children work as servants for others? How can these parents endure being away from their children? Why do the rich not have mercy on the poor? How dare the rich treat their child servants in such savage manners? What would I do if I were one of those children?

While the researcher could not find satisfying answers for her childish questions nor could she do any substantial thing to alleviate the sufferings of these child servants, she developed a strong determination to strive to enhance the lives of poor children. The researcher’s early childhood experiences with the child labor issues may provide a
plausible explanation for her interest in developing service-learning partnerships as a means for addressing societal ills.

The researcher’s educational experiences expanded her understanding of social problems. She attended most of her pre-secondary education in public schools where she noticed that students were treated differently based on their socioeconomic status; students who came from middle and upper-middle social classes were given attention and their mistakes were excused. Conversely, students who came from working-class families were neglected and harshly punished for their mistakes in classrooms. The unequal treatment that students’ received based on their socio-economic status informs the researcher’s interest in exploring the relationships between partners involved in service-learning partnerships. She is especially interested in examining whether or not each partner is treated fairly in these collaborations.

Providing service to her community is a defining characteristic of the researcher’s personality. She believes that having an opportunity to serve others is an honor, not a burden, as many people typically think. Therefore, she has seized every possible opportunity to play active roles in her community (see Appendix K for list of service activities listed on the researcher’s C.V.). During her tenure as the President and Vice-President of the Morgridge College of Education Student Association in 2010 and 2009, respectively, the researcher sat on several of the College’s committees, took part in administration meetings, and dealt with students’ concerns. These experiences allowed her valuable opportunities to observe power dynamics and decision making processes.
Such experiences sparked the researcher’s interest in exploring how these issues interplay in university-community collaborations for service-learning.

The researcher’s volunteer work at two not-for-profit organizations, Egypt’s Message and Habitat for Humanity Metro Denver, for approximately five years enabled her to gain some experiences with the nonprofit world. Yet, the degree of her familiarity with non-profits is relatively smaller than that of the higher education world. That is, she spent almost seventeen years so far in higher education in different capacities. Such a long period enabled the researcher to become more aware of the systems, norms, and expectations of higher education. Based on social justice concerns, there is a strong tendency in the literature to mention the community before the university (e.g., Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 2011). Yet, the researcher chose to entitle her work, “University-Community” rather than “Community-University.” The researcher’s decision to use this order is part of her efforts to be conscious about her knowledge and expertise, not as a result of bias for institutions of higher education.

“Absolute objectivity is an impossible conceit” (Cohen & Kisker p. 8). Like fellow humans, the researcher has her own biases which were reflected in the study. “A pragmatic approach . . . redirect[s] our attention to investigate the factors that have the most impact on what we choose to study and how we choose to do so” (Morgan, 2008, p. 57). The researcher’s teaching experiences largely influenced her decision to focus on students in this study. She worked as an instructor for almost nine years in both pre- and post-secondary institutions. The teaching positions allowed her invaluable opportunities to pursue a number of personal and professional aspirations. For example, this position
enabled her to have both frequent and one-on-one contacts with students. The researcher exerted every possible effort to excel in her teaching and set a good role model for students by embodying the ethics of integrity and fairness, thus furthering her goals of abolishing favoritism from the educational system and beyond. Through her teaching positions, she also managed to identify several problems associated with the educational system in Egypt, such as heavy reliance on traditional pedagogy, a disconnect between theory and practice, and irrelevancy of school curricula to the actual demands of society. One of the fatal problems the researcher recognized through her interactions with students was the growing sense of frustration among them regarding the economic, and social, and political conditions in the Country.

Indeed, the researcher's teaching experience has been fulfilling to her. Such an experience influenced her decision to focus more on students although several other partners are typically involved in service-learning partnerships. Students were given special attention in the study in that their perspectives were analyzed through both quantitative and qualitative methods. Promoting college students’ civic engagement is a primary reason for the researcher’s interest in advancing service-learning partnerships in higher education.

It is worth noting that although the researcher worked as a part-time instructor at the research site for approximately three years in the period from 2004 to 2006, this study is not a “backyard” research study (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) for a number of reasons. First, the researcher no longer works there. Second, she worked there for a relatively short period of time on a part-time basis. Third, the classes she taught met at an off
campus site. These factors did not allow the researcher an opportunity to gain an in-depth understanding of AUC’s internal affairs. This, in turn, indicates that while the researcher had some familiarity with the research site, she was not an insider. Rather, she maintained an outsider perspective throughout the study. She had no prior connection or even acquaintance with the research participants. Since the researcher does not hold any supervisory or evaluative position at AUC, participants might have been open and expressed honest responses. In addition, several efforts were implemented to eliminate bias in the findings of the study. These efforts are described in detail in the subsequent sections.

**Gaining Entry into AUC**

A number of steps were taken to gain entry into the research site and to secure permission to study participants. First, the researcher sent an e-mail message to Dr. Ibrahim, Director of the John Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic engagement, introducing herself and requesting a meeting with her during the International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE) Conference in Indianapolis in the period from October 28 to 30th, 2010. Dr. Ibrahim responded positively, indicating her willingness to meet with the researcher. Accordingly, Professor Nick Cutforth, the Co-chair of this dissertation, facilitated a meeting between Dr. Ibrahim and the researcher on October 29th, 2010. This meeting lasted for approximately 30 minutes in which Dr. Ibrahim shared some information about AUC’s civic initiatives, provided an initial approval for the researcher to conduct her
study at AUC, and mentioned that the Center administers an informal Research Fellows Program.

On November 9th, 2010, the researcher sent a follow-up letter with her C.V. attached to Dr. Ibrahim, thanking her for the time they spent together in Indianapolis and for her support for the study. Following Bogdan and Biklen’s (1992) advice, the researcher also explained the rationale for choosing AUC as the site for the study (see Appendix L for Follow-up Letter). Additionally, she expressed her interest in applying for the Research Fellows Program, clarifying how participation in this program would benefit the study. In her response, Dr. Ibrahim reiterated her interest in the study and requested detailed information, which the researcher provided in another letter. After that, a series of e-mail exchanges occurred between the researcher and the staff members at the Center in which detailed information about the study was provided.

**Ethical Considerations**

Discussing ethical considerations is a critical component of research, especially in qualitative studies (Crewswell, 2009; Marshall & Rossman, 1989). A number of precautions were taken to ensure the dignity and welfare of research participants. First, an approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) (see Appendix M for IRB Approval Letter) was obtained before contacting the research participants. Second, the study honored the ethical principle, “Do no harm,” in the sense that participants were not subjected to any physical, economic, or psychological harm. Third, the participants were asked to sign informed consent forms per established IRB procedure. The informed consent included brief information about the study, such as its purpose, number of
questions, and time required for participation. Potential benefits and risks involved in participation in the study were also outlined. Additionally, the form included a clear statement, explaining that participation in this study was strictly voluntary and that participants had the right to ask questions and withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty. Likewise, the form included a statement about confidentiality, emphasizing that the information provided by the participants would be safeguarded. To further ensure the welfare of the participants, the form included the name and contact information of the researcher and the institution of higher education with which she is affiliated (see Appendices N for Informed Consent Form). Similarly, the survey instrument opened with a project information sheet outlining participants’ rights (see Appendix O for Project Information Sheet). Fourth, research participants were treated respectfully with sensitivity to gender, race, and socioeconomic status. Also, participants’ rights, wishes, and preferences were considered and honored throughout the study. For example, pseudonyms were chosen in consultations with the study’s participants. As a precautionary measure, copies of the recorded interview and transcript files were created and saved as a back up to the original files.

**Connecting Qualitative with Quantitative Components**

Overall, the intent of employing both quantitative and qualitative methods in this study was to provide a holistic and rich account of university-community partnerships for service-learning as perceived by service-learning partners at AUC, students, faculty members, administrators, and community partners. As explained in the previous sections, the mixing of the quantitative results with the qualitative findings occurred in
the final discussion. In this section, the researcher interpreted the findings in light of Enos and Morton’s (2003) theoretical framework employed in this research. She also commented on how qualitative findings helped elaborate and extend quantitative results. The study ended by raising several questions for future research, as well as by calling for action agendas for reform and change. As indicated by in the previous sections, this mixed method study was carefully designed, thus responding to the calls for more rigorous research on the impact of service-learning (Bacon, 2001; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Bringle, et al., 2004; Holland, Gelmon, Furco, & Bringle, 2005; Zlotkowski, 2000)
Chapter Four: Findings and Results

This chapter is organized into four sections by the groups under investigation. The groups are presented in the following order: community partners, administrators, faculty, and students. This section presents the perspectives of the community partners. It is organized into two main parts; the first provides narrative descriptions of the participants, and the second discusses the emerging themes.

Community Partners

Five one-on-one interviews were conducted with professionals of four different organizations. Pseudonyms were used to refer to these professionals; since all of them were Egyptians, Arab names were used. All the partnering organizations were NGOs except for one which was a privately-owned company. These organizations address distinct as well as similar social issues. The subsequent sections provide a narrative description of each of these professionals and their respective organizations. Table 9 provides an overview of the participants.
Table 9

*Community Partners Overview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Date of Inception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed (أحمد)</td>
<td>Alwan wa Awtar (ألوان وأوتار)</td>
<td>Community development though arts</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salama (ىملس)</td>
<td>Tawasol (تواصل)</td>
<td>Community development through education</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad (دمحم)</td>
<td>Center (مركز)</td>
<td>Traditional skills revival</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady (شادي)</td>
<td>Message (رسالة)</td>
<td>Wide range of charity and development activities</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noha (نهى)</td>
<td>Alwan wa Awtar (ألوان وأوتار)</td>
<td>Community development though arts</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Descriptions**

Ahmed (أحمد).

Ahmed was a man in his early thirties who had a bachelor’s degree in Economics from the Faculty of Economics and Political Sciences, Cairo University. Also, he studied Master’s courses in Management and worked as a Graduate Assistant at AUC from 2006 to 2008. In 2008, Ahmed was a Teaching Assistant with a female faculty member who taught a development course with a CBL component. Additionally, he used to work at a community-based organization that partnered with AUC in the CBL program. The name of this NGO, Alwan wa Awtar (ألوان وأوتار), could be translated into English as, Colors and Strings. A detailed description of this organization is provided in the subsequent sections. Ahmed worked at this organization on a full-time basis in 2008 and on a part-time basis in 2009. While working at Alwan wa Awtar, Ahmed helped plan and organize...
some of the collaborative activities between the organization and AUC. In addition to his experiences at AUC and Alwan wa Awtar, he was a volunteer at a youth-led initiative called, Namaa (نبياء) for Sustainable Development. This initiative started in 2005 and aimed to prepare social entrepreneurs by equipping young people with the necessary knowledge, skills, and values to become agents of positive social change in society (Namaa, 2011).

**Salma (سالمه).**

Salma was a woman in her thirties who possessed a bachelor’s degree in Integrated Marketing and Communication from the AUC and worked as the Vice-President for procurement, marketing and communications for Shores, an Egyptian hotel management chain. During her undergraduate years at AUC, Salma led a literacy initiative, offering English and Arabic courses to AUC’s janitorial staff, maintenance personnel, security guards, lab assistants, and drivers by AUC’s student, faculty, staff, and alumni. This initiative was later adopted by the John D. Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement. Salma’s sense of social responsibility continued to evolve after graduation. At the time of this study, Salma was known as an active philanthropist and social entrepreneur. For example, she was one of the founders of Fat'het Kheir (فتحة خير), an Egyptian NGO which was founded in 2001 to assist families living in an underprivileged area called Al-Hadaba Al Wosta (الهضبة الوسطى) in El-Moqattam (المقطم).

Also, Salma was one of the founders of an NGO with which AUC partnered for the CBL program. The name of this NGO, Tawasol (تواصل), could be translated into
English as, Connections. Tawasol was founded in 2008 and registered in the Egyptian Ministry of Education as a One Classroom School. This NGO was located in an area referred to as Stable Anter (اصطبل عنتر) or Ezbeat khaer Allah (عزبة خير الله) which was a squatter settlement in the Old Cairo area that sprouted in the seventies. During the time of this research, Tawasol was operated by 38 full-time and two part-time staff members. Salma explained that it was very difficult to count the number of students served by the school since its inception “because of regular medical convoys.” (Y. Abou Youssef, personal communication, May 4, 2011). However, in 2011, Tawasol enrolled 130 students whose ages ranged from six up to fourteen years old and two-thirds of the students were girls. Tawasol was supported financially by Zakat money, a type of tax that Muslims must pay annually, as well as from donations provided by individuals and companies in Egypt and the region.

Tawasol had two major goals: to retain children in this poor area who dropped out of school to work in technical workshops to support their families, and to provide elementary education to children who had never gone to school. In addition to offering children formal elementary education, Tawasol took care of children in several other ways, such as providing them with nutrition, as well as access to a library and a computer lab. As an incentive for parents to allow their children to attend this school, students received small stipends for participating in a vocational training to learn a craft. In so doing, Tawasol, cared not only for children, but also for their families in this community. Under the umbrella of the CBL program, AUC students collaborated with Tawasol on several projects, such as conducting an assessment of the needs of the community,
developing a fundraising proposal to satisfy those needs, painting homes for the households within the community, and spending time with the children Tawasol served.

**Muhammad (محمد).**

Muhammad was a middle-aged man with a degree in Business Administration from Austria. He was the founder and the owner of a private company called Markaz (مركز) which was founded in 1999. The name of the company could be translated into English as Center. Markaz was a crafts revival and development center. This company was registered as an Egyptian trademark that targeted high quality artisan work. At the time of this research, Markaz was a small company that had 15 staff members working alongside the owner. As expressed by Muhammad, the mission of Marzak was three-fold. The primary mission was to preserve and/or revive traditional Egyptian skills, such as cotton weaving, wool weaving, linen weaving, basket weaving, embroidery, pottery, wood, and leather. Markaz also aimed to generate income for the poorest groups in society who possessed these artistic talents and had to work constantly to provide for themselves the basic necessities. The third component of the mission was to raise awareness among people of beautiful art works which exist in Egypt, but often go unnoticed. This organization started collaborating with the CBL program since its inception in 2008. Specifically, Muhammad hosted several CBL courses at his company. Examples of these courses included Sociology, Proposal Writing, and Photography. Also, he served as a liaison between the CBL program at AUC and several NGOs and local enterprises in Egypt.
Shady (شادي).

Shady was a middle-aged Associate Professor of Electronics Engineering at AUC. He was the founder and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the biggest and most popular not-for-profit organization in Egypt and the Middle East. The name of the organization, (رسالة), could be translated into English as Message. RESALA started in 1999 as a student club in the Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University, where he had been employed. Specifically, during one of his classes, Shady urged his students to refrain from being indifferent toward the issues facing their society and to play active roles in addressing those issues. After class, a group of students visited Shady in his office expressing their desire to take concrete actions to confront societal ills. Subsequently, Shady met several times with these student activists in which they brainstormed ideas on how to turn their thought into action. Next, they agreed to start a student club in the Faculty; among the several names that were suggested, the name Message received the majority of votes, and thus it was chosen as a name for the club. Through this club, students led several initiatives, such as cleaning and sustaining the environment of the University (S. Abdel Azeem, personal communication, May 4, 2011).

Students worked so hard in Message club that they gained great respect and admiration from the community. Significantly, a relative of a female student activist decided to donate a piece of land to RESALA in an area called Fesal (فيصل) in Cairo. This donation gave impetus to Shady and his students to turn the club into an NGO. This piece of land was used to found the first branch of the organization in 2000. Because of the hard work of student activists along with Shady, Message continued to grow; at the
time of this study, the organization had 55 branches throughout Egypt. It is worth noting that Message was operated by full-time and part-time staff, as well as hundreds of thousands of volunteers. The organization was supported financially by donations from individuals and corporates. The primary mission of Message was to promote volunteerism among Egyptians and its vision was to spread the spirit of volunteerism all over Egypt. Message offers Egyptian society with a wide range of services including, but not limited to poverty alleviation services, aid to individuals with special mental needs, the deaf/mute, the blinds; weekly visits to orphanages, the elderly clubs, and hospitals; clothes fairs, monthly food packages, and medication to the needy; blood donation; and recycling activities.

**Noha (نهى).**

Noha was a middle-aged woman with a bachelor’s degree in Business Administration from AUC. In 2006, Noha began work on a part-time basis as a Support Office Manager at the same community-based organization in which Ahmed worked, Alwan wa Awtar (ألوان وأوثر). This organization was established in December 2005 and was registered in the Egyptian Ministry of Social Affairs as an NGO with the mission of promoting visual and performance arts as a means for social development. Alwan wa Awtar was located in an underprivileged area in Cairo called El-Moqattam (المقطم). Many people who lost their homes as a result of the earthquake which took place in Egypt in 1992 were grouped in this area. Alwan wa Awtar aimed to develop El-Moqattem community through arts. Specifically, the goal of the organization was to redress the
neglect of arts at schools by exposing young people at this community to different types of arts, such as music, drawings, and theatre.

According to the Executive Director of Alwan wa Awtar, the organization was a small non-profit which was operated by 20 full-time and five part-time staff members, as well as 20 animators who facilitated art and informal educational activities. Since its inception, the organization had served about 5000 young people whose ages ranged from six to twenty years old. However, Alwan wa Awtar recently started a new initiative, Montessori classes, which enrolled 20 children whose ages ranged from two to six years old. In 2011, 798 young people were enrolled in different activities at the organization, 493 of whom were girls and 305 were boys. Additionally, Alwan wa Awtar served other children through a walk-in program in which children drop into the organization to practice coloring or work on puzzles. The organization is supported financially by donations and kind gifts from the private sector, donor agencies, and individuals.

It is worth noting that Alwan wa Awtar had long standing collaborations with the CBL program at AUC since its inception in 2008. Compared with all the organizations that collaborated with AUC in the CBL program, the partnership between this NGO and the CBL program witnessed the most frequent interactions. Many students from different classes at AUC had interacted with the organizations in a wide range of projects and in different capacities, such as volunteers, interns, and employees. Examples of the collaborative activities between Alwan wa Awtar and AUC included events in which AUC students were paired with children at the organization. Each pair read a story and then worked on a project on how to express this story into any type of artistic
manifestation, such as a play, or a picture. In another event, children were paired with AUC students and taught them how to play a musical instrument that they had learned at the organization. Other activities included conducting educational workshops which were intended to raise children’s civic awareness, such as modeling the Arab League.

Themes

Four major themes emerged from data analysis: making a difference in community, current transactional CBL partnerships along with aspirations to engage in transformative partnerships with AUC; barriers to sustaining CBL partnerships; and the need for strategic planning and thinking. The findings are organized around the research questions which framed the study. The discussion of each theme is supported by direct quotes from the study’s participants and is examined in light of the literature.

Partnership motivations.

The theme of making a difference in the community was demonstrated in the data when participants spoke of their motivations to establish service-learning partnerships with AUC. The primary motivation for community partners to join CBL partnerships was their commitment to making a difference in Egyptian society. Table 10 provides a summary of community partners’ motivations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community Partners’ Motivations for Participation in CBL Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>Raising students’ awareness of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-</td>
<td>Economic privileges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-</td>
<td>Plight of the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-</td>
<td>Socioeconomic disparities in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-</td>
<td>Unjust structures in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>Encouraging cross cultural boundaries between students and community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>Promoting students’ sense of pride in their country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>Educating the next generation of decision-makers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants made several references to this theme. However, raising AUC students’ awareness was the most frequently cited aspect of this theme. In this regard, participants explained that CBL partnerships offer AUC students opportunities to cross cultural boundaries and recognize socioeconomic disparities in Egyptian society. For example, Salma mentioned that CBL partnerships allow AUC students opportunities to get out of their own bubbles and learn about underprivileged neighborhoods in Egyptian society:

For me, exposure is very important for the AUC students to see that there are other perspectives of Egypt, other perspectives of their life outside the premises of the campus and outside their house and friends, and surrounding. That there are poor areas in Egypt in dire need of help not only money because money is never the issue. But, need people to come and care . . . to give them trainings, to spend some time with them, to be exposed to people outside. . . . As an Egyptian, you have to know what’s happening in your country. . . . As an Egyptian, you have to see, you have to know that. If you live in Madii (معادي), you have to know that ten minutes away from Madii (معادي), there are a lot of slums: Dar El-salaam (السلام) (دار إصدان عنتر), Ezbet Khaer Allah (عزبة خير الله), Stable Anter (اصطبل عنتر), Batn El-bakara (بعثن البقرة), Ezbet Abo-Arn (عزبة أبو أرن). These are slums ten minutes away from Madaii. So, Madii (معادي) is not Egypt.
She also noted that these partnerships enable AUC students to become aware of their economic privileges and recognize the plight of the poor in their society:

The AUC students came there and see what it looks like to be a poor person, doesn’t have water, or doesn’t have a toilet, doesn’t have a sewage system, doesn’t have sometimes ceilings, they[community members] are living in house made of red bricks not made of plastic yet. So, for them [AUC students], it is a way to be thankful. I’m glad that they have gone through this experience to be thankful of what they have and they start appreciate the means around them and they start appreciate the money their parents are providing for them.

Significantly, Salma explained how CBL partnerships provide AUC students with opportunities to learn about unjust structures that exist in Egyptian society:

They [AUC students] will learn how things are run differently in poor areas. For example, people pay three pounds per electricity on each electricity invoice for the governorate . . . for garbage removal. In the poor areas, no one come[s] to remove the garbage. So, they pay three pounds for service that they cannot really afford and they don’t receive the service. So, it [the CBL program] open[s] their horizon to know how things are run in our government, in our country, to know that sometimes in the grocery that are in the slum areas are sometimes more expensive than the grocery they would buy in Metro and Alpha Market because the people who would buy the grocery want to have higher mark up to compensate their hard living.

Another aspect of this theme was participants’ desire to promote AUC’s students’ sense of pride in their country. For example, Muhammad explained that CBL partnerships allowed him opportunities to show AUC students high-quality national products and beautiful areas in Egypt:

If I can participate in opening their eyes towards a different world that they don’t know, towards lots of beautiful things in Egypt [that] people don’t know about. I think I am a very privileged man who has had the opportunity to travel to many different governorates in Egypt and have seen so much beauty lying around that people don’t know about. I think that Markaz (مركز), it’s not only myself; it’s a team of 14 different people and we decided that it’s important to raise awareness between people, between our customers who come and are not interested to know, but then they discover: What! This is Egyptian! We start telling them the story.
Every piece here has a story. Each piece here has an origin, and to raise awareness and presentations and collaboration with such places like the Gerhart Center.

A third aspect of this theme relates to participants’ views on how CBL partnerships provide invaluable opportunities for both AUC students and community members to interact with different others. Participants stated that such interactions help both groups confront their stereotypes and generalizations about different others which can then minimize their prejudices toward people who are different from themselves. For example, Ahmed noted that CBL partnerships are:

meaningful because they get exposed to other people: Egyptians, non-Egyptians, from different community. . . . Exposure is meaningful to the kids in Alwaan wa Awatar (ألوان وأوتار) and to the university students. It’s meaningful to Alwan wa Awatar because it helps them get the exposure and they learn new things. . . . When you expose, they learn new things. You get to know new things and widen your prospective to life and to others. . . . It’s diversity and knowing the others. . . . They know the others, it’s no longer strange things, alien. They find them decent people or non-decent. They get to know themselves; nobody tells them what the others are.

Similarly, Noha pointed out that “they [children at Alwan wa Awtar] used to have this prejudiced idea that the AUCians . . . they don’t care about their country. They don’t know how they live.” These comments clearly indicate that CBL partnerships may enable AUC students and community members to have a better sense of others and to develop important multi-cultural competences.

In addition to raising awareness, community professionals noted that they would like to make a difference in their communities by educating the next generation of decision-makers. For example, Muhammad stated, “The objective is to raise awareness through several levels. And, I think that the AUC students are going to take decisions on my life when I am an old man.” In this regard, participants felt strongly that addressing
community issues is integral to the mission of higher education. Shady put it this way: “I think this [CBL program] is a good thing to teach students . . . how to link their academic background to serving communities. This is what education is all about.”

Despite the fact that Egypt is suffering from sizeable economic challenges, community participants stressed their goal to raising students’ awareness of critical issues facing their society as the primary motivator for partnering with AUC in the CBL program. That is, participants stressed the importance of these partnerships as eye-opening experiences for AUC students with little reference to their goals of acquiring material gains for their organizations or clients. This perspective is reflected in Salma’s comments:

It’s about exposure; students from the slum area are exposed to people different than them. And others, the well-off students are exposed to less fortunate students. So, it’s all about exposure. Because I don’t think it will bring a lot of money. It will bring a lot of awareness.

These references echo previous findings in the literature. As with Sandy and Holland’s (2006) study, these references demonstrate community partners’ commitment to contribute to college student education at the beginning of CBL partnerships. Similar to the findings of Worrall (2007) and Sandy and Holland, the theme of crossing cultural boundaries emerged as a main motivator for community professionals to join service-learning partnerships. Unlike Worrall, and Sandy and Holland, however, there was no reference to issues of race and ethnicity. Rather, socioeconomic disparities were the most common issues cited by the participants. This difference can be attributed to the different historical contexts of Egypt and the U.S. The findings of this study add the nuance that
CBL partnerships offer community partner professionals opportunities to contributing to positive social change by promoting students’ sense of pride in their country.

**Partnership relationships.**

The theme of transactional relationships along with aspirations to engage in transformative relationships emerged from discussions about the defining characteristics of current CBL partnerships and community professionals’ visions for future CBL collaborations with AUC. This broad theme involves two main components: current transactional CBL partnerships and aspirations for future transformative CBL collaborations with AUC. Table 11 presents a summary of this theme.
Table 11

*Community Partner’s Perceptions of CBL Relationships*

Current transactional along with aspirations for transformative relationships

1- Current transactional partnerships
   a- lack of students’ visits
   b- limited communication with university partners
   c- clear relationship boundaries and short-term relationships between the University and community partners

2- Aspirations for transformative partnerships
   a- nature of CBL activities
   b- partnership goal alignment
   c- friendly relationships with university partners
   d- positive attitudes toward the program
   e- hopes for long-term partnerships

---

*Current transactional CBL partnerships.*

The first component, transactional relationships, is demonstrated in the data when participants described their current CBL partnerships with AUC in terms of the frequency of student visits to community organizations, communications with the University partners, scope of collaborations, and impacts of these partnerships on students and communities.
Lack of students’ visits.

Community professionals stated that AUC students paid only a few visits to their organizations during the academic semester. Recalling the number of visits students paid to community organizations, Muhammad said:

I saw them [AUC students] three or four times, that’s all. . . . So, we meet once for the presentation and go twice for the visits . . . and then a closing session where the students will come and present their outcome. So, I see them three or four times during the semester and I never see them again.

Salma expressed a concern about the lack of visits students paid to her organization, noting that such few visits would inhibit students from attaining optimum learning experiences through CBL partnerships:

I am not sure it’s [the CBL experience] educating them. It’s again exposure. They [AUC student] didn’t come enough. They didn’t spend enough period[s] in the area to be educating for them, to know how people think, how people behave, to know their motives behind this specific behavior. But, when they come five or six times per semester, it’s exposure. It’s not that long of time that they would be educated, but it would open their eye how things are going in Egypt.

Similarly, the paucity of students’ visits to community organizations led Ahmed to worry about community perceptions of these visits and to question the value of CBL partnerships to student learning:

I wonder do students learn more when they go into the community. Do they get real experience and exposure? I don’t know if they do that or not. So, it’s puzzling for me. Do they learn? Is this process enough for them or it is simple? Simple that they just go, come, and come out. Do we need more interaction to get full exposure and it is not just knowledge from the superficial knowledge, it’s real inside knowledge. It is not a visit. So, the puzzling thing is: is it helpful that you go and visit a community like a tourist and leave or you should either sit and make a difference and communicate for several times and have a certain task for a time and have an impact or just a visit would be nice or it’s just a touristic thing?
Limited communication with the university.

Participants’ comments on their communications with AUC partners provided additional evidence for transactional CBL partnerships. For example, Ahmed indicated that the communication between his organization and AUC was very limited, “It was a communication to get things done. There was no continuous communication, if you are talking about the staff.” Similarly, Muhammad explained that it was difficult for him to accurately assess the impact of CBL partnerships on students because of his limited interactions with them and their faculty: “The thing is I don’t have any contact to the students, [and] professors that deal with them.”

Clear relationship boundaries.

NGO professionals made clear references that there were well-defined boundaries between community organizations and AUC, and that partners maintained strong institutional identities. Salma’s comments were quite illustrative in this regard. Reflecting on the collaborations between her organization and AUC, she asserted, “So, when they [AUC students, faculty, or staff] come, of course, we are in different lands because AUC is AUC and NGO and slum area [are] different.” In describing student roles and CBL activities and impacts, she stated:

They [AUC students] were not that heavily involved in our plan so that they will interfere or be different than our line of thought. They came for three, four, five times and they made an impact and that’s it. No harm of it and no really impact on us in the long-term. Yes, the houses [were] painted and the people were pleased.
Aspirations for transactional relationships.

The second component of this theme, aspirations to engage in transactional relationships, provides significant evidence that community partner professionals aspire to establish transformative relationships with AUC. This component is demonstrated in partners’ comments on CBL activities, the informal relationships they had with AUC staff, their attitudes toward the CBL program, as well as their calls for long-term CBL relationships with AUC.

Nature of CBL activities.

The nature of CBL projects provide evidence for the likelihood that the partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations may progress toward transformational relationships. Participants indicated that CBL activities were carefully planned in a way that ensured both clear connections to students’ courses and true benefits to community members. Additionally, several of these activities went beyond providing basic services to engaging NGO’s clients in meaningful activities. Ahmed described one of the CBL activities for an arts course as follows:

We sat together and we planned for an intervention where . . . it was going to be events with the kids, with the students are coming to the area and everyone has a magazine something like that and sitting in groups with the kids. And then, start read with them and start make them read and then start to think how to translate this magazine into a play and then start to rehearse for the play, a play or any kind of manifestation. So, you can draw, you draw and then you make a play. So, they went through reading into group readings, doing drawings related to the magazine or the book and then having a play and then present it. . . . And then after having this kind of activities at the end, every group makes a presentation about the play to the other, the rest of the group.
Partnership goal alignment.

Participants felt that, for the most part, the goals of community-based organizations and those of AUC were aligned. For example, when asked whether or not her goals of the CBL partnerships were harmonious with those of AUC, Salma answered, “Of course, we agreed on the kind of activities. They didn’t impose their activities. We agreed. We sat together and we agreed on what to be done. Then, we took it a step further.” Similarly, Ahmed noted, “It was aligned. We sat together and we thought how best we can utilize this. And we agreed and they came and do what we have asked them to do.”

Friendly relationships with university partners.

Although CBL partnerships were characterized by minimum interactions among partners, community partners were connected to university staff through cordial and informal relationships. Such friendly relationships were instrumental in establishing CBL collaborations and could make it easy for the program to progress toward transformational relationships. Salma reflected on the smooth relationships she had with the director of the CBL program noting, “Usually, we don’t sit. Mona [the real name of the director was replaced by a pseudonym] call[s] me on the phone and we agree. And, I know Mona from before. That’s why it’s very informal for us.”

Positive attitudes toward the program.

Even though participants spoke frankly about the weaknesses of the CBL program, they held positive attitudes toward the program and expressed optimistic views about its growth. For instance, Muhammad attributed the shortcomings of the CBL
partnerships to the early stages of the program, and believed that as time goes, these partnerships would develop:

Definitely they [university partners] are going to the right direction. They need a little more time to adapt, to adjust to the right direction, to maximize the outcome. . . . I am positive towards the [CBL] program. . . . I think that this is a great program that still needs a little time to mature.

*Hopes for long-term CBL partnerships.*

Community partners’ repeated comments about their hopes to having long-term CBL partnerships with AUC provided additional powerful evidence for the potential of these relationships to progress toward transformation. When asked whether she preferred project-based or continuous CBL partnerships with AUC, Salma answered, “I would like to have long-term partnerships.” Similarly, Muhammad expressed his preference for long-term partnerships, “I am interested in continuing working with the students.” Some community partners even believed that the positive outcomes of CBL partnerships were dependent on long-term relationships. For instance, Muhammad related the positive outcomes of CBL partnerships to the continuity of the program and suggested that students should spend more time in, and become more involved with, community organizations: “I always believe that after a while if this goes continuous, outcome will be positive. . . . more involvement, more time, and that would reflect on the outcome.”

Participants’ comments denote that CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations were characterized by short-term relationships, small commitments, and minimum interactions among partners. Also, these partnerships did not result in a significant change in the partners’ individual identity or institutions. Within the framework of Dorado and Giles (2004) in which partnerships evolve through
three paths—tentative, aligned, and committed—CBL partnerships seem to follow a tentative path which characterizes partnerships that are recently established, involve surface and short-term interactions, and in which learning behaviors dominate. In light of Enos and Morton’s (2003) conceptualization of partnerships as they move from transactional to transformative relationships, CBL partnerships lean more toward transactional relationships. However, there is evidence that these partnerships can progress toward transformational relationships. This conclusion is supported by participants’ comments about the activities of their partnerships, informal relationships with the program director, their aspirations for long-term relationships, and positive attitudes toward these partnerships regardless of the costs involved. This suggestion is also suggested by Dorado and Giles who contended that relationships with the potential to progress from the aligned path to the committed one may take a short time to do so because partners’ commitment motivates them to overcome any initial difficulties.

**Challenges to CBL partnerships.**

In discussing the challenges to establishing and maintaining CBL partnerships with AUC, participants identified three major barriers: issues related to local culture, differences between the university and community-based organizations, service-learning students, and the capacity of community-based organizations. Table 12 provides a summary of these challenges.
Table 12

NGO Professionals’ Perceptions of the Challenges to CBL Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges to Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Cultural-related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- unfamiliarity with the concept of service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- bureaucracy prior to the Revolution of 25th January, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- lack of democracy prior to the Revolution of 25th January, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Differences between the university and the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- theoretical vs. practical approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- academic calendar vs. ongoing service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- trust issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Student-related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- lack of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- inadequate preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Limited capacity of community-based organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Culture-related issues.**

Unfamiliarity with the concept of service-learning.

A number of participants attributed the difficulty to establishing CBL partnerships to issues particular to local culture, such as little familiarity with connecting coursework to community service. For instance, Muhammad regretted canceling one of the CBL activities because of parents’ rejections to student participation:

I remember to have planned trip to Shalateen (شلاتين) [a far away city from Cairo in southern Egypt]. I was invited to a wedding in South Red Sea area and everything was set. There was no money, but they organized. And then, last minute, they all cancelled because they were afraid because their parents didn’t allow them to the wild Eastern desert.


Participants referred to the political situation—bureaucracy and lack of democracy—prior to the Egyptian revolution on January 25, 2011 as a critical barrier to promoting CBL partnerships. For example, Shady expressed his frustration with the red
tape which was prevalent before the revolution, explaining how bureaucratic rules limited the progress of his NGO, Message:

There are bad things happening like the bureaucracy in Egypt, but it is not a puzzling question. Egypt has such red tape, bureaucracy, and routine. Progress in Egypt is so difficult, very undemocratic society, very rigid rules, extremely void of any logic. This is Egypt of the past. I hope Egypt will change. I am not sure it will change, but I hope it will change. It is an obstacle, for sure, yes, of course. We could have grown double the size if there was not such bureaucracy in Egypt. Oh! My God, it took years to get a permission to build a building on a piece of land something that would take a month, it takes years, years, really.


Shady also explained how the previous government in Egypt was so repulsive and controlling that it prohibited students from getting involved in NGOs:

It’s very difficult if not impossible to establish a student club with the name Message in any Egyptian university. Because of security police, the past, they were not allowed. They would not do this. They would not accept students to belong to an NGO outside of the university: security reasons. The students [do] not belong to anybody. They consider this a danger to the state that students have some leadership from outside of the university or they belong to some association. Freedom of association, this was something alien to the Egyptian society before the 25th of January. They were not open to any kind of association because of fear of the unknown. And the unknown happened because of what they were doing. They blocked any free movement for students, any free association, any activities for the students. Because they blocked everything, people exploded. This is what happened. It was their own wrong doings that caused this to happen. They closed the doors for any independent activity or any meaningful activity. They closed all doors. So, people exploded. That’s what happened. They destroyed their system.

*Differences between the university and the community.*

Participants identified the cultural differences between the AUC and their NGOs as another major barrier facing CBL partnerships. Responses included references to the differences between the functioning of universities and NGOs. Muhammad stated, “They work on a very academic level and I work on a very community-based level.”
Participants also spoke of the difference between the academic calendar and the ongoing nature of the work of NGOs. Although Salma expressed her wish to have long-term relationships with AUC, she acknowledged the difficulty of so doing: “I think this is difficult because they [students] would usually have a semester and then credits and they leave, they finish, and they move to another semester.”

*Trust issues.*

Ahmed expressed a concern about the lack of trust that may exist between AUC as a foreign institution and local communities in Egypt, noting:

The difficulty will be getting to know your partners, [pause] and their agendas. For example, if you are a community and these people are coming from the AUC, some people have [pause] perceptions of the foreigners as spies and things like that.

*Student-related issues.*

The issues related to local culture and the differences between AUC and NGOs were the most often cited barriers to CBL partnerships. In addition to these issues, participants discussed a few issues pertaining to students, and NGO capacity. For example, Muhammad indicated that a number of students were not interested in the work of NGOs, stating: “Maybe five or six are interested and the rest are waiting for the bus to come, excused themselves to go, talking on the phone.” In the same vein, Ahmed mentioned that some students were not well-prepared to interact with community members. When asked about the challenges he encountered in CBL partnerships, he pointed to the “incapability of some of the students to deal with the kids.”
Community-related issues.

Ahmed also observed that sometimes the capacity of community-based organizations to host a large number of students at the same time could be a minor issue facing CBL partnerships:

Sometimes there is a lot of mess because plenty of people working at the same time. So, they are not coming one by one. They come together in the same time. So, sometimes it’s good, sometimes, you cannot control it easy. It depends on the time and the staff available and things like that. So, sometimes you don’t have the capacity to receive all of them. It’s not a great a challenge.

These findings are largely consistent with those of prior research. For example, the challenges pertaining to the academic calendar and students’ lack of interest and/or lack of preparedness were cited by several studies, such as Worrall (2007), Sandy and Holland (2006), and Vernon and Ward (1999). Also, the finding about the cultural differences between AUC and community-based organizations confirms the theoretical perspectives that highlighted the cultural differences between universities and communities as critical barriers to establishing and sustaining CBL partnerships (Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999; Holland, 2002; Walshok, 1999).

The findings concerning the challenges presented by the political and social contexts in Egypt provide novel insights into typical thought about possible challenges to CBL partnerships. Participants’ comments clearly illustrate that the political and social contexts where these partnerships are initiated matter. As participants indicated, the political situation may progress or paralyze these partnerships in significant ways. Similarly, the social context exemplified in parents’ attitudes toward students’ engagement in CBL activities can play a supportive or a deterring role to these
partnerships. These new findings call attention to the critical importance of paying
careful attention to the local culture as part of the efforts of promoting CBL partnerships.
Moreover, these findings shed light on the added challenges presented by the engagement
efforts of a foreign institution in a local context. Additional research is needed to better
illuminate this area.

**Partnership improvements.**

The theme of strategic thinking and planning emerged from participants’
suggestions for improving CBL partnerships. Participants identified the need for
strategic thinking and planning as the most critical overarching strategy for establishing
effective CBL partnerships. Community professionals provided specific references as to
what critical thinking and planning may look like with respect to CBL partnerships. The
sections that follow describe each of these references. Table 13 provides a summary of
participants’ suggestions for improving CBL partnerships.
Table 13

*NGO Professionals’ Suggestions for Improving CBL Partnerships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic thinking and planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Building a clear vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Increasing student involvement in the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Increasing faculty involvement in the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Establishing clear connections to the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Paying attention to Egyptian national context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Ensuring community impact and involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Promoting the capacity of community-based organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Sharing the history of service-learning and success stories with partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Following a step-by-step approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Facilitating logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Conducting program assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Strategic thinking and planning.*

*Building a clear vision.*

Participants indicated that CBL partnerships should be planned with a clear vision to ensure profound impacts on partners involved and to lead to real changes in society at large. As Ahmed articulated:

"Trying to develop a vision for intervention so that it is not just simply students go, have practice, and come back. But, we have a vision of how this intervention ultimately would lead to real change and we measure what our intervention not just by how much students learn, and how much the community benefits simply, but how much change would happen afterwards. So, this is a little bit higher longer . . . and impact assessment . . . The big picture."

Ahmed’s comment supports Enos and Morton’s (2003) theoretical perspective that the impacts of truly transformative service-learning partnerships go beyond transforming individuals involved in the relationship to transforming their organizations and the community at large.
Increasing student involvement in the partnership.

The call for students to spend more time in, and become more involved with, NGOs was at the heart of participants’ suggestions for improving CBL partnerships. For instance, Salma thought that in order for AUC students to have a significant impact on communities, they should extend their relationships with the NGO over an academic year or at least visit the NGO on a regular basis during the academic semester:

Maybe it’s good for them [AUC students] to make a higher impact if they stay for a year or so or even if during the course, they would spend more time coming to the NGO, deciding on activities to do together. Maybe it’s not easy to find an activity ongoing during the whole semester. But, maybe spending some time on a regular basis is more effective.

Community partners’ calls for students to spend quality time at their respective community-based organizations echo the suggestions made by other community members in Sandy and Holland’s (2006) study and Tryon et al.’s (2008) study.

Increasing faculty involvement in the partnership.

Similar to participants’ suggestions for more student involvement, community professionals stressed the importance of faculty participation in CBL partnerships, especially in the planning phase. In the following quote, Muhammad clearly indicated his desire for a long-term CBL partnership with AUC in which faculty members and their assistants get involved with the NGOs before student service-learners so that they become familiar with the mission of the NGO, and plan their courses accordingly:

Long tem, of course, with a plan. I think the faculty should first of all go for a year, those who are really interested and design an outcome that will happen in two years and work successfully. . . . If any effort should be put, I think should be put with the professors and the assistants. . . . I have a clear suggestion . . . You work with graduate level if this is within the themes or work with faculty. First, brainstorm an approach, and define a timeframe after which will come up with a
plan, curriculum, catalogue, manual, I don’t know; I am not an expert. It needs expert to define. But, there has to be interaction between faculty before the students get involved.

As this quote shows, Muhammad indicated a preference to working with graduate-level students, but he did not provide a clear reason for that. However, his preference could be understood in light of the previous comments he and other participants made about some undergraduate students’ lack of interest in the NGO work and under-preparation for interacting with clients served by community agencies. Participants’ calls for more faculty involvement with community agencies, especially during the planning phase of CBL partnerships, support Miron and Moely’s (2006) caution that there will be significant missed opportunities in the absence of co-planning and authentic co-operation between faculty members and the partnering community professionals.

_Establishing clear connections to the curriculum._

Participants stressed the importance of connecting the activities students do at the NGOs to the course objectives. For example, Ahmed argued that connecting the course content to community service would ensure high quality CBL activities and provide students with opportunities to apply the theoretical concepts they learn in class to practical applications in real-life situations. He offered the following suggestions for improving CBL partnerships:

The quality of the intervention [should] be based on the content of the curriculum. So, we are giving quality intervention. So, if the course is about engineering and manufacturing, when you go the community, you find things that this manufacturing will help them to solve some of their problem. So, it is a _demand driven of the community_, but in the same time, based on your _competence in this study_. This will give you extra, an edge to give quality intervention and in the same time give you as students an edge to learn to apply what you learn. _It is not just trying to help the community in whatever the ways._
This finding corroborates previous works by Sandy and Holland (2006), Strand et al. (2003), Holland (1999), and Boyer (1990) which highlighted the critical importance of connecting course content to engagement activities.

_Paying attention to Egyptian national context._

Participants acknowledged their partnerships with a U.S. institution in the CBL program. Yet, some of them drew attention to the cultural and organizational differences between Egypt and the U.S. Thus, they emphasized the importance of designing and implementing CBL partnerships based on Egyptian culture and traditions. Muhammad put it this way:

[The CBL program is] a noble thought. But, how to do it? You have to do it the Egyptian way not the American way. The system is completely different. The NGOs here, the nonprofit, and culture of the needy is completely different.

This finding stresses the fact that engagement efforts are context-laden. As such, university engagement models must be tailored to national contexts and respond to the unique needs of local communities. Also, university officials should be aware of an important issue, namely that a model that works well in one region of the world would not necessarily be effective in another region.

_Ensuring community impact and involvement._

Community partners stressed that CBL partnerships should be designed in such ways that ensure mutual benefits to AUC and to NGOs as well as allow community partners opportunities to contribute to student learning. Muhammad commented,

It [CBL partnership] has to be a win-win situation. . . . use us [community professionals] as partners to give presentations, to work individually with students in small groups, this will be a lot more effective.
The literature of service-learning includes repeated and strong emphasis on the ideals of collaboration between universities and communities (e.g., Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Walshok, 1999). Similar to the community partners in Sandy and Holland’s (2006) study, community partners in this study highly value and enjoy their roles in educating college students. Ensuring mutual benefits for universities and communities is another ideal that is also emphasized and promoted in the literature (Connors & Seifer, 2000).

*Promoting the capacity of community-based organizations.*

Ahmed voiced concern that AUC tends to focus too much on community clients and not enough on the NGO itself. For example, he suggested that CBL activities should consider advancing the organizational capacity of the NGO itself rather than focusing exclusively on organization clients. He argued that so doing would better enable the NGO to sustain its services to clients and impact communities in bigger ways. Ahmed articulated this suggestion as follows:

When we intervene, usually, we intervene directly to the community to have tangible deliverables. We need to think . . . strategically. One of the strategic ways of thinking is working on the capacity . . . of the NGO, the capacity of the staff, their capacity to find for better efficiency of work, better management, better teaching if they are teachers, working on the employees, on the staff, on the institution itself. . . . If we have the privilege of working longer periods, if we can bring people from the management staff to help this institution for the efficiency inside. . . . So if you are a management student and you have studied organizational structures, things like that, try to have sessions with the staff to find the organizational structure for them, job description, how they can do it. So, they apply this on that level. So, they enhance the efficiency of the institution, work on the institution itself: the staff and the plan, and the organization. . . . So, we help them through institution, through strategic planning to have a higher impact of what they do, things like that. If it is development courses, try to help them to find the best theory of change that you can work through to make real difference in the community, things like that. That’s envisioning the different needs this NGO will need and try to fulfill that from different departments and
this is strategic way of thinking. So, it’s not only just as a student, I go to the community, try to help them do something in the community as a deliverable thing, it is one good thing, but try to think deeper into the institution itself because this is more sustainable. If you enhance the institution, it will be sustainable in giving the service to the community.

Unlike Sandy and Holland’s (2006) study, there was no clear evidence that CBL partnerships increase the organizational capacity of the NGOs. For example, when asked whether CBL partnerships with AUC helped their organizations network with other organizations or provided them with funding opportunities, all community members either responded negatively or indicated that such opportunities were possible, but did not happen. The only exception was Noha who indicated that CBL partnerships provided her organization with funding opportunities and increased the workforce of her organization because students continued to engage with the organization beyond the course. This exception can be understood in light of the frequency of interactions between AUC and this organization. As indicated above, CBL partnerships between AUC and Alwan wa Awtar was ongoing and witnessed the most frequent interactions compared with the rest of AUC’s community partners.

As such, this finding indicates that the frequency of service-learning interactions between universities and communities can be an important factor in understanding the impacts of these partnerships on partners involved and their level of satisfaction with the partnership. Additionally, the level of interactions may predict the future development of these partnerships over time. Other studies identified age as an explanatory factor of the type of service-learning partnerships (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Dorado and Giles, 2004; Scheibel et al., 2005). Since all the organizations in this study started their CBL
partnerships with AUC at the inception of the program, it was not possible to assess the impact of the age of the partnership on the partners or their respective organizations.

*Sharing service-learning history and success stories.*

Muhammad noted that community partners would welcome opportunities to learn about the historical evolution of service-learning and success stories of CBL partnerships. He pointed out that learning about CBL partnerships in other contexts would be helpful to him at both personal and professional levels:

> It would be interesting to attend a session downtown not far up there [the new campus] about the history of CBL. I don’t know if it’s implemented elsewhere and it’s successful at American Universities in Beirut, or in Turkey. It will be nice to gather a little presentation for those who are interested. Maybe we should hear about success stories elsewhere about that CBL program. . . . A couple of stories,. . . . a presentation for those who are interested. I am definitely interested in continuing. . . I think it will help me own personal education,. . . . my own personal horizon-widening. . . . For me personally and as a leader of this organization, it will benefit the organization by learning about stories.

This finding indicates that community partners take their CBL partnerships seriously in that they are willing to invest time in educating themselves about the program in other contexts. Thus, AUC is encouraged to offer sessions to advance the knowledge of community partners about CBL partnerships and showcase success stories. As Muhammad stated, it is important to select venues relatively close to community partners to encourage their participation.

*Following a step-by-step approach.*

Ahmed recommended engaging students in CBL activities in a gradual manner. First, students would be encouraged to make concrete contributions to the NGO so that they can feel the immediate impact of their efforts on the organization thus gaining a
sense of self-efficacy. Then, students would become more encouraged to take part in more critical activities that may take time to yield impacts. Ahmed indicated that ultimately he would like to engage students in quality CBL activities yet he explained the rationale for following a step-by-step approach moving from basic services to higher-level activities:

We need quality intervention. . . . Nevertheless, sometimes, some of the students are not very much aware of the impact they can give through their quality intervention. They cannot feel it easily. But, they can feel easily when you teach students or paint a wall because that’s tangible. So, sometimes, if there is a long-term process, you can start with something tangible so that they can feel it, but not an end in mind. But, for a smaller proportion, for an intervention proportion so that they feel their ability to achieve. And you need to work on that because sometimes we don’t think we can add something, we don’t know much. But, finding ways that they find that they can be of help, this is an empowering process that they can feel that they do something tangibly and once we achieve something, you can work on the other levels.

As the literature review in the second chapter demonstrated, there is a debate concerning service-learning partnerships as acts of charity or endeavors of social change. There is a consensus that most service-learning partnerships adopt a charity model in which students provide direct services and technical assistance to community-based organizations and their clients. Although serious criticism has been directed against this model (Carpini & Keeter, 2000; Robinson, 2000; Saltmarsh et al., 2009), Ahmed’s argument invites a reconsideration of this criticism. Ahmed suggested that sometimes involving students in providing basic services is a first essential step for progressing toward engagement in critical service-learning activities.
Facilitating logistics.

Community partners suggested that AUC should work out some administrative issues, such as transportation and accommodation to facilitate student engagement in CBL partnerships. For example, Muhammad hoped that AUC students would become engaged with communities outside Cairo. For this to happen, he explained that the University should make special arrangements to offer students affordable housing and transportation, “If this program should continue and those students have the opportunity to go outside Cairo, there has to be arrangements to get cheap housing, to get cheap transportation.” This finding calls attention to the importance of generating an internal budget for the CBL program, which is an important organizational factor in predicting engagement efforts on campus (Holland, 2005; Vogelgesang, 2004; Ward, 1996).

Conducting program assessment.

All community partners clearly stated that there had been no attempts to neither assess community impact of CBL partnerships nor investigate community partner perspectives of these partnerships. The absence of formal evaluation left community members wondering about the worth of these partnerships to their NGOs and to student learning. For example, when asked to share a puzzling experience about CBL partnerships, Ahmed responded that he was not sure, “How much the students will learn from this experience?” Similarly, Noha exclaimed, “Is it worth it what we’re doing or not?!” Likewise, Muhammad repeatedly stated that it was difficult for him to identify the impact of CBL partnerships:

Nothing measurable, to be very honest. There is nothing measurable . . . We have some pictures working with the photography classes. We have some pictures
visiting the different areas and every student has a camera. . . . I don’t have it all. I got a sample of those products.

As recommended by many scholars, ongoing assessment should be an integral component of strategic planning of CBL partnerships (Bringle & Hatcher 1999; Scheibel et al., 2005; Torres 2000). Assessment data can be helpful in identifying the impacts of these partnerships on all partners involved and in justifying the efforts invested in establishing them.
Summary

This section introduced the perspectives of the community member groups. It started by providing narrative descriptions of the community professionals and their respective community-based organizations. It then presented the themes as they pertain to the research questions framing this study. While these findings are largely consistent with previous literature, especially the studies by Worrall (2007) and Sandy and Holland (2006), they advance our understanding of service-learning in non-Western contexts.

One of the most compelling themes is participants’ repeated emphasis that contributing to educating AUC students was their major motivation to join service-learning partnerships. This finding is unexpected; given the economic challenges facing Egyptian society and the limited resources available to these NGOs, one may expect that leaders of NGOs may be motivated to partner with institutions of higher education for economic benefits.

Participants provided several examples of how these partnerships may enable them to educate college students. The most striking point was a reference to participants’ eagerness to promote students’ sense of pride in Egypt. This reference can be understood in light of the history of colonialism in Egypt. Egypt was invaded by France in 1798; the French occupation of Egypt lasted for three years. Egypt was invaded again in 1882 by Britain; the British occupation of Egypt lasted for almost 81 years (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2012). Although Egypt has retained its independence and is currently in a postcolonial era, the hegemony of Western countries still influences, to a great extent, the ways Egyptians think and behave. Of particular relevance, the vast majority of Egyptians internalized oppression during the periods of occupation in a way that they see
themselves and their country as inferior to Western people and countries. Muhammud expressed their desire to help deconstruct these deficit ideas by showing students that there are beautiful areas in Egypt and high-quality national products, in the hope that these students feel proud of their country and who they are.

The theme, relationships, permeated the interview transcripts and showed that CBL partnerships lean more toward transactional relationships. Yet, participants’ positive attitudes toward the CBL program and their strong belief in its potential provide substantial evidence that it can progress toward transformative relationships. In discussing their relationships with AUC, community partners demonstrated a critical awareness of societal issues and the University’s structures. With regard to the challenges facing CBL partnerships, these findings confirmed many of the challenges identified by previous studies. Unlike previous research, however, the political situation and the local culture emerged as two primary factors that may influence CBL partnerships. With respect to the fourth theme, strategic thinking and planning emerged as the key approach for improving and sustaining CBL partnerships.
Administrators

This section introduces the findings of the administrator group. As summarized in Table 14, four participants constitute this group. Similar to the community partners section, the discussion opens with a narrative description of the participants providing some background information about them. It then introduces the emerging themes along with a discussion of the findings in light of pertinent literature.

Table 14

**Administrators Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonyms</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Beginning of employment at AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rokaia (رقية)</td>
<td>Director of the Center for Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona (منى)</td>
<td>Director of the CBL program</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Senior Co-ordinator of the CBL program</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Associate Provost and Director of the Core Curriculum</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Descriptions**

*Rokaia (رقية).*

Rokaia (رقية), a woman with a Ph.D. degree, was the Associate Dean of the learning technologies and the Director of the Center for Learning and Teaching (CLT) at AUC. The main responsibility of this Center was to stimulate the learning environment of AUC in three major ways: pedagogy, technology, and assessment. First, the Center aimed to address faculty development by training them on how to introduce innovation and different pedagogical approaches in different disciplines. So, it offered assistance
with course design, instructional design, and instructional material. Second, it aimed to integrate technology to facilitate learning and affect its outcomes. In this regard, the Center developed a program that trains graduate students on recent technologies who would then work one-on-one with faculty to help them integrate technology into their classes. According to Rokaia, this program was very useful in that it honored faculty time and accommodated their different learning paces. The third component of the Center’s mission was to help faculty in assessing their own teaching in a confidential manner and offer them consultation. In this regard, Rokaia noted that the Center focused on informative rather than evaluative assessment. Also, the Center offered many workshops and issued a newsletter every other week.

CLT collaborated with the CBL program to support its goals, especially the pedagogical ones. For example, CLT might develop measurements to assess students’ satisfaction with the program and help faculty members learn how to conduct reflection sessions. Also, CLT collaborates with CBL on organizational and administration levels. For example, CLT staff might upload materials on the website of the program. CLT and CBL might organize joint activities, such as symposia and workshops. Rokaia had attended many of these joint workshops where she learned about some of the accomplishments of the CBL program that she greatly admired. It is worth noting that CLT’s collaborations with the CBL program pertained only to the pedagogical and administrative components of the program at AUC in the sense that CLT had no connections with the NGOs with which the CBL program partnered.
Mona (منى).

Mona, a middle-aged woman, was the founding director of the CBL program until May 2011. She started working at AUC in 1993 as a part-time instructor and in 1995, became a full-time instructor. At the time of this dissertation, she served as both a senior instructor at the Department of Rhetoric and Composition and the director of the CBL program at AUC. In her role as the CBL program director, Mona’s responsibilities included developing and managing the program at all operational levels. For example, she worked with faculty members to raise awareness of the methodology, provide training and resources, and support them with course design and community partner contact. With regard to her responsibilities for students, Mona visited classes to give orientations about the program, describe student expectations, provide examples of project ideas, and conduct reflection sessions. On the administration level, Mona’s responsibility was to ensure that the CBL strategic plans were aligned with the wider University strategic plans and that there were clear outcomes for assessment purposes. In so doing, she collaborated with CLT to design and administer assessment tools to measure student satisfaction with the program. Also, Mona delivered annual reports to both the Directors of CLT and the Gerhart Center about the CBL program in which she provided overviews of the outcomes for the year, how they had been articulated, administered, and accomplished. Overall, Mona’s responsibility was to promote the CBL program mainly on the AUC campus and to document student and faculty CBL experiences. In addition to her responsibilities for the CBL program on campus, Mona worked with community partners. For instance, she surveyed their needs, made these
needs known to the campus community, connected them to campus events, profiled their NGOs in campus publications, and provided them with training in Arabic.

**Amelia.**

Amelia, a middle-aged woman, was the Senior Co-ordinator for the CBL program at AUC since October 2010. She had also filled in for the Director of the program who was on leave in the spring semester of 2011. Her job responsibilities included providing support to faculty and students, as well as providing managerial and administrative support for the program. She described her professional role as “the first stop” for campus community to learn about service-learning. For example, she visited classes to give short presentations about the CBL program. Amelia believed in service-learning as an inductive and experiential learning pedagogy. She felt that her educational background in anthropology would be an asset to the future development of program.

**James.**

James held a Ph.D. degree and was the Associate Provost of AUC for almost 20 years. The responsibilities of James’ position varied depending on the demands of the Provosts with whom he had worked. In addition to being the Associate Provost, James had been the Director for the Core Curriculum at AUC for the last six years. The Core Curriculum included a group of professional advisers who advised students regarding all the courses required for the completion of their degrees. According to James, the Core Curriculum at AUC was not an academic department in the sense that it did not have faculty members. Rather, it was an administrative and supervising body which aimed to accomplish various university objectives primarily related to the liberal arts and critical
thinking skills. For most students, Core Curriculum courses amounted to about one third of the minimum hours that were required for graduation.

With regard to the CBL program, James explained that the Core Curriculum could encourage departments to develop certain courses, but it was up to the departments to decide what to do in terms of course offerings. He elaborated that the Core Curriculum requirements were organized into levels in the sense that there were requirements students were supposed to meet in their freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior years. Senior students had to complete two requirements. Students were offered a number of options to meet these two requirements. One of these options was a three or four hundred-level course that had been certified as having a community-based learning content. Choosing this option was one way that students could take a course in the Core Curriculum with a community-based learning component. James, however, pointed out that students could meet these requirements by choosing other courses.

Themes

Partnership motivations.

The theme of achieving the civic mission of the University emerged as the major motivator for AUC to develop CBL partnerships. This theme describes participants’ thoughts about how the CBL program enables AUC to fulfill components of its mission. Table 15 provides a summary of administrators’ motivations for establishing CBL partnerships with community-based organizations.
Table 15

Administrators’ Motivations for Participation in CBL Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieving the civic mission of the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- fulfilling strategic goals for community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- furthering liberal arts ideals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- advancing student learning and personal growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fulfilling strategic goals for community service.*

All participants believed strongly that the CBL program aligns with AUC’s mission statement. For example, Amelia felt that the program was necessary for the University to achieve one of its strategic goals for community service:

AUC has a . . . set of goals and . . . goal number four states that AUC will strive to be a community-based university which means they [AUC constituents] will seek to engage their local community, the Cairo community and also the greater Arab region. And they [AUC constituents] essentially cannot do this goal without a service-learning component in the curriculum as well as the program, student development program. So, AUC as a university, its motivation to have CBL comes from one of the main university goals for community engagement. And it’s part of the University mission statement.

*Furthering liberal arts ideals.*

Rokaia noted that the fact that AUC was a liberal arts college provided another important reason for the University to develop a CBL program:

It is part of AUC mission. As a matter of fact . . . any university that disposes liberal education is now considering the moral and civic education is very much part of the students, it should be very much part of the student [experiences].

*Advancing student learning and personal growth.*

In addition to enabling AUC to fulfill its goals for community engagement, participants indicated that the CBL program enhances student learning and personal growth. For example, James described the value of the program as follows:
It’s [the CBL program] important for lots of things. It’s important for students in terms of their own learning, it’s important for their understanding of themselves relative to their communities, how do they fit into these communities, developing an ethos of service to the communities and [the] University does want to encourage this.

Mona believed that the University bears responsibility for advancing students’ civic values and that the CBL pedagogy promotes students’ civic and academic outcomes:

I think it is the responsibility of the University to teach civic values. But, even the academic outcomes associated with CBL, the academic gains they make are so significance. It’s worth employing the methodology.

University leadership emerged as a significant factor for institutionalizing the CBL program into AUC. Rokaia highlighted the role of the previous AUC President, John Gerhart, in connecting community service to the curriculum:

CBL courses actually started off after the Gerhart Center was established. Part of the dream of Dr. Gerhart was that the service-learning should become institutionalized at AUC and that was the main AUC motivation. He passed away, unfortunately, but this was also embedded in the mission of the Gerhart Center, and so it came as a natural thing.

The move to the new location emerged as another major factor for boosting the CBL program at AUC. Mona reported that the program had momentum after the University moved to the new campus in New Cairo, an area under construction:

AUC as an institution placed more of an emphasis on community-based learning when it moved out here into the desert in 2008. And the reason was that suddenly we [AUC community] felt isolated, and the University felt that it is very important to make sure that the students are not protected in a bubble, that they [students are] actually engaged and interact with different communities outside of the University walls so that they are made aware of the world outside of the University so that their learning acquires a significance for the society.

These findings confirm the theoretical perspectives that service-learning promotes the civic mission of institutions of higher education (Leiderman et al., 2003; Ward &
Wolf-Wendel, 2000). The findings also support the calls for incorporating moral and civic education into college students’ education (Colby et al., 2003). Additionally, they add more evidence to prior research demonstrating that involvement in service-learning positively affects academic and personal outcomes for students (Karin & Nurse, 2004; Lansverk, 2004; Mooney & Edwards, 2001). Unlike prior research (Scheibel et al., 2005), however, there was little evidence that AUC is motivated to develop CBL partnerships to attract students from minority groups. Given the high tuition of the University, one may reasonably assume that AUC mainly attracts students from high socioeconomic backgrounds.

**Partnership relationships.**

Similar to the theme that emerged from the community partner group, the theme of current transactional partnerships along with aspirations for engaging in transformative partnerships describes the perspectives of the administrators concerning the relationships characterizing the CBL program. Table 16 presents a summary of this theme.
Table 16

*Administrators’ Perceptions of CBL Relationships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional partnerships along with aspirations for engaging in transformative partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- current transactional partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- structure of CBL partnerships → class level vs. campus level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- well-defined university-community boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- minimum communication with community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- short-term relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Aspirations for transformative partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- nature of CBL activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- personalized relationships with community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- positive attitudes toward the program and community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- awareness of the importance of establishing reciprocity with community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e- vision for the ultimate purpose of CBL partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Current transactional partnerships.*

The first aspect of the theme, current transactional partnerships, was demonstrated when participants described the structure of CBL partnerships, the boundaries between AUC and community-based organizations, the frequency of their communications with community partners, and the difficulty of sustaining CBL partnerships.

*Structure of CBL partnerships.*

The current structure of CBL partnerships provides clear evidence of the transactional relationships characterizing CBL partnerships. Mona described this structure as follows: “The partnership is at the class level. It’s not at the institutional level. It is not at the broad campus level.”
Clear-defined university-community boundaries.

In describing one of the visits community partners paid to Tahrir campus, Amelia provided a vivid picture of the well-defined boundaries between AUC and community-based organizations:

They didn’t use our facility for their own purposes. . . They came to have a meeting about a CBL project. So, we use our facilities for our own projects with them. It wasn’t like just their own meeting.

This quote clearly indicates that there exist clear boundaries between AUC and community-based organizations and that the University would be less inclined to allow them to have meetings on campus unless those meetings were pertinent to the CBL program.

Minimum communication with community partners.

The paucity of communication between CBL staff and community partners presents additional evidence of transactional partnerships. For example, Mona explained that the lack of constant communication with community partners made it difficult to sustain CBL relationships, “It [the partnership] has been hard to sustain because it had been hard to communicate on an ongoing basis.” Consequently, most CBL partnerships were short-term. In the following quote, Mona indicated that initiating CBL partnerships was often an easy process. However, maintaining them over time was difficult:

I don’t think that there are challenges in developing partnerships. . . When you approach a community-based organization . . . and explains to them [community professionals] what this [the CBL program] means, invariably, they want to work with you. The problem comes in sustaining these partnerships because to sustain them means you need to continue communicating and continue to offer work with them one semester after the other. And a lot of the time the students or the faculty members keep targeting the same organizations and the others on our list of partners hardly ever get approached. So, maybe we work with them one semester
and then for two years we have nothing to do with them. How do you sustain a partnership? That has been difficult for us.

Similarly, Amelia’s words show how the CBL staff struggled to follow-up and maintain relationships with community partners:

I feel like communication is good, but it’s the follow-up. . . . On our part as a program, we don’t have the staff to do the follow-up, to maintain the relationship. Really, that is what it is: follow-up and maintenance of the relationship, just calling them [community partners], checking on them, inviting them to events, having once a year or annual or biannual partnerships events.

Participants’ comments imply that university-community CBL partnerships at AUC were short-term, intended to accomplish specific projects, and operate within existing systems. As such, these partnerships are transactional according to Enos and Morton’s (2003) framework. However, a critical examination of the data revealed that there is a possibility for AUC-community partnerships to elevate to the transformative level. This assumption was drawn based on participants’ descriptions of partnership activities, types of communications and relationships with community partners, and their attitudes toward the program and vision of CBL partnerships.

**Aspirations for transformative partnerships.**

*Nature of CBL activities.*

The description Mona provided for one of the partnership activities illustrates that CBL courses were carefully planned so that students’ service activities were connected to the course content and objectives. This description also indicates that students conducted a needs assessment before planning an intervention in the community. This reveals that the CBL activity addressed a real community issue. Additionally, it seemed that community members worked alongside of students to address this issue:
Students [were] doing a very broad needs assessment on behalf of the community-based organization that they surveyed the residents in this area and did a needs and an asset assessment. And it was very beneficial to the community, but it was the community that offered not exactly the design of the tool, but the methodology of how to do it with the residents. So, again, the students functioned as manpower for the community. They brought in their own tool because they were taking a psychology course on how to design tools for assessment.

Designing CBL activities in such ways are consistent with the ideals of designing sound CBL partnerships (Holland, 1999; Walshok, 1999).

*Personalized relationships.*

As indicated above, communications between CBL staff and community partners were seldom. However, partners were connected to each other through informal and personal relationships. Amelia noted that communications among CBL partners took several formats, such as e-mail messages, phone calls, and face-to-face meetings. She also expressed her satisfaction with her relationships with community partners:

I feel like our partners are very receptive via phone and e-mail and also in person. . . . Surprisingly, we all have each other’s mobile numbers. So, we’re calling on the weekend or after hour. So, this flow of a relationship. . . . As a new person coming on, I feel very well connected with our partners. . . . based on this concept that everybody is readily available to speak to each other.

*Positive attitudes.*

Participants’ responses reflected a general positive attitude toward the program. For example, Mona reported that whenever partners came across obstacles, they perceived them as learning opportunities and adjusted their original plans to handle them:

Faculty always had a good response . . . Whatever challenges would come about our learning experiences. So, even when some time in the middle of a semester or in the middle of a project, you find that you need to decrease the scope of what you are doing or prolong the time that you expected or whatever. And these are perceived as challenges, even then the faculty with the students and the partners see them as opportunities to learn about how things happen on the ground.
Similarly, Amelia provided a great example showing how agency professionals’ positive attitudes toward the program led them to guide a new staff, faculty, and class:

The substitute instructor for the Rhetoric and Composition course this term . . . is new and I’m also new. So, it’s a new faculty member, it’s a new staff member, and students are obviously new. But, our partners are the ones that . . . stay. Even though they are dealing with new faculty, new students, and also new staff, they’re showing us what to do. So, to me, that’s positive. They’re willing to work with us. They’re willing to have patience with us as a new program, as new people . . . coming through. It’s an established relationship. It’s an established project and they’re really excited to continue working. So, as a staff member, I have been very encouraged by . . . the support of our partnerships.

_Awareness of reciprocity._

Respondents’ comments reflected a general awareness of the importance of establishing reciprocal relationships between university and community partners. Here is an example from Mona:

*It [reciprocity] is a very clear, key element of CBL that I bring to the faculty’s attention right at the beginning when they’re constructing the course syllabus, and also to the community partners’ attention. You cannot go to the CBL partner with a ready tailored project and say, “We are here to do this.” I make it very clear from the beginning that we cannot do that. We have to have this conversation [in] the beginning so that they are part of the decision taking. If they are not part of the decision taking, they are not going make use of the service and they are not going to provide adequate learning support.*

There was, however, little evidence showing whether or not reciprocity was honored in practice.
Vision for partnership outcomes.

Precipitants’ visions of what the ultimate goal of CBL partnerships should look like provide a strong evidence for their aspirations for transformative relationships. In discussing the goals of CBL partnerships, Rokaia mentioned, “I am after the molding of the human being.” Mona described an effective CBL program as, “One that has an impact on the community. . . [an] impact on student learning, and [lead to] faculty satisfaction.” Mona’s description demonstrated a lingering desire for a program that affects all partners.

These comments indicate that CBL activities were planned thoughtfully in accordance with good standards of effective partnerships. They also demonstrate that partners were connected to each other through friendly relationships and maintained positive spirits in spite of the challenges they had experienced. Most significantly, partners’ visions for the end result of these collaborations provide a strong indicator that they may move toward transformative partnerships.

Partnership challenges.

The challenges facing CBL partnerships were the primary theme throughout the interviews. Participants identified difficulties related to the institution, political situation in the region, students, and differences between the functioning systems of the academy and the community. The sections that follow shed light on each of these challenges. Table 17 provides an overview of these challenges.
Table 17

*Administrators’ Perspectives of the Challenges to CBL Partnerships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1- Institutional-related issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a- lack of institutional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- competing interests in the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- traditional criteria for universities’ ranking systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Political ramifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Student-related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Differing functioning systems between the university and the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional-related issues.**

_Lack of institutional support._

The lack of institutional support emerged as the major obstacle in advancing the CBL program. It was widely acknowledged that the institutional support to the program was quite inadequate. The following comments reflected Amelia’s frustration with the University’s lack of attention to the program:

It [the CBL program] has cost AUC zero dollars. This program exists on outside gifts. . . So, administratively and financially, it is not supported. But, it’s supported academically by volunteer, practically volunteer efforts of CBL faculty and that is the cost to CBL faculty is their time because they do volunteer a lot of hours. So, it is supported academically. It is just institutional, it is not supported. So, you can imagine what that does to a program if a program does not have institutional, administrative, and financial support, it kind of limps along, it’s handicapped in a major way. It’s handicapped by recruiting instructors, recruiting students, recruiting partners. It affects that all parties involved. So, we perceive that the administrative support is kind of the lynchpin…. it’s the cornstone of building the program in a very productive healthy way. We cannot progress; we cannot grow too much without this support.

Similarly, Rokaia identified the lack of institutional support as a key challenge to the program; she highlighted how there was no support system for the faculty and students engaged:
I think [a] community-based learning course requires more time from the part of the student and from the part of the faculty. There is nothing institutionalized, things like concentrations. For example, courses are not given more credits, faculty are not given more time, reward, no recognition whatever form it is. So, that itself makes it difficult to introduce in many courses. . . . So, that is one of the challenges.

**Scarce financial resources.**

The lack of institutional support had several negative impacts on the program. For example, Mona referred to the scarcity of financial resources, explaining that she had been “working with very meager resources [and that] it is exhausting.” Likewise, Amelia shed light on the financial issue as a major barrier to supporting the program:

> There is no money to cover transportation cost. There is no money to cover our supplies cost. There is no money to cover faculty extra time. There is no money for all these teaching enhancement projects. There is no money. There is no money for staff salaries.

**Meager academic resources.**

In addition to the limited financial resources, the lack of institutional support resulted in limited academic resources available for the program. Amelia expressed a concern about this issue:

> I am having a serious problem with resources for service-learning in our library. We have zero resources. I mean we’re slowly building the culture of service-learning at AUC and building resources is important because when we send our research students to say . . . “read this article, read this book” and it is not even located on this campus, that’s frustration for them.

**Competing interests of the University.**

The competing interests inherent in nature of universities including AUC is another important barrier to allocating adequate support for the CBL program. James elaborated on this issue, stating:
It’s frustrating to me that they [CBL staff] are frustrated that they haven’t had more success. But, I also think that one of the reasons they haven’t had more success is inherent in the nature of universities which is that this is a priority, but it’s only one priority among many. And the University would like to achieve all of its aims. But, there are some things that are going to be more significant than others. . . This is the way universities are and they have to parcel out their priorities.

Mona acknowledged this obstacle noting that “they [senior administrators] see it [the CBL program] as important, definitely, and they talk about it a lot. But, it is one important thing out of many important things.”

These findings provide a plausible justification for the current transactional relationships characterizing AUC-community partnerships. That is, prior research suggested that institutional factors influence university-community partnerships (Dorado & Giles, 2004; Sandy & Holland, 2006). For example, Sandy and Holland found that partners who faced logistic issues in their partnership experiences preferred transactional exchanges to ensure that their organizations received tangible benefits. On the other hand, partners who experienced less difficulty with logistics leaned more toward transformational relationships.

*Traditional criteria of universities’ ranking systems.*

The traditional criterion of ranking systems of institutions of higher education worldwide emerged as a key explanatory factor as to why AUC was reluctant to provide adequate support to the CBL program. James bluntly unveiled this issue; he pointed out that the University had been struggling to earn both national and international recognition:

AUC spent many years as a small not very well-known school in Egypt. It was important in Egypt because of its teaching, but it did not have much of
international reputation. Even today, our international reputation is fairly limited. And the reason for that the international reputation of universities is built on research.

James acknowledged research as the golden standard of university ranking systems, “The ranking systems . . . around the world that rank universities in terms of quality, none of them include teaching. It’s all about research.” In the case of AUC, he explained that “AUC doesn’t show up on any of the rankings and this concerns a lot of people here [at AUC.]” James pointed out that, at the present time, the University aspires to enhance its visibility internationally:

The University is trying very hard to upgrade its status as a leading university in the region which means more and more emphasis being put on the research that faculty do. Now, it is true that that competes with faculty time for doing things like developing community-based learning classes, and other things. It is just the reality.

James noted that AUC was a great university in terms of the quality of its teaching, but expressed concerns about the consequences of not qualifying for those systems in terms of the University’s ability to attract funds and recruit students from regions outside of Egypt:

The bad part about that if you are not ranked in those systems, you are not a well-known school, then your ability to go and get more money is very limited. You have to build your reputation and you build your reputation internationally by research. We could be the greatest teaching institution in the world. I think we are actually quite a good one by the standards of most universities. It doesn’t matter at all except to the parents and the students here in Egypt. But, if you’re trying to attract students from the Gulf or elsewhere, why would they go to AUC? Because it has a great reputation. But, what if it doesn’t have a great reputation? How are you going to have a great reputation? By doing research. So, there is going to be a huge priority given to that.

James’ comments call attention to practical challenges facing not only AUC, but also other universities that are interested in promoting engaged scholarship and aspire to
be recognized as prestigious institutions. The issue of ranking systems, indeed, brings into question the expectations and realities of university engagement in service-learning. It also speaks to the need for a critical examination of the influence of the traditional criterion of ranking systems on universities’ decisions to promote the engaged scholarship. Recently, the Carnegie Commission on Higher created a new elective classification for Community Engagement (Carnegie Foundation, n.d.). Such a classification is a good first step, but it is not sufficient. If higher education were to take the public scholarship seriously, the criteria of ranking systems of its institutions must reflect that commitment.

**Political ramifications.**

**Security issues.**

Issues related to security and safety emerged as another major challenge to CBL partnerships. AUC is a unique institution in several ways, among which it is an American institution in an Arab nation. It seems that such a unique position led the University officials to impose higher standards of safety and precautions than those typically employed at other institutions of higher education. In describing security procedures at AUC, Amelia said: “We still have a very high wall with four gates that are secure access.” She expressed several concerns about these strict procedures. For example, she felt that such measures disconnect AUC from the outside community: “I feel that this is a major part of our isolation.” She also thought that secure access to the premises of AUC discourages community partners from visiting the campus:

Our security gates really prevent us from inviting and having easy access relationship with our partners. It’s always ideal to get our partners to come to
campus. So, they don’t come easily. Even the downtown campus. . . You think that in an urban campus. . . people can just walk from building to building and just use the services, and just sit on the park bench outside on the campus. . . But, this is not the case with AUC’s both campuses. To even use the premises, you have to get passed the security. So, it is not open to community partners.

Amelia added that such security procedures present an added challenge that impedes the University’s efforts to connect with its community and advance its civic agenda:

I think when you have a compound mentality which is the case here, it really prevents permeability. It prevents us from actually connecting with the community. So, when we go out to connect with the community, we have civic engagement, or when we want to teach students in our classrooms how to be civically minded. It’s an extra effort to get passed the compound of our campus.

While Amelia appreciated the University’s efforts to provide safety for its students, faculty, and staff, she felt that these efforts were exaggerated and cost the University unnecessary expenses:

We know that the intentions are good to have safety, but it’s overdone. . . . I don’t think that it makes a lot of sense here. I don’t think it should be here. I think it’s a lot of waste of money. I think that it sends the wrong message.

**Political uncertainty in the region.**

Related to the issues of security, participants raised concerns about the political situation in the region. Such political uncertainties present a dilemma for the program administration wanting to encourage students to engage in their communities, but concerned about their safety. Mona reflected on these issues:

There are other costs that have to do with a broader regional situation; there is [are] safety issues and these are real and we constantly have to balance between wanting to send the students out to get this experience, and at the same time wanting to provide a safe, not wanting to go through this headache of how do you provide safety? Do you limit the activities or what do you do?
These findings clearly illustrate that university-community partnerships are context-laden. As such, the political, economic, and social contexts of these partnerships must be taken into consideration when planning university-community collaborations.

**Student-related issues.**

**Student resistance.**

Student resistance emerged as a unique challenge to CBL partnerships at AUC; courses with a CBL component were not given any special designation in the course offerings, and thus most students did not recognize that they were enrolled in CBL courses until after classes started. Mona described the experiences of some students as follows: “People [students] feeling why I am doing this? Other sections are not! People feeling kind of out of place and unsure when we go to poorer communities.” Mona provided illustrative examples of student resistance. Here is one:

One of the projects . . . was that the students had to collect stories of refugees, their oral narratives and then we publish it in a book. Because it was a class on Writing for Publications and the service would be to raise awareness about the refugees’ plight in Egypt and when the book was sold, the royalties would go to an organization that supports refugee issues. So, one of the students did not want to do this at all. She did not want to listen to stories of trauma and she would cry and cry and cry because she did not want to be part of this. At the beginning, I felt how am I going to equate her grade with the other students? They are spending such a long time in the semester doing this and they are going to be graded for it. What am I going to give her? And I ended up coming with an alternative assignment for her. She had to collect oral narratives of some other population, but it wouldn’t be part of the book.

Student resistance led Mona to experience negative feelings. As time goes, however, she found out that students change their attitudes and behavior at the end of their CBL experiences. She described these changes as follows:
Student resistance at the beginning . . . I used to be frustrated. I used to panic. And then I learned that actually it takes time. Students eventually come around even the most resistant students when the project is taking shape near the end and you see the meaningfulness of what you’ve done and how it’s giving substance to your learning, they end up feeling very excited about their work and very proud of what they’ve done.

Not only did students change their attitudes and behavior, but they also became more engaged in civic activities beyond their structured experience at college. In the following quote, Mona described how the student who was very resistant to participate in class activities became actively engaged in experiences similar to that of the CBL course activities:

But, it was the same student who came to me a semester after this particular project and she said to me, “I graduated. I am living in Sinai (سِنَابِيَة) [a governorate in eastern Egypt]. I am living amongst Bedouins and I am collecting their oral narratives and I am publishing a book on my own to raise awareness of the Bedouins and their difficulties and give them voice.” So, here is a challenge turned into an opportunity.

These findings suggest that students who participate in service-learning during their college years are likely to continue to be engaged in civic activities after graduation. While numerous studies have investigated the impact of service-learning on many academic and personal outcomes for students (Ender et al., 2000; Karin & Nurse, 2004; Lansverk, 2004; Mooney & Edwards, 2001), dearth research exists to illuminate our understanding of how participation in service learning may affect students after graduation. These findings, then, call attention to the importance of undertaking longitudinal studies to trace the impact of those experiences on students later in their life after graduation.


**Student immaturity**

In addition to resistance, the attitudes of some students constituted a mild challenge to CBL partnerships, especially to community partners. In this respect, Amelia felt that “[if] AUC sends students out who are not willing to participate or don’t know, . . . they [community partners] end up having to baby-sit or it produces more wok for the partner . . . They [community partners] feel that AUC students are too much trouble.” In the same vein, Mona reported that “some organizations really appreciate [that] students have a lot of substance to offer and some organizations did not have quite have a good experience. They thought students were too childish.”

These comments indicate that while some community organizations appreciated student work, others felt that students were an added burden on them. These findings are consistent with prior research. For example, Tryon et al. (2008) cited community partners’ concerns about the obligatory nature of short-term service-learning courses, and thus partners had to handle the resentment of some students. Yet, in the Ferrari and Worrall’s (2000) study, community partners reported that students were reliable and offered valuable contributions to their agencies. These mixed findings invite more studies to better illuminate this area.

**Differing university and community functioning systems.**

The different functioning systems of universities and community-based organizations are another key challenge facing CBL partnerships. Mona described this difference as follows: “The University timeframe is different from the community timeframe. So, we finish the semester and the service is over and the students move on,
but the community is still there.” Such a difference, Mona pointed out, negatively impacts university-community relationships and had translated into several costs to community agencies. She described these adverse impacts as follows:

And we always felt that we kind of cut relations. The one class cut relations with the community and then another class would come and then another class would come and another. It’s a bit destructive in every time a new class came, the community would have to, once again, give them an orientation of the place, their condition, whatever. So, there is a lot of repetition on the side of the community because the students are changing so consistently and that is a challenge.

The difference between the academic calendar and the ongoing nature of community work has been repeatedly identified in the literature as one of the key challenges facing service-learning partnerships (Ferrari & Worrall, 2000; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Tryon et al., 2008). These findings confirm this challenge. However, they increase the depth and breadth of our understanding of what the impact of this difference may look like specifically on the community-based organizations.

**Partnership improvements.**

The theme of a critical need for institutionalizing the CBL program into the University emerged as the most significant suggestion for improving CBL partnerships. Participants made specific references to several organizational factors that they believed would institutionalize the program. The sections that follow describe each of these factors. Table 18 provides a summary of these suggestions.
**Administrators’ Suggestions for Improving CBL Partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical need for institutionalizing the CBL program into the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Building an infrastructure for the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Allocating an institutional budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Cultivating a culture supportive of community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Restructuring faculty tenure and promotion policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Ensuring institutional leadership support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Activating the role of academic departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Widening and diversifying the circle of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Ensuring community voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Conducting program assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building an infrastructure for the program.**

At the time of this dissertation, there was no infrastructure for the CBL program. It was hosted at the Gerhart Center. Rokaia described the structure of the program noting, “The program itself still [has] not found a home. The director [is] still pretty much a faculty member in another department. . . . Her position is a part-time position. . . . It does not have its own budget. . . . So, there is nothing being institutionalized.” The program was run by a director and three staff members, all of whom were on a part-time basis. Additionally, the program employs work study students. When asked about the number of staff members, Mona answered:

It has not been consistent. But, now, you are getting us at a good time. And there are three part-time staff, two Egyptians and one American. We also employ students from the work study program. So, they come and offer something like eighty hours a semester and they’re paid by the University.
Building an infrastructure for the program would promote CBL partnerships in several ways. For example, it can help articulate clear goals for the program that align with the broader goals of the University. Mona referred to this issue noting that there hasn’t been yet a body, a unit on campus that co-ordinates all of the different civic efforts on campus in a way that creates clear goals, clear outcomes, and therefore clearly measurable outputs.

Building a centralized unit on campus for CBL can also provide a support system for all partners. For example, it could assist faculty members, especially those in hard sciences, in incorporating CBL components into their courses. In this regard Rokaia noted,

Sometimes, many disciplines don’t know how to fit CBL in their courses. It seems to fit very well with courses in the social sciences; it is natural whether it is Sociology or even Psychology. It fits nicely as outcomes of the course. But, typically in things like Engineers or Computer Sciences and so on, they find difficulty and that is where Mona’s [the real name of the CBL program director was replaced by pseudonym] role comes in, how to help them fit or to help them develop an idea that they make sense into a full grown project that has a civic component.

Additionally, the supporting staff of the program could take care of many administrative matters associated with CBL courses, thus allowing faculty members more time to focus on the pedagogical aspects of these courses. In this regard, Amelia said:

We have faculty that are doing a lot of work that support staff should be doing or could be doing that frees the faculty to do the teaching component instead of the administration. So, if we have institutional support that provides co-ordination of the program, then more people are being hired and more people are being involved in supporting the program, then I think the benefits would be greater for the faculty.

This office can also assist faculty members to apply for grants “that support [their] work in the community-based learning,” Mona said.
In addition to assisting faculty members, this unit can plan and deliver orientations to partners involved. In this regard, Rokaia spoke of the importance of “preparing the two communities that are coming together. . . to be able to talk to one another, to be able to build trust issues and to be able to identify with the others in a sense when we do come from different perspectives.” Such an office can also provide a safe space for partners to reflect on their CBL experiences. In regards to the value of reflection to students, Rokaia said, “I think the action of reflection is so important. If they [students] get out of that alone, I think they gained something.” Likewise, Amelia noted that reflection sessions allow faculty opportunities “to talk amongst themselves: What are your frustration[s]? Were the work load too much?” [In] these [sessions,] . . . we hear from faculty bout complaints.” Moreover, such a centralized office can plan and implement events to celebrate CBL partnerships. When asked whether or not the program celebrated the partnerships, Amelia answered, “Like appreciation days or special training days where our partners feel they’re being invested in and appreciated for their efforts? We don’t have that.”

Furthermore, establishing a centralized CBL office can increase the visibility of the program on campus and in communities. Amelia explained that the program has “a website which is good and that’s a great marketing tool.” Yet, she noted that “we [the program administration] could do a lot more on campus and in the community, more [in terms of] marketing.” Participants noted that CBL partnerships require handling logistics. As such, building a CBL office can address such issues. Rokaia provided examples:
Students that go out in the community, they are the responsibility of the University, especially nowadays, you have to have someone on the bus with them. You have to have permits. You have to have buses that take them out. All of these are plans and things that are part of the responsibilities of the leader of the program director in addition to the time, how to schedule it. So, it is a complex addition that needs planning in terms of the timing of the course, the time that students plan, the recognition that is given to both the students themselves and the faculty. And all of this still has not matured yet.

Significantly, participants also spoke of the importance of recruiting staff members who are bilingual. For example, Amelia noted:

CBL as a program needs bilingual staff so that we can continue our good communication with our partners. That’s not to say that our partners are not also bilingual because the majority of them are. But, we want the partners to feel comfortable to always speak in their first language because it’s their country. So, we don’t expect to go to their place of work and make them speak a foreign language they might not be comfortable with in conducting business. So why to do that? Just because we’re an English speaking university! So, for me, that’s a very important component to make everything runs smoothly: the language.

Given the unique situation of AUC as an English speaking university in an Arab speaking country, it becomes critical to hire bilingual staff who can speak both languages fluently so that they can communicate effectively with constituents who speak only Arabic or English.

Participants’ comments demonstrate their strong advocacy of developing a centralized unit on campus as a means for institutionalizing the CBL program. These findings confirm many theoretical perspectives highlighting the critical importance of building infrastructure for engagement efforts (e.g., Bringle & Hatcher, 2000a; Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Scheibel et al., 2005). With the exception of bilingualism, there was no mention of other competences required for CBL staff members, such as having a publication record, to which Zlotkowski (1999) referred.
Allocating an institutional budget for the program.

The CBL program did not have an internal institutional budget. Rather, the “program exists on outside financial gifts that are given to Gerhart as a research center,” said Amelia. As a result of this funding structure, the program could neither retain its staff nor hire new staff necessary for running the program. Mona complained:

It [the CBL program] has been unsustainable and unpredictable. And that is why, we have not been able to employ full-time staff and we have not been able to retain the staff we employ on a part-time basis. . . . And in the short period of two years and half that the program has been running, we’ve had four with periods of nobody in between. So, some people come, they are here for three months maximum and you cannot retain them and it’s because of the lack of sustainable funding, and therefore absence of job security.

The lack of financial resources and supporting staff impeded the program’s capacity to effectively connect with agencies and to offer professional development opportunities for faculty and community partners. Amelia believed:

We, as a program, need to stay true to service-learning pedagogy in the sense that we train our partners and train our faculty. We need to . . . have events where faculty and our partners can gather together and talk amongst themselves. We can train them simultaneously where they can meet prior to the project start up. . . . That will take money, of course, and staff. We need money and staff for sure because all of these things depend on money and staff.

Participants’ comments clearly indicate that designating an internal institutional budget for the CBL program is critical to sustaining the program and allowing it to achieve its strategic goals. Unfortunately, however, it is less likely that the University would allocate such a budget in the near future. This conclusion is based on several comments made by senior administrators at AUC. Here is an example from James:

If the issue we want to have all the money there so that we can tell faculty: See you can work towards this, I don’t know how to deal with that. I don’t think that
this is going to happen at AUC, at least not in the near future, because I don’t think that we are financially capable of doing this right now.

These findings largely support the arguments that institutional internal funding is one of the organizational factors that indicate engagement (Holland, 2005; Ward, 1996). While limited resources are a realistic challenge facing most institutions of higher education, this is not a compelling justification for not allocating an internal fund to the CBL program. Rather, AUC is encouraged to follow Vogelgesang’s (2004) advice to intentionally search for alternative, diversified, and sustainable sources of funding for promoting community engagement on campus.

Cultivating an institutional culture supportive of community engagement.

Senior administrators’ comments revealed that AUC officials perceive research and teaching to be the main mission of the University. Here is an example from James, “Ultimately universities are, to great extent, about research and about teaching, that’s what everybody says, primarily.” Accordingly he felt that “for this University to make the priority community-based learning, would make it . . . unique in the world because this is not what universities are primarily about.” James stressed that “developing a proper community-based learning program is important, but it’s not academic research.” As such, he believed that “community-based learning could count in both teaching and in service to the University.” James directly stated that AUC does not provide institutional incentives for faculty to be engaged in such a type of work, “We do not have a university wide impetus for all faculty, all of them to seriously engage in developing community-based learning.” He felt that providing institutional support to the CBL faculty would limit their engagement in “high level research.” He put it this way,
But, then if we did that, it would be very difficult for the University to expect of all faculty to engage in a high level of academic research because it’s so time consuming and so it’s left up to individual faculty to decide what they want to do.

These comments openly indicate that AUC culture is not supportive enough to CBL activities. The University does not acknowledge CBL as a form of research. Given the demands on faculty time and the standards they have to meet for tenure and promotion purposes, it can be very difficult for them to engage in community-based research. These comments then prompt a suggestion for changes of the prevalent culture at AUC. Examples of these changes may include following Kecskes and his colleagues’ (2006) advice to shift faculty culture from private to public and from an individual to a collective focus on the common good.

**Restructuring faculty tenure and promotion policies.**

AUC adopts the three traditional criteria for evaluating faculty: research, teaching, and service. Similar to many research institutions, AUC places more emphasis on research in the tenure and promotion guidelines. James stressed this point noting:

> The system here [at AUC] and this is true in virtually any university, formal academic research is more important for promotion and tenure than developing courses that would have community-based learning aspects.

Likewise, Rokaia recalled the experience of a faculty member in the hard sciences to support her argument that CBL courses do not count toward faculty tenure and promotion:

> Whatever she [faculty member in Construction Engineering department] did in that [CBL] course, she could have even published it. She could have gone to a conference. [But she told me] by the end of the day, it does not count as being an engineer, the CBL part of it, nobody cares. As far as a department goes, as far as a promotion goes, as far as tenure goes, that is gravy, but it is not essential.
When asked about the reasons why the number of faculty members engaging in CBL courses was relatively small at AUC, James explained:

For faculty at the University, they have a whole range of responsibilities that they have to meet and they cannot meet all of them, they simply cannot. So, they pick and choose among these. . . . Unless the institution decided that this was more important than let’s say academic research, the priorities of most faculty are going to give is to academic research.

These comments clearly indicate that the tenure and promotion guidelines influence faculty decisions on whether or not to incorporate CBL components into their courses. The literature widely acknowledges that traditional guidelines for faculty tenure and promotion discourage faculty from undertaking CBL courses (e.g., Diamond, 1999; Ward, 2005). As such, reviewing these guidelines in ways that acknowledge faculty involvement in communities could be a strong practical step toward institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. It is noteworthy, a few U.S. universities, such as Portland State University, revised its tenure guidelines to account for the public scholarship. Other institutions, such as Michigan State University and Pennsylvania State University, included public scholarship in their annual review process (Nicotera, Cutforth, Fretz, & Thompson, 2011).

**Ensuring institutional leadership support.**

Participants’ comments conveyed a belief that institutional leadership plays a significant role in promoting or confining CBL partnerships. For example, participants felt that the University leadership can advance the CBL program by placing emphasis on it. James highlighted this point, “When the term support comes up, if support means making it a priority, it’s a decision that has to be taken not just by the Provost, but by the
Participants also believed that CBL partnerships flourish under certain leadership more than they do under others. For example, Amelia identified change in the University leadership as a reason behind the limited financial resources available to the program:

I think that there is a combination of issues around the reasons why there’s not financial support and that is there has been a change in leadership. So, the leadership prior thought that it was important and it should go forward. In the new leadership, there has been some reluctance. So, there’s been a stale, period of stalling, change of leadership is one.

Participants’ comments revealed that institutional leadership can delay the progress of the CBL program. Amelia provided a great example:

Most service-learning programs worldwide are part of the campus compact. We have been waiting for the President to sign the paperwork. I think it’s like $900 for a one-year membership. The Gerhart Center is willing to pay that fee, but the institution is not willing to sign the membership approval form or to approve the payment of it.

When asked about the reason of such a leadership attitude, she responded:

I don’t know why actually. I don’t know why if it’s because their offices struggle with their support staff or because their schedules are busy or because they’re avoiding us. I don’t know why it is. . . . It’s an institutional problem with AUC that when we as a program send a request to high administration, the requests go unanswered and even there is follow-up, there is no, it’s like a black whole of communication. There is a breakdown of communication between AUC administration and [the] program administration. But, I have literally just last week, I received a signed paper, but it was three months in the making. And I am still waiting for a memberships of Campus Compact.

These comments suggest that institutional leaderships can and does really influence CBL partnerships. These findings are quite consistent with prior research that highlighted the role of institutional leadership as of paramount importance to engagement efforts on university campuses (Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Vogelgesang, 2004). These
findings also highlight the potential role of the University Senate in supporting the public scholarship. As such, they offer directions for future research to investigate the roles entities, such as the university board of trustees and senate can play in promoting engaged scholarship on campuses.

Activating the role of academic departments.

The role of faculty members and academic departments emerged as important factors to institutionalizing the CBL program at AUC. James highlighted the responsibility of faculty members for developing and teaching courses with CBL components, “That’s a decision [that] has to be taken by the faculty member who is going to develop and teach the class.” However, he expressed a concern about faculty members’ lack of training in developing courses with CBL components, “It’s possible to develop courses . . . But, not all faculty are trained in community-based learning. Most, in fact, have no idea how to do it.” This comment invites a reconsideration of the preparation of doctoral students for their future roles as faculty members.

Participants described the role of academic departments in boosting CBL courses in two major ways: encouraging faculty to develop CBL courses and including such work among the criteria against which they evaluate their faculty. James put it this way:

This is a departmental responsibility. So, it is not just a matter of encouraging the departments to encourage faculty to do this, you then have the departments to build this into the way they evaluate their faculty.

James felt that “this is best done by getting the schools to commit to it.” These comments clearly emphasize the role of academic departments in institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. This finding is consistent with theoretical
perspectives calling for connecting service-learning projects to the curriculum (Butin, 2006b; Holland, 2000; Zloktkowski, 2005). It also calls attention to an overlooked challenge facing the public scholarship: faculty lack of training in undertaking such type of research. Therefore, this finding invites dialogue and empirical studies investigating doctoral students’ academic training and preparation for faculty roles.

**Widening and diversifying the circle of partners.**

The director of the CBL program reported that CBL partnerships comprised from AUC and community-based organizations, “So far, it’s been the University and the community working together and that the third party, the government, has been either blind to what we’re doing or resistant to what we’re doing because they’re not part of it.” However, it was widely acknowledged that including various groups and entities is a key factor for furthering these partnerships and deepening their impacts. Specifically, participants spoke of their hopes to engage government bodies in these partnerships. Amelia strongly supported this suggestion, arguing that involving government is especially important given the political situation in Egypt after the January 25th Revolution of 2011:

> Because this [government] is a central component of civic engagement or civic education. There is a bridge of partnership or learning that takes place between government and civil society and also universities. . . . Universities should play a role in bridging those two governments and civic society. So, students are going to be participating in civic society. They also need as much interaction with government as possible. So, we definitely, want to involve them; it’s pivotal time now.

Similarly, Mona advocated for the involvement of government officials in CBL partnerships, noting that such an involvement would lead to many positive impacts, such
as facilitating the logistics of the program and enabling the University to play a bigger role in community development:

Hey this is Egypt; we need to partner with people like the Governor, the Minister of Social Solidarity. We need the government to be partners with us so that they facilitate the process. They don’t impose restrictions once you are halfway through the project. They don’t arrest the students once they’re in the community and say, “Hey, what are you doing here?” Once parts of the government that have to do with community development are partners with us, then we’re also representing their agenda or their agenda can be informed by the people. They can use the University as a resource to help develop the communities.

Participants also spoke about their goals to attract corporations into CBL partnership. For example, Amelia explained that privatization has grown fast in Egypt leading to the emergence of many corporations. She felt that some of these corporations exhibit social responsibility. Therefore, they could be suitable partners:

Corporations are also major part of civic society education, civic education as well. . . . Corporations in Egypt because there’s been an increase in privatization in the past decade. . . . CBL has on its horizon to incorporate more business school CBL courses that reach out to the corporations even the corporations that are near us geographically. We have some partners they’re very open to civic society like [X the name of the corporation was removed for confidentiality purposes] is a great example; they’re already way ahead of the game on civic issues. They would be a great partner.

In addition to engaging the government and corporations in CBL partnerships, participants expressed their desire to widen the circle of CBL partnerships to include other entities, such as universities, schools, and hospitals. For example, Amelia stated, “We’re also looking at hospitals, schools . . . , banks, not just NGOs.” Mona referred to the perceived benefits of partnering with other universities,

Imagine if all the universities acquire this knowledge and engage their students in such service, then how much service would you be able to give and how much learning would the students take back? It would be amazing!
Moreover, participants’ responses conveyed a desire to extend CBL partnerships beyond Cairo to include other areas in Egypt and in the entire region. Amelia believed that developing these partnerships constitutes an opportunity for growth for the program:

CBL is a very specific Cairo-based AUC-based program and it’s very small. But look, here is the potential of growth. . . We also need to look at partners and programs outside of Cairo that includes Alex (الاسكندرية), Suez (السويس), Upper Egypt (صعيد مصر), El-Mansoura (المنصورة) University, for instance. We’re talking about a huge amount of the Egyptian population that doesn’t know about service-learning projects or experiential learning.

These comments reflect participants’ aspirations for inviting diverse partners into CBL collaborations. As such, they support theoretical arguments emphasizing the importance of involving diverse voices in university-community partnerships (Boyer, 1996; Dewey, 1916; Walshok, 1999). But, again this finding underscores the political context as a major factor in promoting or paralyzing CBL collaborations.

Ensuring community voice.

Community voice and engagement emerged an important factor for sustaining CBL partnerships. One of the suggestions Mona offered for improving CBL partnerships was to “listen to the organizations and see the kinds of language they’re using and the kinds of engagement they require. And based on that develop the program. That hasn’t happened. I wish. That’s my dream.” Mona’s words reflect her genuine desire to give voice to community partners in planning and implementing CBL partnerships. However, this has not taken place in practice yet. As detailed in the second chapter, several scholars stressed the importance of informing such collaborations with community
perspectives to ensure democratic and reciprocal relationships between universities and communities (Holland, 1999; Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Walshok, 1999).

**Conducting program assessment.**

With the exception of assessing student satisfaction with CBL courses, there were no attempts to assess CBL partnerships. Mona stated, “We do it [program evaluation] with the help of the Center for Learning and Teaching. So far, it’s been only trying to evaluate student satisfaction.” Similarly, Amelia lamented the lack of program evaluation noting, “Assessment . . . like data gathering and analysis . . . we don’t have these things and we really need them.” When asked about the community perception and impact, Mona responded, “We haven’t assessed the community partner perspective at the end. . . . It is hard to talk in terms of impact. Nothing has been measured. It is not a measurable impact. It is not something that we have actively thought to measure yet.” She attributed the absence of assessing community partner perceptions and impacts to the scarce resources, the early stages of the program, and unsustainable relations with community agencies:

Limited resources inhibited assessing community impact . . . and it’s because the program is very young and the partners that we have are largely changeable. So, we have a number of partners, a whole long list of partners. Sometimes students in different classes will engage with a particular partner for a semester, and then for the following semester, no body is working with that same partner. So, it is not an ongoing partnerships, except with a very few partners, may be six partners with whom we have sustained relations for quite a while.

Mona expressed a wish to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the program that includes assessing all partners involved,
We’re hoping that one day, we will also be able to . . . survey the community partners and the faculty. And we would also like to assess the director of the program . . . and also the staff.

These comments suggest that that partnership assessment is an important step toward ensuring the effectiveness of the program. This finding confirms theoretical arguments highlighting the value of assessment as an integral element of service-learning partnerships (Scheibel et al., 2005). It also informs our understanding of the organizational factors that may hinder assessment of these collaborations.
Summary

In short, data analysis of the administrators revealed that AUC is motivated to develop CBL partnerships mainly to fulfill the civic mission of the University and to enhance student learning. Data demonstrated that AUC-community collaborations are characterized by transactional relationships along with aspirations for transformative partnerships. The lack of institutional support and prevalent culture in higher education emerged as key challenges to CBL partnerships. Institutionalizing the CBL program through addressing a number of organizational factors emerged as the pivotal suggestion for advancing CBL collaborations. The findings of this section largely echo prior research. However, these findings provide unique insights into the substantial role cultural contexts may play in shaping service-learning partnerships.
Faculty Members

This section presents the findings of the faculty member participants. As summarized in Table 19, five faculty members with different academic ranks and from various disciplines participated in the study. This section is organized into two parts. The first one provides narrative descriptions of the participants including brief demographic information and their involvement with CBL partnerships. The second part delineates the themes emerged from the analysis. This section provides the findings and highlights the connections between these findings and relevant literature.

Table 19

Faculty Participants Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonyms</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Beginning Date of Employment at AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmoud (محمود)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hend (هند)</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, and Egyptology</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huda (هدى)</td>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Narrative Descriptions

Jay.

Jay, a woman in her fifties, was an Associate Professor of Public Policy and the Chair of the Public Policy and Administration department at AUC. Her work focused on social corporate responsibility, international development, and utilizing private sector resources for development. Jay had extensive work experience in international settings. Through her CBL courses, she established partnerships with various types of organizations, such as NGOs, government agencies, and corporations. In the spring semester of 2011, she taught a course on local economic development in which students used New Cairo area as an example. In this course, her class partnered with the New Cairo Council, an advisory body, which worked with the local government. Students’ projects in this course included developing a website for New Cairo and making recommendations as to how to implement local development in this area. In previous CBL courses, Jay also partnered with the New Cairo Council where students examined the master plan for New Cairo and developed a presentation attended by the Minister of Housing and other government officials.

Mahmoud (محمود).

Mahmoud, a man in his forties, was a Visiting Assistant Professor of Physics at AUC. He had taught several CBL courses, such as Scientific Thinking: SCI-120; Astrophysics and Space Science: Physics 415; Mechanics and Heat and Thermodynamics: Physics 111; and Electricity and Magnetism: Physics 112. To Mahmoud, CBL courses were a means to advance science and knowledge literacy in
Egyptian society. He explained that students start their projects by identifying knowledge gaps in society then develop projects to fill in these gaps. After that, students disseminate their projects in different ways, such as giving presentations and posting their projects online, using social media, including Facebook and Twitter. Also, CBL projects were hosted online on a video channel, VEMO, which was attached to Mahmoud’s website, science and society.org. Mahmoud explained that the idea of VEMO was similar to that of Youtube. However, VEMO was more concerned of scholarly work. Examples of CBL projects included a monthly calendar of inventions where students highlighted one invention each month. In a similar project, students developed a science agenda for children which provided scientific information daily. In another project, students developed a video about how our understanding of the universe had changed through history and cultures. The “Science Bus” was another CBL project in which students visited several communities to convey scientific information in innovative ways.

Hend (هند).

Hend, a woman in her forties, was a Rhetoric and Composition Instructor at AUC. Her first-hand experience with CBL courses was in the spring semester of 2011 when she taught a course on Grant Writing, Rhetoric 410: Grant Writing for Community Building. She explained that the goal of this course was to teach students the technical skills necessary for writing a grant proposal. The CBL component engaged groups of students in working with several NGOs to develop grant proposals responding to the specific needs of these organizations. Also, students’ projects involved identifying potential sponsors who might be interested in funding these proposals. The CBL component of the
course was intended to equip students with the practical skills required for this task. Since teaching a CBL course was a new experience to Hend, she invested much time and effort in preparing for it. However, she was happy to have had this experience because of the practical aspect of the course and its potential benefits for underprivileged communities. Therefore, Hend expressed her willingness to teach future CBL courses.

Jack.

Jack, a man in his thirties, was an Assistant Professor of Psychology in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, and Egyptology at AUC. His research focused on examining the influence of public and administrative policies on the health and welfare of individuals. According to Jack, his department offered CBL courses both at the graduate and undergraduate levels. *Personal Growth and Development* was one of the most popular CBL courses at this department. Jack explained that this course was a three-hundred level capstone course in which students interact with communities through several projects and then reflect on how these experiences might have influenced their own personal development. Jack had some work experience in the U.S., but his first-hand experience with the pedagogy of CBL was at AUC where he taught a CBL course, *Community Psychology*. Also, Jack noted that while his course—*Research Methods for Psychology*—was not a CBL course in the traditional sense, it was based on the concepts of CBL in that students had to visit communities and develop research projects on their own.
Huda (هدى).

Huda, a woman in her fifties, was an Adjunct Professor of Sociology at AUC. Her frequently taught courses were Development Agencies and Third World Development. She incorporated a CBL component in her course, Development Agencies, during the last three years. This course covers development stages in different types of organizations, such as international and civil society organizations including NGOs.

Huda was keen on connecting the CBL activity to the course goals. In her CBL courses, students worked in pairs to develop professional profiles in English for their respective NGOs. She estimated the number of profiles students developed to fifty or sixty over the years she had taught this course. Reflecting on the value of these projects to the partnering organizations, Huda noted that NGOs typically look for grants and funding opportunities. Therefore, having profiles in English might make them attractive to a wider spectrum of sponsors.

**Themes**

**Partnership motivations.**

Data analysis revealed three impetuses for faculty involvement in CBL partnerships: enhancing student learning, contributing to the community, and professional backgrounds. These themes were evident in the data when participants described their motivations to join these partnerships. Each of these themes is discussed in the subsequent sections. Table 20 summarizes these themes.
Table 20

*Faculty Motivations for Participation in CBL Partnerships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1- Enhancing student learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2- Contributing to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Professional backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- disciplinary backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- past work experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Enhancing student learning.*

With regard to the first component of this theme, enhancing student learning, participants often reported that service-learning is a great pedagogical approach in that it offers students opportunities to connect theory to practice. For example, Jay pointed out that she decided to teach CBL courses because she thought:

> It’s important for our students to . . . really have an applied approach to what they’re doing . . . and not just do it strictly in terms of what’s in the readings and what they do for a paper, but actually have to get out and interact with the real world.

Similarly, Huda explained that students’ involvement in CBL partnerships allow them opportunities to gain practical experiences and validate theoretical concepts they learn in the classroom:

> It’s bringing this practical experience. . . This will add to [student] experience and to [student] learning away from theories and stuff. And even theories, [students] can test your theories. And this is what I do with my students; they take the theory and test it, and they said, “No, this is not right,” which is good. That’s why I like it [the CBL pedagogy] very much.
Stressing the importance of ensuring the quality of CBL experiences, Jack noted that these courses enable students to appreciate the contributions of both theory and practice in addressing real-life issues:

I think that the students are better able to, when it’s done well, understand how the theoretical foundations and the practical skills that they’re learning are actually valuable in making changes in communities.

Participants also mentioned that CBL courses enhance students’ learning by promoting their understanding of theoretical concepts and enabling them to better grasp the course materials and gain new skills. Reflecting on students’ learning in her CBL courses, Huda said, “Actually what I noticed [was] that students remember more about the syllabus and the readings.” Similarly, Jack elaborated:

I can tell them [students] all about them [community members] all day, but until they actually get out in the community and start working with them [community members] and trying to get these projects going, they just don’t quite understand some of the problems. So, at the undergraduate level, it’s more of an exposure and at the graduate level, it’s a skill building exercise.

Consistent with the findings of previous research (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Hammond, 1994; Hesser, 1995; McKay & Rozee, 2004), faculty participants in this study cited advancing student learning as the primary motivator for teaching service-learning courses.

**Contributing to the community.**

In addition to enhancing student learning, faculty participants mentioned that they were motivated to teach CBL courses to contribute to the community, which is the second component of this theme. For example, Hend spoke with excitement of her goal to contribute positively to the community through teaching CBL courses:
When there is a positive impact on the community, that definitely make[s] me happy because everyone of us has this part when we would like to give. . . . You want to give back to the community and sometimes you give back, but you feel it is not enough. So, in a way, by teaching this course, I felt that indirectly I am contributing to the community by preparing these students to help. So, it really satisfies me.

Similarly, Mahmoud noted that teaching CBL courses allowed him an opportunity to fulfill a civic responsibility as a scientist:

It is a civic duty upon every scientist to share some of the research and some of the knowledge he works on, to share that with the community. I found CBL to be the medium, to be the channel to achieve this. So, it came very naturally.

These comments reveal that faculty members are motivated to teach CBL courses, in part, to make contributions to their communities. This finding reinforces those of other researchers who reported community-centered factors as motivators for faculty involvement in service-learning (Abes et al., 2002; McKay & Rozee, 2004).
Professional backgrounds.

Discipline.

Faculty members’ disciplinary backgrounds emerged as an important reason that encouraged them to teach CBL courses. When probed as to what motivated him to engage with CBL partnerships, Jack replied:

I think it’s the discipline. . . . The field itself is very active with the idea of actually getting people out and encouraging people in the community to identify and solve problems on their own, kind of a counseling approach to community work.

Similarly, Huda referred to her disciplinary background as a major motivator for her engagement with the community:

Especially when you talk about development, you talk about sociology, it’s unless you are part of the community, unless you do service for the community, unless you know more about the community, you cannot make an intervention. You don’t know what is there.

Past work experience.

In addition to disciplinary backgrounds, prior work experiences were evident in participants’ motivations to joining CBL partnerships. For example, Jack said that he was inclined to teach CBL courses “mostly, it’s just that my background as a community psychologist.” Likewise, Huda stressed her past work experience as a central incentive to teaching CBL courses:

I think my background. I’m a practitioner. . . . Before I start teaching, I started in development. So, I have been working in Egypt for 15 years in research. . . . I worked in different types of research related to education, to children. And, I thought . . . it’s time to teach because I want to combine my practical experience with theoretical experience because at some point, I felt there is a gap between theory in academia and practice. I wanted to combine this.
These comments indicate that faculty members’ disciplinary backgrounds and prior work experiences are important factors influencing their decisions to teach CBL courses. This is a fertile area for research that will increase our understanding of the effect of these factors on faculty involvement with service-learning.

Similar to the findings of the administrators’ group, the move of AUC to a new campus in a remote area emerged as a major factor that heightened faculty members’ motivations to engage students in CBL partnerships. Huda put it this way:

[The old campus in] downtown . . . it’s really very vibrant, you can see people. Now, you are totally isolated. So, you have to send your students there. You want to create this link between university and community. And so, I think that was very good for me.

The 25th January Egyptian Revolution of 2011 was a prominent factor in motivating some of the participants to teaching CBL courses. For example, Mahmoud felt that the Revolution provides an important reason for teaching CBL courses:

The value of CBL in inducing the knowledge and the innovation culture, which is very much needed to the Egyptian people in the post-revolution phase and because this century is the knowledge-based century. We are talking about knowledge-based economy and this is not going to be produced without knowledge societies and knowledge societies need to be knowledgeable. And, we have more than 40.0 % literacy. So, we think these CBL projects . . . enhance knowledge and science literacy for people, which is essential to development.

As participants’ comments revealed, the new location of AUC and Egyptian Revolution of 2011 provided additional motivations for faculty to offer CBL courses. While these findings may be specific to the context of this study, they draw attention to the possible impact of changing the campus location and the political situation on expanding or limiting service-learning at institutions of higher education. Future studies
are then required to assess the impact of these factors at other institutions on service-learning partnerships.

**Partnership relationships.**

Data analysis revealed that the theme of transactional relationships along with aspirations for engagement in transformative partnerships holds true for the faculty members group as well. Transactional relationships were demonstrated when participants described CBL activities and the frequency of interactions among partners. Participants conveyed their aspirations for transformative partnerships when they spoke of their desires for long-term relationships with communities, visions of, and attitudes toward the program, as well as the concepts of reciprocity and empowerment. The sections that follow shed light on both components of this theme. Table 21 provides an overview of this theme.

**Table 21**

*Faculty Members’ Perceptions of CBL Relationships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional partnerships along with aspirations for transformative partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- current transactional partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- short-term relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- limited interactions with community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Aspirations for transformative partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- positive attitudes toward the program and community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- ambitions for long-term relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- awareness of the importance of establishing reciprocal relationships with community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- awareness of the importance of community empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Transactional relationships.

Short-term relationships.

Participants’ comments revealed that the interactions between AUC and community-based organizations were quite short and limited. For example, Jay reflected on these interactions, noting “the involvement that we’ve had has been pretty constrained. . . . They [students] didn’t really interact with the community that much at all. . . . The class goes and does a particular set of activities.” When asked about her perceptions of the impacts of CBL courses on the NGOs, she replied, “I think just taking one class and having a fairly short engagement is not really going to have that much of an impact.” These comments indicate that limited interactions with community partners may confine the benefits organizations could gain from participating in the CBL program.

The early stage of the CBL program emerged as another factor that may constitute a barrier to assessing its impact on communities. For example, Jack found it difficult to identify the outcomes of the program because of its young age: “Our program has only been active for two years and so . . . it’s hard to say that we’ve had . . . what the dramatic impact is.” This finding reinforces Bringle and Hatcher’s (2002) view that age helps define the development stage of university-community partnerships. It is also consistent with that of Dorado and Giles’s (2004) study that identified age as an explanatory factor of the relationships among service-learning partners.

One the one hand, participants stressed the importance of community input in designing and implementing CBL activities. For example, Jack stated that his faculty colleague, Sara, [the real name was replaced with a pseudonym] “went in and talked to
the community and had her students fan out and talk to a couple hundred of the residents and identified a list of issues that they wanted to face.” One the other hand, there was no clear evidence that CBL activities sought to challenge the systems that cause social problems. Rather, it seemed that these activities were designed in such a way to maintain the traditional divide between social classes in society. For example, after conducting a needs assessment in one of Cairo’s poorest communities, Ain El-Sera (عين الصرى), students concluded that, “They [Ain El-Sera community] needed some employment training and skills training and things like that.” Jack said. Accordingly, “Students in collaboration with the community have been developing training programs for people wanting to work as nannies or caregivers, and also as house cleaners” reported Jack.

Students’ lack of understanding of the social problems of Ain El-Sera community is an illustrative example of Marullo and Edwards’ (2000) caution that unless the social justice component of any problem is taken into consideration, student service-learners are likely to attribute the miserable conditions of the underprivileged individuals to personal deficiencies. As such, they will focus their efforts on improving the skills of these individuals. This is perhaps the case with AUC student service-learners. While they conducted assessment of the needs of this community, they overlooked the structural causes that put this community in such poor conditions. As such, the main issues of societal injustices were minimized to individual limitations. Based on this understanding, AUC students decided to develop programs to enhance the skills of these individuals. Marullo and Edwards noted such programs may lead to positive outcomes and increase the likelihood that underprivileged individuals access job opportunities. However, they
cautioned that unless due attention is paid to the root causes of societal problems, “We are merely reshuffling who among the lower classes will be in such programs” (p. 904) at any particular time. This finding calls attention to the importance of preparing students to examine the structural causes of problems. Such a preparation can be accomplished through a careful plan and choice of course readings, activities, and assignments.

Aspirations for transformative partnerships.

Positive attitudes.

Although faculty members faced several types of challenges teaching CBL courses, none of them expressed a high level of dissatisfaction with teaching these courses. Rather, they maintained positive attitudes toward the program. For example, Huda said, “I put more time, of course, preparing. But, I don’t mind time because I enjoy it myself.” Likewise, Hend noted that she would welcome teaching another CBL course: “If I was offered [a CBL course] again, I would definitely accept it.” These comments indicate that faculty members are willing to continue teaching CBL courses over time.

Ambitions for long-term relationships.

When asked whether they prefer long- or short-term partnerships, all the faculty members asserted their support for long-term relationships with community partners. For example, Jay said, “It makes much more sense for it to be a long-term involvement because of the high up-front cost of developing the relationship.” In practice, Jack explained that his program had been working on establishing long-term CBL relationships:

One of the things we’ve tried to do here and one of the things we’re trying to do [to create] longer-term [partnerships] is to identify relationships with certain
communities and rather than being like a one project, to go in and do one project and then leave and do another project in another part of the community is to actually pick a community and a couple of NGO’s and work with them not exclusively, but for the majority of the projects and do longer-term projects so that we have a relationship with them over time.

These comments indicate that not only CBL faculty members desire long-term partnerships with communities, but also some of them have started taking practical steps to translate their hopes into practice.

An awareness of the importance of establishing reciprocal relationships with the community.

Faculty members exhibited an awareness of the importance of maintaining reciprocal relationships with community partners. For example, Jay reflected,

With the NGO, we were very careful to ask them for their suggestion. . . We said, ‘Do you have any projects that would be good?’ And they suggested a particular project and we did that.

Faculty members, however, identified threats to honoring the concept of reciprocity in CBL partnerships.

Social class divide and perceptions of the superiority of the academy over the community.

Jack felt that strong social class differences in Egypt are a major obstacle in maintaining reciprocal relationships with community partners:

I think there’s a couple of challenges, especially here in Egypt. One is my impression is that there’s this kind of a stronger class system within Egypt. And that many of the students that we’re working with are coming from middle and upper-middle [social] classes. And have very interaction social interaction, interpersonal interaction, with people from other classes, others as maids or workers or other kinds of things. And so, I think that that’s one of the challenge ... I think a cultural challenge. I feel like this is a big issue here in Egypt. . . . I think one of the biggest challenges with the reciprocity is this conception that, and I think this is from the students and I think the faculty at some level as well, have a
conception that, from a class perspective, we’re better. I am better. Just that they’re better.

Jack’s words reveal that students and faculty tend to perceive themselves as better than community members by the virtue of coming from higher socioeconomic classes.

Furthermore, Jack felt that maintaining reciprocal relationships is hard because the community also believes that professionals know more than we do. I think that the challenge is not only communicating that to our students and training our students to become servants of the community, but also training the communities to believe that they have something to offer.

Implicit in the above quote is that community members’ beliefs of the superiority of the academy over the community is another threat to establishing reciprocal university-community relationships. Not only do students and faculty conceive of themselves as superior to the people they encounter at their service sites, but also community partners perpetuate these conceptions by assuming that university members are more knowledgeable than themselves. Thus, they tend to rely on academicians for solving community-related problems.

*Imbalanced power between the university and the community.*

In addition to the issue of superiority of the academe, power differentials between the university and the community constitute another obstacle in establishing reciprocal relationships between the two entities. Jack illuminated this point: “The university has a certain amount of power and I think, again, community principle that . . . the university, the faculty, and the students are all coming from positions of power and privilege.” As such, he maintained, there is a potential that the university may
exploit and sort of unintentionally oppress both the community members, as well as the organizations. And so, I think it’s one of the trickiest things to balance and finding a way to kind of make sure that these relationships are [reciprocal.]

In order to protect the community from possible exploitation by the university, Jack suggested that universities “could have some form of peer review where other people involved in community-based learning are reviewing it to make sure that people are not exploiting, or oppressing the communities that they’re working with.” These comments illustrate faculty members’ awareness of the barriers to developing reciprocal partnerships between university and community partners. Recognition of a problem is a first essential step to addressing it; thus, it is possible that CBL faculty members at AUC will find ways to minimize those barriers and establish reciprocity in CBL partnerships.

Clear class divides in Egypt, perceptions of the superiority of the university over the community, and the huge disparities of power and resources between the university and the community emerged as daunting challenges to initiate and maintain reciprocal university-community partnerships. Jack acknowledged this difficulty noting, “I don’t know that they [university and community] would ever be equal, but at least that both sides are getting a benefit.” In spite of these difficulties, participants suggested that addressing the barriers to reciprocal relationships should be a two-way process that encourages both members in the academe and those in the community to change their long-held perceptions of the superiority of the academy over the community. Allowing frequent opportunities for members of both entities to interact with each other can be an effective change strategy. For example, Jack reported that although students’ interactions with community members may not completely change students’ traditional perceptions of
the community, these experiences help students recognize that community members can contribute to their learning: “I think especially after their first community experience, they [students] realize that . . . they [community members] are humans and there’s a lot to learn. . . . I mean it doesn’t necessarily take away all those things.”

This section demonstrates participants’ critical awareness of the importance of establishing reciprocal relationships with the communities they partner with in the CBL program. Participants cited clear social class differences, traditional perceptions of the superiority of the university over the community, and the power differentials between them as major barriers to establishing reciprocal CBL relationships. Systematic efforts to change these traditional views along with establishing peer review processes for CBL projects emerged as two important strategies for promoting reciprocal university-community partnerships.

Awareness of the importance of community empowerment.

Participants’ references to community empowerment provide additional evidence that CBL partnerships are likely to move toward transformation. In this regard, Jack noted:

One of the primary goals in Community Psychology is the construct of empowerment and sustainability. And the only way to empower communities and sustain these kinds of gains is to have them do the work and for them . . . to figure out how to address these problems.

Based on their beliefs of community empowerment, Jack and his colleagues designed CBL activities in such ways to ensure community involvement in defining and addressing community issues:
Faculty Sara had her students talk to a couple hundred of the residents and identified a list of issues that they wanted to face. And the top two things that they needed, one was sewer and two were roofs for their houses. So, in the following semester, my undergraduate class took on the idea of developing a plan and a project and worked again with the community for trying to identify a program or a way for addressing the issue of the roofs. They needed some employment training and skills training and things like that. So, what they ultimately proposed and through collaboration with community was developing a training program where members from the community that knew about building could train other members of the community and then they collaboratively worked to start building the roofs.

Jack stressed the concept of empowerment as integral to university-community partnerships, explaining:

Because when we [university members] leave, they [community members] still have to live there. And the problems that we address in a semester are only a very small portion of the issues that they [community members] are going to face on a long-term basis. And in reality, the number of professionals that there are is so small compared to the size of the problems in any country. So, if we look at mental health problems in the United States, there will never be enough psychological counselors to deal with all the psychological problems just as in Egypt or in any country for that matter. There’s never enough social scientists or public health people and whatever.

Marullo and Edwards (2000) identified the concept of empowerment as a core feature of university-community partnerships with a social justice orientation, noting that unless these partnerships empower communities, they may further marginalize the underprivileged and alienate the needy. They regarded empowerment as a means to encourage service recipients to meet their own self-determined needs and safeguard against the sense of superiority service providers may experience over the needy.

To ensure the reliability of this theme—transactional relationships along with aspirations for transformative partnerships—the findings were compared to Enos and Morton’s (2003) framework. Faculty members stated that students had little interactions
with community partners through short-term projects which aimed to benefit both the course goals and those of the organizations. Based on Enos and Morton’ framework, these descriptions characterize transactional partnerships. Faculty members’ ambitions for long-term relationships with community partners and their comments on key issues, such as reciprocity and community empowerment, provide evidence that they may take actions to disrupt existing systems and norms at AUC so as to transform CBL partnerships.

**Partnership challenges.**

The theme of structural barriers to integrating service-learning emerged as the main theme that describes the challenges faced by faculty members while teaching CBL courses. Faculty members listed a wide range of difficulties related to the institution, pedagogy, students, and community partners. The sections that follow highlight each of these challenges. Table 22 provides an overview of these challenges.
Table 22

*Faculty Perceptions of Challenges to CBL Partnerships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Institutional-related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- time constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- academic calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e- administrative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f- vague process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g- move of AUC to a new location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Pedagogical-related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- difficulty of connecting academics with service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- difficulty of planning meaningful service projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- difficulty of achieving course goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- difficulty of conducting assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Student-related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- busy schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Organizational-related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- insufficient staff experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- inadequate level of commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- reluctance to share information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Faculty-related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- lack of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- lack of local knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional-related issues

Time constraints.

Of all the cited difficulties to teaching CBL courses, time was the most frequently cited issue. Faculty members were concerned about the substantial amount of time required for course design, preparation, and communication with community partners. In this regard, Hend stated:

It [teaching a CBL course] is a little burden on me. Time in the sense that it needs more kind of networking than other courses. For me, in particular, because it needed a long time of preparation. So . . . it needed a long time especially it was a course a little bit outside of my comfort zone. So, I needed to prepare very well for it.

Time becomes more of an issue especially for junior faculty members who have to meet tenure requirements. Jack said:

I think for junior faculty, it’s a little more difficult to make this [CBL courses] the primary focus of your research agenda because it takes so much time. . . . At a practical level, there’s a certain amount of pressure to produce research and to produce good teaching and service and things. And CBL on top of that is an additional burden.

Academic calendar.

Faculty members were also concerned about the restriction of time dictated by the academic semester. For example, Jay noted:

The semester starts on a certain date and it ends on a certain date and the students projects must begin at the beginning of the semester and end at the end of the semester. So, things can’t slip even like a week. If that’s the end of the semester, that’s the end of the semester. You can’t say, “Well the presentation has to be next week because somebody’s traveling or whatever.” It has to be when it has to be because that’s it. If it doesn’t happen in the schedule where the semester requires it to happen, you’re stuck.

Participants cited the under-appreciation from the University administration and attitudes
of fellow colleagues as practical challenges facing them. For example, Mahmoud mentioned that he feels disappointed:

When some other faculty don’t value that or when part of the administration don’t care if you take extra time, or [wondering] why are you putting grades for some activity like this. Some department chairs might not appreciate that at all. So, unconventional and new approaches always have enemies.

**Inadequate institutional resources.**

**Funding.**

Faculty members also listed inadequate funding and other types of institutional resources as major barriers to teaching CBL courses. Mahmoud raised the issue of funding, noting that allocating financial resources to CBL courses can encourage multiplicity of CBL projects:

We need money to produce good projects; funding because people actually pay a lot of money. I actually had another project for *Scientific Thinking* [course] which is the greatest discoveries. This is one actually one about the greatest discoveries in science and they [students] produced large posters about each field of science and they [students] paid a lot of money in this from their own pockets. The people [students] who produced the robotic arm, they [students] paid money also from their pockets. In AUC, I can say that this can work without problems. But, if you want to do some thing like that in national universities, I think it will be a challenge unless you will be stuck to/limited to the videos, producing videos, which is software on their laptops. They just do it. But, to diverse the CBL projects, you would need funding, and you would need sponsors. And I hope that the Gerhart Center . . . would actually find sponsors that can fund CBL projects.

**Logistics.**

In addition to funding, Jack highlighted the issue of transportation, especially after the move of AUC to a new campus in remote area:

Transportation is an issue for both [students and faculty]. In order to manage the classes well, there needs to be provisions for transportation, especially with our new campus. I think at the older campus downtown, it was easier because you could walk out and walk across the street and do a project.
Jack also spoke of the need for equipments “in terms of digital recorders and video equipment. Just making those kinds of things available to these types of projects, I think, would be a big benefit.”

_Administrative support._

Additionally, faculty members highlighted the need for a support system, such as staff members to establish connections with community partners. Jay explained:

> If you were really going to do this on a large scale, it would have to be supported by a staff person . . . that’s responsible for organizing it and doing the traveling and making the negotiating with the partners up front and developing the assignments, and all that kind of thing is done by a staff person.

Faculty members expressed concerns about the lack of a centralized unit on campus to manage the University’s relationships with community partners. Rather, AUC’s relationships with NGOs were scattered in different units on campus. Jay elaborated:

> The NGO relationships that the University has are spread all over the place. Gerhart [Center] has some, Sociology [Department] has some, the Social Research Center has some, and we [Public Policy Department] have some. And nobody really knows who has relationships with whom.

Furthermore, Jay complained that some units on campus were reluctant to share the relationships they had developed with community partners with other departments on campus:

> We’ve had problems in terms of research. Say one unit that has a relationship with somebody. There’s no incentive for them to share that relationship. They see it as risky to involve students in this relationship in terms of they’ve invested a lot of time and effort to develop a relationship that’s important to them for their objectives. And they think that if student[s] come in, they might be very critical of this organization. They might somehow damage the relationship. So, the incentive for them is to say, “No.” They gain nothing, or they don’t perceive themselves as gaining anything and have the potential to lose. So they don’t go ahead with it. They say, “No.”
Among the institutional issues reported by faculty was the vague process of establishing a partnership between AUC and community-based organizations. Jack noted:

[The] process [of establishing connections with community partners] is completely unclear. Who’s responsible for it? . . . What kinds of approvals we should get? . . . I don’t have the authority as a faculty member to develop a relationship for the University with another organization.

The new location of AUC was cited by faculty members as another obstacle in their interactions with NGOs. Hend provided an example of how the move of AUC to the new campus minimized her level of involvement with one organization:

For example, I used to be involved in an NGO downtown, Nahdeat El-Mahrosa (نهضة المحروسة). And when AUC was downtown, it was very easy for me, after I finish work, . . . just to pass-by walking, . . . and go back home, it’s very easy. Now, AUC nothing is surrounded. It’s very far away. So, I think the geographic location affected this. For me, to be able to go to this Nahdeat El-Mahrosa (نهضة المحروسة), I need a day off. I cannot go after working hours. I think geographic location impacted that.

Thus, faculty members’ perceptions of institutional barriers to teaching CBL courses included constraints on their time, the academic calendar, administrators’ and colleagues perceptions of CBL, accountability issues, as well as insufficient funds and inadequate resources available for the program. The next section illuminates another set of barriers related to pedagogy.

Faculty frequently cited several barriers related to pedagogy in CBL courses. Issues raised included the difficulty of connecting academics with service, planning
meaningful service projects, achieving course goals, and conducting assessment. In regard to bridging the gap between academics and service, Jack stated:

I think one of the biggest challenges for me . . . is just this combining the CBL experiences with more of the academic. . . . One of the biggest questions is how do you merge those two? Because many academic programs focus primarily on the academic.

Huda spoke of the difficulty of planning service activities that are relevant to her courses:

Let me tell you about what’s difficult about CBL. Maybe it’s me, it is not CBL. I need help in designing something to fit the course. The idea is to have something. It’s not easy. We did the profile. So, if I want to do something else, I will not go to the profile again. So, [I am] thinking what else can I do to provide service for the community? It doesn’t easy come. . . . This is the part which is really difficult for me to decide on what to do . . . It is not about sending students to spend hours helping. I want it to be very relevant to the course, to the theory, I wanted to bridge this and it is not easy, no.

Jack expressed a concern about the difficulty of achieving CBL course goals because of the high demands of these courses in terms of requiring students to learn theories and how to apply them at the same time:

I think one of the challenges in teaching the CBL course, at least the way we’ve organized it so far in our classes, is that we’re expecting students to learn the theory and the practical skills and do the work all at the same time. I’ve run into this primarily in my research class. . . . When you’re trying to get a student to develop a research question which they’ve never done before and they read about it the week before, it’s very difficult.

Pedagogical concerns also included assessment. For example, Mahmoud indicated the difficulty of assessing his CBL courses because of the shortage of resources and the lack of support system for the program: “[CBL] course[s] actually lack lots of resources. It’s actually good that we finish the projects. To do assessment, we need actually staff to help us.” Participants’ concerns about the pedagogical aspects of CBL
courses reflect the critical importance of creating support systems to assist faculty members in integrating service components into their traditional courses.

**Student-related issues.**

Students-related issues were a common topic during discussions of the challenges facing faculty members when undertaking CBL courses. Issues raised included students’ resistance, busy schedules, and safety.

*Student resistance.*

According to Jay, student resistance stemmed from three main sources. First, students were not comfortable with the unstructured nature of CBL courses. In this regard, Jay explained:

> One of the things that I think the students find very difficult to deal with is the lack of structure and predictability. If you get a worksheet, you take the worksheet, you take your textbook, or the reading, or whatever it is. It’s completely structured for you and there’s a right answer and it’s known in advance. And, hopefully you can figure out what it is. But, in dealing with the community, there is no right answer and the situation by its nature cannot be fully structured. So, things will not happen on schedule. Things will not be done the way you thought they were going to be done. People will raise questions that nobody thought of, etcetera. So, the students find that very difficult to deal with.

Second, Jay attributed students’ resistance to their fear and stereotypes of poor communities:

> A lot of the students are comfortable in a charitable role where they’re going and giving things to poor people. They’re not comfortable in actual interacting, it seems, as much. In interacting with adults, I think, that they would . . . try to overcome some severe stereotype issues and also some real fear issues that the people have been taught to fear those people and to fear their neighborhoods. It’s not because of the superiority. It’s because they see those people as being the other. They see them as being very sociably distant from them and as being people that can’t understand what their motivations are, or what they’re going to do. And they have been taught to think of those areas as being dangerous, physically dangerous. . . . People [students] really want that to be very structured and go in and talk to somebody, come out. They’re not comfortable
with just going there and interacting. It’s an issue.

Third, Jay thought that student resistance was a result of the way students were socialized to believe in the superiority of academicians over ordinary people in the community. As such, students are less likely to accept the idea of community partners as being co-educators:

The idea that illiterate person[s] can still tell you a lot about their lives or about their problems and that you can learn from that is something that, I think, in this culture is difficult to communicate to students. . . . I think probably they’re less open to that. I mean, their idea very much is a flipside of the idea that they owe us [faculty members] respect and I hear that from the students, “Oh, your Ph.D. is from Harvard, we expect you to be able to teach me things.” And, frankly, we’ve had resistance, strong resistance in another class to the idea that . . . the students actually resent the idea that . . . they’re being asked to learn from each other. They resent it. They say, “I didn’t come here to learn from my fellow students. I came here to learn from the professor. You’re supposed to be teaching me these things.” And the course is about leadership! So, fellow students who are at least master students and compared to some illiterate guy in some coffee shop. They’re going to be hesitant to think that that person has something to teach them, I think.

Jay’s comments echo Rhoads’ (1997) views that students’ involvement in communities through service-learning is mostly an experience of “border crossing” where borders stand for the different areas of cultural diversity. However, AUC students appeared reluctant to interact and engage with others from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. As Jay’s references revealed, students were hesitant to interact with poor communities because of their prior negative assumptions and stereotypes about the poor. Similar to many of their counterparts at other institutions, AUC students were socialized to honor the expert model of knowledge generation that places “an exclusionary position relative to other forms of knowledge and other knowledge producers” (Saltmarsh et al., 2009, p. 7). As such, these students tend to believe that knowledge flows in one direction from
the academy to the community. A common goal of service-learning projects is to engage students in communities. Therefore,

students need to be able to cross over into different zones of cultural diversity and form . . . hybrid and hyphenated identities in order to rethink the relationship of self to society, of self to other, and to deepen the moral vision of the social order. (McLaren, 1995, p. 22)

The value of reflection in helping students self-correct their misconceptions is well emphasized in the literature (e.g., Bradley, 1997; Goldberg et al., 2006). Thus, offering safe spaces for reflection is an effective strategy through which faculty members can help students confront and challenge their preconceived notions about others.

**Student busy schedule.**

In addition to student resistance, faculty cited students’ busy schedules as another challenge to teaching CBL courses. For example, Mahmoud stated:

The challenge is actually to have a good group of students and to coach them to fulfill or walk through the different steps of the project. So, the challenge is some of the students might be busy . . . They think that this is one of the many projects that they can cram in a day or two. We tell them “No, this something that you need to do on a long-term.”

**Student safety.**

Moreover, faculty raised concerns about students’ safety. For example, Jack highlighted a potential risk for students because of their involvement in service projects given the political situation in Egypt before the Revolution of 2011:

The other thing that I’m concerned about as a program advisor is . . . one of the core tenants of community psychology is constructive empowerment and social justice. . . . Egypt is, at least until Mubarak was removed, is an authoritarian regime and sort of discouraged empowerment and discouraged social justice. . . . There’s sort of a contradiction of actually training students to be doing this and then putting them into the field. . . . For the Egyptian students, it theoretically poses a big, a potential risk for them doing this work. And it’s not just, “Oh, this
is bad. Get out of here.” But, . . . they [Egyptian students] can be imprisoned and disappeared, which is a problem. I think it’s a realistic risk that, at the university level, needs to be considered and I think especially in developing countries. I would say this is much less of an issue in the United States and much less of an issue in Europe because there are legal structures and protections and things like that. There is some risk of it, but I think much lower.

Jack’s comments call attention to a practical dilemma facing the pedagogy of service-learning in less democratic countries. Typically these countries are governed by authoritarian regimes; those regimes ultimately aim to benefit a small group of individuals constituting the elite at the expense of the vast majority of people constituting the ordinary citizenry. Although economic inequalities and several other types of injustices prevail in such regimes, people are less likely to confront societal ills and call for social reforms; dictatorial regimes intimidate people from taking actions to correct injustices by imposing harsh policies and rules that suppress people from expressing opposing opinions to government practices.

The Emergency Law number 162 in Egypt exemplifies the repressive rules dictated by autocratic regimes. This law was first enacted in 1958; however, it was not implemented until the Israeli-Arab War in 1967. This Law was widely practiced in the period following the assassination of former Egyptian President, Muhammad Anwar El-Sadat. This Law largely extended the power of police and banned street demonstrations. Most significantly, under this law, constitutional rights were suspended and censorship was legalized. Additionally, it authorized the government the right to apprehend any individuals for whatever reasons and keep them in prison for any period of time without trials. In response to people’s repeated calls to end this law, the government officials claimed that this law was mainly maintained to facilitate their efforts to fight terrorism.
and drug dealers (International Commission of Jurists, 2009). In practice, however, the Emergency Law had been used against political opponents. Abolishing the Emergency Law was one of the primary demands of Egyptian revolutionaries in 2011. The Supreme Council of the Armed Forces who had been leading the Country after the resignation of former President Muhammad Hosni Mubarak ceased this law in the first anniversary of the 25th January Egyptian Revolution of 2011.

The Emergency Law in Egypt is just one example, among many others, that illustrates how severe the consequences of promoting social justice could be in countries governed by oppressive regimes. As such, Jack’s concerns about students’ safety are legitimate in light of the political situation in Egypt prior to the Revolution. The progress of service-learning in Egypt depends, in large part, on political reforms. This revolution brings a hope that the new government will take tangible steps to promote liberty and freedom of speech. Such a political context is very likely to encourage common people’s involvement in polities and addressing community issues. If this were to happen, then one could expect that faculty members would encourage students to participate in service-learning projects without fear over their safety. Hopefully, then, service-learning instructors and students, along with other reformers, will be able to address the structural causes of societal ills without concerns about their safety. The changes of the Egyptian political life are hopes yet to be seen in the coming period.

Organizational-related issues.

A range of organizational-related issues were put forth by faculty members in discussing the challenges to teaching CBL courses. Examples of these challenges
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included the insufficient experience and inadequate level of commitment of some community partners, as well as the bureaucratic systems and the tendency of some organizations to hide information. Jay’s comments were helpful in fleshing out many of these issues.

*Insufficient experience.*

Jay explained that student interactions with community partners who are not experienced enough with their organizations may limit students’ benefit from these interactions:

In Alwan wa Awtar, although the original contact was made with the head of the organization, we then dealt with a lower level . . . executive in the organization who was also at AUC. So, we had no problems in dealing with her, but she was a lower level person. Now, whether she had enough experience, she hadn’t really been with Alwan for that long . . . . So, depending on who you are and to how long she’d been with the organization also. So, whether she would have that much to contribute to the students, I’m not sure . . . . But, in general, I would say that people have a lot of potential.

*Inadequate level of commitment.*

Jay also reported that that the minimum commitment of a government body with which her class partnered was a practical obstacle:

Working with the New Cairo Council has been challenging because nobody returns phone calls. So, . . . on the one hand, you want the students to be grappling with the situation the way it really is and this is the way it really is. On the other hand, it’s difficult to ask them to do something when the other side is just not living up to any particular set of expectations. So, that’s challenging.

This comment denotes that the success of CBL partnerships is a shared responsibility between university and community partners. It also indicates that CBL partners are connected to one another through interdependent relationships in which the action of one
partner affects the others. When asked about her justification of the insufficient commitment of some organizations, Jay replied:

Certainly the government organizations are not used to . . . the idea of the university coming out and doing projects in the community. And it is a real constraint. And you have to say, “Well, from their perspective, why should they care?” They’re not used to thinking . . . of students as consultants or of students as some staff equivalence, or something. The students who are someone that would make a contribution to their work and that, therefore, they have to ... to do something in return. They see it as a favor. And, therefore, they’re not willing to make any real commitment on their side.

Jay’s comment signifies that the local culture may influence service-learning partnerships in significant ways. It also denotes the need for a cultural shift in Egypt in ways that redefine university-community relationships so that the university is no longer perceived as an ivory tower. Rather, it should be regarded as a partner whose resources are readily available for investment in addressing community issues. This cultural shift should also change the mindset that college students are too young to contribute to their society. Rather, they should be perceived as youths who are capable of playing active roles in their society. The leadership demonstrated by youth in the 2011 Egyptian revolution is powerful evidence that Egyptian youth are reliable and can be trusted to hold leadership positions in their communities.

Bureaucracy.

Bureaucracy within some community organizations was another challenge faced by some CBL faculty members. For example, Huda noted:

Some organizations will not be helpful or co-operative because I don’t know why exactly. Some of them, they have bureaucracy. I went through this. They have to get an approval from I don’t know who and what. So, sometimes it’s a hassle.
Reluctance to share information.

In addition to the excessive bureaucracy and monotonous routine that characterize the vast majority of government agencies in Egypt, faculty members complained about the tendency of government organizations to not disclose information which would typically be available for the public in other countries. In this vein, Jay complained about:

The inability to get access to information . . . , with government especially even with companies, but to a lesser extent, is challenging. . . . It’s puzzling or sort of frustrating that you want to work with an organization and you want to help them [organizations], but they’re not helping you to help them by making information more difficult to get.

Faculty-related issues.

Lack of experience.

In addition to these common challenges, individual faculty members reported other issues specific to their situations. For example, Hend recalled that one of her colleagues who teaches CBL courses had to take an unexpected vacation during the spring of 2011. As such, Hend received an offer from the department chair to replace her colleague in teaching a CBL course. Hend noted that although she felt happy to have had this offer, she was concerned about her lack of experience in teaching courses with CBL components. She stated:

To be quite frank, I was very happy to teach this course, but at the same time concerned that I don’t have the experience and background that [the name of her colleague was removed for confidentiality purposes] has because she’s been in the community-based field for so many years. But, thank God, I had the winter break and I really started to prepare for it.
Hend reported her lack of experience in teaching service-learning courses as one of the
difficulties she encountered when she was first offered an opportunity to teach courses
with a CBL component. This finding reinforces that of Banerjee and Hausafus (2007)
who identified faculty members’ lack of knowledge for designing service-learning courses
as a deterrent to using this pedagogy.

*Lack of local knowledge.*

Unfamiliarity with the local culture and limited language skills emerged as
practical challenges to foreign faculty members. For example, Jack felt that his Egyptian
colleagues achieved more success teaching service-learning courses than him. He
attributed his limited success teaching these courses to his foreign citizenship status. His
limited language competency in Arabic hindered his communications with community
partners. Also, his unfamiliarity with Egyptian culture was an obstacle in teaching CBL
courses. Jack reflected on these issues:

I think my colleague, Dr. [the name was removed for confidentiality purposes]
has had a lot more success and I’ve had less success with it and I think part of it is
cultural understandings and part of its language. I think it’s been more difficult;
I’m not very good in Arabic. I think the CBL work in Egypt is much harder than it
would be in the U.S. because of the cultural and language differences for me. I
have limited interactions with the communities directly. I think it’s more
complicated coming overseas. Like just basic question, you don’t know. And you
need to know in order to be published. That’s one of the primary limitations.

Ideally, service-learning courses should aim to address societal problems and
improve the quality of life in communities while achieving course goals. For the most
part, societal issues are context-laden, thus addressing them requires extensive familiarity
with the local contexts. This, in turn, poses practical challenges to international faculty
members with limited skills in local languages and little knowledge about local cultures.
This area is relatively unexplored in the literature. Future investigations are warranted to identify the specific challenges facing those faculty members and how they can be supported while teaching service-learning courses. For example, future research should address the impact of institutional supports offered to this group including the ways in which colleagues and administrators facilitate the transition of this group into the local culture.

The findings concerning the challenges perceived by faculty are consistent with those reported by previous studies. Similar to the findings of Abes et al. (2002) and Harwood et al. (2005), lack of time and competing time demands were found to be the most critical challenges facing CBL faculty. The findings on institutional issues—funding, logistic support, colleagues’ attitudes—echo those of McKay and Rozee (2004), Harwood et al., and Banerjee and Hausafus (2007). Also, the concerns about pedagogical issues resemble those reported by Abes et al., McKay and Rozee, and Harwood et al. However, in addition to confirming prior findings on the challenges facing faculty members who aspire to teach service-learning courses, this study’s findings pinpoint new factors, such as faculty concerns about student safety and the impact of the political context where service-learning partnerships are conducted on motivating or deterring faculty from participating in these collaborations.

Furthermore, these findings indicate that the organizational structures of community-based organizations can significantly influence the university’s decisions when choosing a community partner. While several frameworks exist to illuminate our understanding of the institutional factors that affect community engagement (e.g., Bringle
& Hatcher, 1996; Furco, 2002; Holland, 1997), less is known about the organizational factors that facilitate university-community service-learning partnerships. By identifying several organizational-related issues, this study begins the conversation on this issue. More research, however, is needed to investigate more organizational factors that faculty members deem important for choosing community-based organizations.

**Partnership improvements.**

The theme of cultivating an institutional culture supportive of community engagement captures participants’ suggestions for improving CBL partnerships. Faculty participants made several references related to this theme, including establishing a unit on campus to co-ordinate CBL partnerships; building support systems for faculty members; reconsidering faculty reward structures; allocating sufficient financial resources; and setting up legal structures. The sections that follow describe each aspect of this theme. Table 23 summarizes participants’ suggestions.
Table 23

*Faculty Members’ Suggestions for Improving CBL Partnerships*

Cultivating an institutional culture supportive of community engagement

1- Establishing a service-learning unit on campus

2- Advertising the CBL program

3- Diversifying the program’s sources of funding

4- Widening and diversifying the circle of community partners

5- Restructuring faculty tenure and reward policies

6- Ensuring institutional leadership support

7- Building legal structures

8- Designating spaces for partnering organizations on campus

9- Assessing community impact

---

*Establishing a service-learning unit on campus.*

Participants suggested creating a centralized unit on campus with staff devoted to supporting faculty members with course design, ideas for service projects, and connections with community partners. For example, Huda stated, “I think it needs more help for the faculty. . . to design it [the CBL course], to give ideas, to help them organize, to reach more community.” Similarly, Jay stressed the importance of supporting faculty with staff members to assist them in organizing CBL classes and building connections with community partners:

I do think that there . . . need to be more staff support provided for the CBL [faculty]. Specifically in terms of developing the partnerships and beginning to
help in institutionalizing the relationships such that there are relationships that are managed on multiple levels. And then there is the staff support time through the actual physical organization of the class. I think those are the main things.

While participants underscored the importance of creating support systems for all CBL faculty members, foreign participants noted that such support is especially critical to international faculty members. For example, Jay noted:

Supposing an international faculty came here who didn’t speak Arabic who didn’t know anything about Egypt. They wanted to do CBL activities because maybe they did them at their other university or whatever. What kind of support would they need and how would the university provide that support? It is a particular problem here because we have so many faculty who are not Egyptian.

These comments indicate the importance of establishing a unit on campus to support faculty in developing CBL partnerships. Taking into consideration that foreign faculty members constitute a substantial number of the faculty body at AUC (see Appendix A for Fact sheet), it is important to provide special support to these faculty members given their limited knowledge about the local culture and language. Analogous to AUC, many other institutions benefit from the expertise of foreign faculty members. Therefore, careful attention should be paid to facilitating the transition of this group of faculty into the local culture so that they feel encouraged to incorporate service-learning into their courses.

Advertising the CBL program.

Participants thought that advertising would be an effective strategy to raise faculty members’ awareness of the program, thus attracting them to use service-learning. For example, Mahmoud felt that “publicity would enlarge the participation in CBL.” Likewise, Hend thought that publicity may help promote the program at AUC as well as
highlight community-based organizations on campus: “Maybe advertising CBL courses. Advertising; not many people know about NGOs.”

**Diversifying the program’s sources of funding.**

As revealed in discussing the challenges to teaching CBL courses, the lack of financial resources emerged as a mild challenge. To overcome this challenge and enhance the quality of service projects, Mahmoud suggested soliciting funding from various types of agencies, such as NGOs and philanthropic organizations:

HAV[ing] sponsorships with NGOs. There are lots of NGOs with money . . . and philanthropy organizations. I think by educating the poor through CBL by a university like AUC, it’s a very worthy cause. If you reach it to the right audience, you’re going to get funded. And this will allow us to do a better job.

This comment prompts a suggestion that university officials should seek funding for service-learning projects from external donors. This finding reinforces Walshok’s (1999) advice to institutions of higher education to diversify the sources of funding for engagement efforts.

**Widening and diversifying the circle of community partners.**

In a similar vein, Jay suggested establishing partnerships with government agencies, companies, and corporations. She felt that making connections with such entities would encourage more faculty members in different disciplines, such as business, journalism, and engineering, to incorporate CBL elements in their courses:

If CBL is going to be throughout the curriculum; I mean the largest departments that we have are the Business Department and the Journalism Department not just in our school [Public Policy], but those are the largest departments overall in the University. Engineering is also pretty large. And if they were going to do something that involves CBL, it’s going to almost have to be with the government or company. There’s [a] limited potential for them to do things with NGOs.
Jay’s comment reveals that establishing partnerships with different types of organizations rather than focusing exclusively on NGOs would be an effective strategy to motivate faculty members from various disciplines to implement service-learning courses.

Including diverse types of organizations has the potential not only to encourage more faculty members from a wide spectrum of disciplines to use service-learning, but also to benefit communities. In this regard, Jay recommended involving corporations in CBL partnerships because they have substantial financial resources, and thus could provide tangible benefits to the community. In the following quote, Jay acknowledged that corporations are profit-based entities. Yet, she believed that including them could provide an array of benefits to communities:

It’s a giant construction corporation and they’re willing to provide funding to do something in Manshet Naser (منشية ناصر), which is a poor area. This seems to be presumably some kind of corporate social responsibility activity. . . . But, they could potentially bring real resources . . . So, they potentially provide manpower. They potentially provide space. They could potentially provide funding. They provide continuity. I mean, there’s a lot of ... advantages to involving corporations. I mean . . .they’re a company. They’re planning to make money. That’s what the companies do. So, they’re looking for ways, but they may also be trying to . . .get their staff more involved in the community as a way to motivate them or a way to raise their skills.

These quotes indicate that involvement of corporations in CBL partnerships could motivate more faculty members to join CBL collaborations, provide communities with palpable benefits, and connect the corporations’ staff members with communities. As such, universities are encouraged to diversify their partnerships and consider inviting corporations to join these collaborations.
Restructuring faculty tenure and reward policies.

Tenure guidelines and reward structures were often cited, especially by tenure track faculty members, during the discussions on how to advance CBL partnerships. For example, Jack felt that the traditional criteria for tenure and promotion—research, teaching, and service—were reasonable: “I think the general guidelines make sense that you need to split across these different pieces and that kind of represents your overall professionalism.” Yet, he expressed a concern about adopting a sole criterion in evaluating all faculty members in all disciplines:

Having a single standard and saying we’re only going to accept peer review journal articles from the top ten percent of journals . . . doesn’t really apply well for visual anthropologists who are making movies or music people who are creating scales of music, or theater productions or other kinds of things.

Instead of using only one criterion, Jack applauded the use of non-traditional ways of evaluating faculty members’ work in the community:

There are now mechanisms that we can get those types of works peer-reviewed. There’s also a number of developing resources that are designed to actually peer review non-typical research work. The Community-Campus Partnership for Health has one. So . . . I think the field itself is sort of adapting in a certain way.

Jack called upon tenured faculty members to promote such atypical measures for evaluating faculty members: “I think it comes from the professors who are tenured and putting it in places.” Restructuring the tenure guidelines and reward structures so as to recognize faculty members’ involvement with communities is a recurring theme in the literature (see, for example, Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Driscoll, 2007; Franz, 2009; Novak & Johnston, 2005; Vogelgesang, 2004; Ward, 2005). Participants’ comments on
tenure guidelines in this study mirrored those in previous research and highlighted the role of tenured faculty members in making those adjustments.

Despite participants’ repeated emphasis that faculty work in the community should count toward their tenure, they cautioned against mandating such a type of work in the tenure guidelines. For example, Jay stated:

You [can] make it something that counts, but . . . you can’t really say to somebody, “If you haven’t done CBL, it will hurt your tenure case.” Because it does have to be a choice on somebody’s part. And . . . also . . . you don’t want people doing CBL who really don’t want to do it.

Jack concurred with Jay explaining,

I think [the] risk of putting it in the curriculum is that you get a lot of people doing it poorly . . . Because if you have to do it, then everybody does it. And so, they will be some people who do it because they enjoy it and others that don’t.

These comments direct attention to an unexplored area in the literature pertaining to whether or not community-based work should be a requirement of the tenure process or recognized as the type of work that some faculty choose to do. Future studies exploring the views of both faculty members who are engaged in community work and those who are not will help illuminate this area.

All participants noted that faculty members’ involvement in CBL courses should be rewarded. For example, when asked whether or not faculty who teach CBL courses should receive special recognition, Mahmoud replied, “Of course, yes. It should be recognized because we put extra work and because this is among the objectives of the University. So, those who contribute to that objective should be rewarded.” However, there was not agreement on what these rewards may look like; rather, participants proposed different ideas. For example, Mahmoud felt that designating a special award
for community-based work would be helpful in motivating faculty members to integrate
service-learning in their teaching: “It [award] would matter, of course. The most
important [thing], it will be a trend that people would like to try in other universities and
even within the same university.” Similar to Mahmoud, Jack suggested generating an
award as a motivator for faculty members to implement service-learning courses.

    Maybe a community-based service award which is independent of the research,
teaching, and service, but contributions to the community. And one element of
that could be community-based learning. I think it provides some formal
recognition within the university administration. That it’s important.

Jack’s comment underscores the role of the university leadership in recognizing service-
learning as a legitimate mode of scholarship.

    Unlike Mahmoud and Jack, Jay doubted the value of creating special awards for
CBL faculty. She argued that eliminating the challenges to service-learning would be
more effective in attracting more faculty members to employ this pedagogy:

    I guess you could create rewards for it, but I’m not sure that that necessarily
motivates people because only a very small portion of people can get awards kind
of by definition. . . . Rather than trying to provide particular rewards for it, trying
to find ways to regularize it within the curriculum so that there are fewer barriers
to doing it.

Participants’ differing opinions about the role of rewards in motivating faculty members
to employ service-learning resemble those reported in Banerjee and Hausafus’ (2007)
study. In contrast to these findings, previous research suggested that rewards play a
central role in motivating faculty members to use this pedagogy (Levine, 1994). Such
mixed findings suggest that more research studies would better illuminate this area.

    Besides participants’ comments on tenure guidelines and reward structures, they
provided examples of other types of faculty support, including reducing the teaching
load, providing financial resources, and offering opportunities for team-teaching CBL courses. Given the extra amount of time faculty typically invest in CBL courses, Mahmoud suggested reducing “the teaching load” for faculty who teach CBL courses. In the same vein, Jack recommended developing “creative solutions to making it easier for professors to try it and encouragement to do it.” Jack stated that examples of these solutions may include offering faculty “additional support maybe . . . money available for it, . . . some buddy system, like co-taught CBL courses.” Moreover, Jack suggested recruiting professors of practice whose responsibility mainly focuses on strengthening the university relationships with communities:

For example, we could hire a professor of practice who could go out and do community work and never have to write it up. . . . So, if they’re doing teaching, they don’t have to do research. That gives them a third more time to develop classes and develop relationships and all these kinds of things. So, I think that . . . provides an opportunity to kind of develop these more community-based learning classes.

Jack’s suggestion to recruit professors of practice may contribute to advancing service-learning partnerships. Since less demand is put on these professors in terms of producing publications, they would have more time to develop relationships between the university and the community.

In addition to discussing the direct support systems to faculty members, participants suggested three other strategies to advancing service-learning partnerships: ensuring university leadership commitment, creating legal structures, building offices for NGO on campus, and assessing community impact of service-learning partnerships. Each of these suggestions is discussed in the following sections.
**Ensuring institutional leadership support.**

In discussing the role of university leadership in supporting faculty involvement in CBL partnerships, Huda felt that senior administrators’ support is important “because it [the CBL program] becomes more institutionalized if they [university leadership] support it.” Likewise, Jay stressed this role, noting “definitely. The leadership has to recognize that this is something that . . . they’re committed to.” This finding mirrors that of Vogelgesang’s (2004), as well as Hinck and Brandell’s (2000) studies in stressing the critical role university leadership can play in promoting faculty members’ involvement with the community.

**Building legal structures.**

Jack expressed concerns about the informal nature of the relationships between AUC and community-based organizations. As such, he recommended establishing legal contracts between the University and community partners. He thought that such structures would hold both sides accountable, ensure mutual benefits, and facilitate the evaluation of community impact:

If we’re developing these relationships, I think that there needs to be some type of formal mechanism . . . because then that way, there’s a level of accountability for both the professors, as well as the agencies. If we have this agreement, then it’s one way that we can at least identify at a very basic level what each side is getting out of the deal. And if there’s no agreement, then it’s harder to quantify and say, “Well what AUC is getting and what these organizations are getting.” So, I would use it as a way less for AUC’s benefit because I think AUC will get out of it what they need, but more for the protection of the NGOs that we clearly lay out what our expectations are and what we’re going to be giving to these organizations.

Jack’s suggestion reflects the cultural differences between Egypt and the U.S. In Egypt, people tend to connect with each other through personal relationships, and thus things
typically operate in a less formal manner. In the U.S., formal structures tend to prevail in the workplace. Therefore, this idea is reasonable in theory; however, in practice, its implementation may not be realistic. The vast majority of NGOs in Egypt are grassroots organizations with limited human and financial resources. Given the huge disparities in resources and capabilities between AUC and local NGOs, these organizations may feel intimidated to partner with AUC had the first imposed legal agreements on such collaborations. Therefore, AUC and other universities may consider signing less formal agreements with NGOs, such as memoranda of understanding that encompass such features as the goals, expected outcomes, roles of each partner, and method of assessment of such collaborations.

Designating space for partnering organizations on campus.

In discussing strategies to advance CBL partners, faculty members had two suggestions related to community-based organizations: establishing offices for these organizations on campus and assessing community impact. For example, Hend explained that her busy schedule along with the remote location of the new campus made it difficult for her to connect with NGOs, most of which are located in downtown Cairo. Therefore, she stated that establishing offices for the NGOs on campus would better enable her to be more involved with the NGOs:

Maybe to have the NGO offices at AUC. I have other commitments. Cairo traffic is terrible and parking space and all that. It is not that I don’t want to; it is because it is very difficult for me to do so. So, why don’t open offices. We have space around. . . . Why not even have offices inside AUC compound . . . the NGO built themselves . . . or maybe we can help them out? I can do my work here instead of going downtown or whatever. . . . That would be an excellent idea.
Pribbenow (2005) noted that service-learning is a novel pedagogy that requires faculty involvement and commitment. Finding ways to connect with faculty members on a regular basis was cited by community partners in this study and in several other ones (e.g., Sandy & Holland, 2006) as a significant challenge to establishing and sustaining service-learning partnerships. Therefore, it becomes necessary to find creative ways to increase the level of interactions between faculty members and community partners. Hend’s suggestion to establish small booths for NGOs is worthy of consideration. Given the increasing demands on faculty time, implementing this suggestion could be a practical solution to increasing interactions and communications between faculty members and community partners.

**Assessing community impact.**

Nearly all participants reported that assessing community impact of these partnerships has been absent and felt strongly that soliciting feedback from community partners is of paramount importance to the sustainability of CBL partnerships. Here are two examples by Huda and Jay, respectively:

Maybe it’s about time to . . . [assess] the impact on the community and see how it goes so far. You have been doing it for a few years now. Ask them [community partners] and from that, we can get the ideas where to go from here, how to move forward. I think . . . this will help. Always, it will help to stop, evaluate, and continue in a different direction.

If you’re going to have an ongoing partnership with them, that [assessing community impact] makes the most sense . . . because you need to know what you did right for not only the students, but what we did right or didn’t do right. How we could do it better. Because, otherwise, you can’t ensure that you’re going to be continuing to create value for them [community partners]. And the creation of value is the basis for the partnership.
The above comments indicate that while faculty members understand the value of evaluating the outcomes of these collaborations to communities, this indispensable component is missing in CBL partnerships at AUC. This study sought to address this gap by seeking the perspectives of a number of NGO professionals with which AUC partners. Yet, one study is not enough; rather, strategic planning for the program should include ongoing assessments of community impact as a core component of designing these partnerships. Doing so, of course, entails allocating sufficient human and financial resources for the program.
**Summary**

This section reported the findings of the faculty members group. Data analysis indicated that enhancing student learning and contributing to the community were the main motivators for faculty members’ involvement with CBL partnerships. Similar to earlier analyses, the theme of transactional partnerships along with aspirations for transformative relationships emerged as the most accurate descriptor of CBL partnerships. Participants identified several structural barriers to using service-learning. These barriers were clustered into five major categories related to the institution, pedagogy, student, the community, and faculty. Building a supportive culture to community engagement emerged as the most critical strategy to motivate faculty members to incorporate CBL components, thus advancing these partnerships. While the findings are largely consistent with past research, they provide new insights and offer directions for future research.
Students

This section provides the data analysis of student participants. As noted earlier, students’ perspectives of CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations were obtained using both quantitative and qualitative methods. As such, this section is organized into two major parts: part one introduces the results of the quantitative analyses; part two presents the findings of the qualitative analyses.

Quantitative Analyses

Results addressing hypotheses.

This section reports the results of quantitative data analysis as they relate to the raised hypotheses. The first hypothesis examined the relationship between the number of CBL courses and students’ scores on the two scales employed in the study: the Community Awareness and the Interpersonal Effectiveness. To address this hypothesis, a Pearson $r$ was calculated. As shown in Table 24, there was not a statistically significant correlation between the number of CBL courses and students’ scores the Community Awareness scale ($r = .21, N = 61, p = .102$) and there was not a significantly significant correlation between the number of CBL courses and students’ scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scales ($r = .15, N = 61, p = .256$). As such, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.
Table 24

Summary of Pearson r Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Community Awareness</th>
<th></th>
<th>Interpersonal Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CBL Courses</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours students spent at community-based organizations</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of other courses with a community component</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of participation in community activities outside the classroom</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Participation (inside and outside the classroom)</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: correlation is significant at the .05 level, two tailed.

The second hypothesis examined how students’ scores on both scales varied by the type of participation in CBL courses (optional versus mandatory). To address this hypothesis, independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare mean differences of students who participated in CBL courses on an optional basis and those who participated in CBL courses on a mandatory basis. Results show that there were no statistically significant differences between optional and mandatory participation in CBL courses on the Community Awareness scale \( (t = -1.82, \ df = 59, \ p = .074) \) or on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale \( (t = .64, \ df = 59, \ p = .522) \). As such, the null hypothesis could not be rejected for the Community Awareness scale or for the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale.

The third hypothesis investigated the relationship between the number of hours students spend at their community-based organizations per week in CBL courses and their scores on both scales. Pearson r was used to address this hypothesis. The test
indicates that there was no statistically significant correlation between the number of hours and students’ scores on the Community Awareness \( (r = .15, N = 61, p = .256) \). Likewise, there was no statistically significant correlation between the number of hours and students’ scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale \( (r = .08, N = 61, p = .538) \). Based on these results, the null hypothesis could not be rejected for any of the scales.

The fourth hypothesis examined whether students’ scores on both scales varied by the department in which they took their CBL courses. To address this hypothesis, independent samples \( t \)-tests were conducted to compare scores between students who took CBL courses in the Rhetoric department and those who took CBL courses in other departments. Results indicate that the difference between departments on the Community Awareness scale was statistically significant \( (t = -4.30, df = 57, p = .001) \). The differences between groups \( (M_{\text{Rhetoric}} = 38.56, M_{\text{other department}} = 44.19, SD_{\text{Rhetoric}} = 5.79, SD_{\text{other department}} = 4.27) \) indicate that students’ self-reported scores on the Community Awareness scale were higher for the students who took CBL courses in other departments than those who took CBL courses in the Rhetoric department. However, there was no statistically significant difference between departments on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale \( (t = -1.29, df = .57, p = .203) \). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for the Community Awareness scale, but failed to be rejected for the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale.

The fifth hypothesis examined the relationship between student involvement in community activities other than CBL courses and their scores on the Community Awareness and the Interpersonal Effectiveness scales. To determine this relationship,
students were asked to respond to three questions. The first one asked them to estimate the number of courses other than CBL courses that they have taken at AUC with a community component. Pearson $r$ showed that there was no statistically significant correlation between the number of courses other than CBL courses that students have taken at AUC with a community component and their scores on the Community Awareness scale ($r = -.02, N = 61, p = .908$). Similarly, the test indicated that was no statistically significant correlation between the number of courses other than CBL courses students have taken with a community component and their scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale ($r = .06, N = 61, p = .668$). The second question asked students to indicate how often they have participated in community involvement as part of their student experiences at AUC outside the classroom. Pearson $r$ showed that there was no statistically significant correlation between student involvement in community activities outside the classroom at AUC and their scores on the Community Awareness scale ($r = -.03, N = 61, p = .804$). Likewise, the test indicated that there was no statistically significant correlation between student involvement in community activities outside the classroom at AUC and their scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale ($r = .09, N = 61, p = .483$).

The third question asked students to summarize the number of both inside and outside classroom community activities in which they have participated at AUC. According to Cohen (1988), a correlation of .1 is considered low, .3 is medium, and .5 is high. Pearson $r$ showed that students’ scores on the Community Awareness scale were significantly correlated with their overall participation in community activities inside and
outside the classroom \( (r = .26, N = 61, p = .046) \). Based on Cohen’s standards, this correlation revealed that there was a positive weak relationship between the two variables. Squaring the correlation revealed that these two variables had 7.0% of the variance in common. A statistically significant positive correlation was also found between students’ scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale and the number of their overall participation in community activities inside and outside the classroom \( (r = .39, N = 61, p = .002) \). By Cohen’s guidelines, this correlation reveals that there was a positive moderate relationship between the two variables. Squaring the correlation revealed that these two variables had 15.0% of the variance in common. These results indicate that students who are engaged in both curricular and extracurricular activities with community components are likely to be aware of their communities and demonstrate effective interpersonal skills. These results have important implications for institutions of higher education: Promoting students’ civic engagement is better achieved through both curricular and extra-curricular offerings.

The sixth and last hypothesis examined the relationship between students’ demographic characteristics (age, GPA, gender, major, race, citizenship, and class level) and their scores on both scales. To determine the relationship between students’ ages and their scores on these two scales, Pearson \( r \) was calculated. Results showed that there was no statistically significant correlation between students’ ages and their scores on the Community Awareness scale \( (r = .24, N = 61, p = .080) \). Likewise, results indicated that there was no statistically significant correlation between students’ ages and their scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale \( (r = -.06, N = 61, p = .654) \). Pearson \( r \)
correlation was calculated to determine the relationship between students’ GPA and their scores on these two scales. Results showed that there was no statistically significant correlation between students’ GPA and their scores on the Community Awareness scale ($r = -.16$, $N = 61$, $p = .227$). Likewise, results indicated that there was no statistically significant correlation between students’ GPA and their scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale ($r = .02$, $N = 61$, $p = .871$).

To determine if students’ scores on the Community Awareness and the Interpersonal Effectiveness scales varied by their majors, an analysis of variance one-way anova was conducted. Results showed that there was no statistically significant difference between students’ scores on the Community Awareness scale based on their majors, $F (2, 53) = 1.27$, $p = .29$. Likewise, results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between students’ scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale by majors, $F (2, 53) = .97$, $p = .39$.

As the sample characteristics revealed, the overwhelming majority of the survey respondents were Egyptians. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare scores between Egyptians and non-Egyptians on the two scales. Results showed that there was no statistically significant difference between citizenship status groups on the Community Awareness scale ($t = .82$, $df = .58$, $p = .413$). Similarly there was no statistically significant difference between citizenship status on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale ($t = -.11$, $df = .58$, $p = .913$). The sample characteristics also showed that the vast majority of the survey respondents were Arabs. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to examine whether or not students’ scores on both scales varied based
on their racial/ethnic backgrounds. Results revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between students’ racial/ethnic backgrounds and their scores on the Community Awareness scale \( (t = .68, \text{df} = 58, p = .502) \). Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference between students’ racial backgrounds and their scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale \( (t = -.91, \text{df} = 58, p = .367) \).

Similar to earlier analyses, independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare differences in scores on both scales between students at the undergraduate class level and those at the graduate level. Results showed that there was no statistically significant difference between class level on the Community Awareness scale \( (t = -1.31, \text{df} = 58, p = .196) \) or on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale \( (t = -.65, \text{df} = 58, p = .517) \).

Finally, independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare gender differences in scores on both scales. Results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between males and females’ scores on the Community Awareness scale \( (t = .74, \text{df} = 58, p = .464) \) or on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale \( (t = -.02, \text{df} = 58, p = .99) \). Based on these results, the null hypothesis, stating that there is no relationship between students’ demographics and their scores on the Community Awareness and Interpersonal Effectiveness scales, could not be rejected with the sole exception of differences based on department. Table 25 provides a summary of the independent samples t-test results.
Table 25

Summary of Independent Samples T-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Community Awareness</th>
<th>Interpersonal Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class level</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Ancillary Analysis Results

A total of 61 responses were received; forty one (67.2%) of the survey responses were submitted electronically via an online survey while twenty (32.8%) were administered on hard copies using paper and pencil. To determine whether or not students’ scores on the two scales varied by the method of survey administration, independent samples t-tests were conducted. Results show that there was a statistically significant difference in students’ scores on the Community Awareness scale based on the method of survey administration ($t = -2.52$, df = 59, $p = .015$). Students who submitted their responses electronically scored higher than those who completed the survey manually on hard copies ($M_{\text{hard copies}} = 38.85$, $M_{\text{electronic copies}} = 42.66$, $SD_{\text{hard copies}} = 6.02$, $SD_{\text{electronic copies}} = 5.31$). Likewise, there a statistically significant difference in students’ scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale by the method of survey administration ($t = -2.26$, df = 59, $p = .025$). Students with electronic responses scored higher than those with who filled in the survey manually ($M_{\text{hard copies}} = 26.25$, $M_{\text{electronic copies}} = 28.83$, $SD_{\text{hard copies}} = 4.20$, $SD_{\text{electronic copies}} = 4.08$). These results indicate that the
method of survey administration was associated with students’ responses. Given the small size of this sample and its other limitations discussed in the third chapter, Methods, this conclusion is not definitive. Rather, more research studies with bigger sample sizes are required to accumulate more evidence on the effect, if any, of the method of survey administration on participants’ responses.

As noted above, many of the survey participants indicated that their first-hand experience with CBL courses happened in the spring of 2011. This time period was critical in Egypt because of the Revolution of January 25th 2011. This revolution affected life in Egypt in many significant ways. In regard to the CBL program, the revolution led AUC to impose higher security measures. As a result, the program was confined in several ways during that semester. In some courses, for example, students started their projects late in the semester. Also, restrictions were put on students’ visits to the NGOs.

Taking into considerations these factors, further analysis was warranted to investigate how might students’ scores differed based on the semester in which they took CBL courses. To determine this difference, independent samples t-tests were conducted. Results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in students’ scores on the Community Awareness scale based on semester during CBL courses were taken ($t = -3.89$, $df = 57$, $p = .001$). Students who enrolled in CBL courses in the spring of 2011 scored lower than those who enrolled in earlier semesters ($M_{spring~semester} = 39.75$, $M_{earlier~semesters} = 44.91$, $SD_{spring~semester} = 5.61$, $SD_{earlier~semesters} = 3.76$). These results can be attributed, in part, to the limited interactions students had with the NGOs during that
semester. There was, however, no statistically significant difference in students’ scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale by semester ($t = -1.95$, $df = 57$, $p = .056$).

The statistically significant difference in students’ scores on the Community Awareness scale based on the semester of enrollment in CBL courses prompted another research hypothesis: Is there a statistically significant association between the department and semester in which students take CBL courses? To test this hypothesis, a chi-square analysis was conducted. Results revealed that there was a statistically significant association between semester and department: $\chi^2 (1, N = 57) = 14.87$, $p = .001$. Table 26 provides descriptive statistics about this association. The association was of a moderate strength: $\Phi^2 = .511$. So, the semester when students took CBL courses was moderately related to the department in which they took CBL courses. This indicates that the statistically significant difference which was found in students’ scores on the Community Awareness scale by department is confounded by the semester during which students took CBL courses.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlier Semesters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion.

The literature abounds with studies assessing the impact of service-learning on college students participating in service-learning (e.g., Eyler & Giles, 1999; Moely et al.,
2002). This study breaks new ground by examining a relatively unexplored area in the literature; specifically, this study investigated the relationships between college students’ outcomes from service-learning and course experiences as well as students’ demographics. The intent of this study was to examine whether the quality of course experiences matters and whether students’ demographic characteristics affect their gains from service-learning. However, the results did not provide sufficient evidence to supporting these relationships. The lack of statistically significant results in this study should not be interpreted such that course experiences or students’ demographics do not affect students’ outcomes from service-learning. Rather, these results should be considered in light of the small sample size and limitations of the sample discussed earlier in the third chapter, Methods.

Aside from these limitations, this study reinforces previous results and conflicts with others. For example, the results of this study showed that there were no statistically significant relationships between students’ demographics—gender, citizenship status, race/ethnicity, class level, grade point average, or religion—and their scores on the Community Awareness or Interpersonal Effectiveness scales. Similar to the results of this study, Bowman et al. (2010) found that students’ gains from service-learning were generally unrelated to their demographic characteristics, including race/ethnicity, gender, or family income. These results are also consistent with those of Eyler and Giles (1999) except that these scholars reported gender effects in that women were more likely to gain from service-learning outcomes than men. These results suggest that the gains from service-learning courses are not limited to a specific group of students with particular
demographic characteristics. Rather, these results indicate that service-learning courses can affect all college students regardless of their demographic backgrounds.

The results of this study showed that there was no statistically significant relationship between types of students’ participation in service-learning courses—mandatory versus optional—and their scores on the two scales employed. Similarly, Eyler and Giles (1999) reported that there was not an agreement among service-learning students on whether or not service-learning should be a requirement; 61.0% of students believed that it was appropriate to mandate service-learning while 17.0% opposed this idea. Students’ disagreement on this issue calls for more research to better illuminate this area.

No statistically significant relationship was found between the number of CBL courses and students’ scores on the two scales employed in the study. Unlike these results, Bowman et al. (2010) found that students who had taken previous service-learning courses had significantly greater gains on three outcome measures, responsibility for improving society, openness to diversity, and empowerment view of helping, than students who were taking their first courses. Similarly, Spring, Dietz, and Grimm (2005) reported a correlation between the number and type of quality service-learning experiences and students’ outcomes in the areas of civic engagement in K-12 settings.

There was no statistically significant relationship between the number of hours students spent at their respective NGOs and students’ scores on the two scales employed. Again, this result should be viewed in light of the sample’s limitation, namely the vast majority of students performed one to five hours of service per week. In contrast to this
result, prior research suggested a positive relationship between the amount of time students spend conducting community service and their civic values. For example, Kendrick (1996) and Markus, Howard, and King (1993) indicated that students who spend at least twenty hours during a semester attain greater awareness of social problems and more positive attitudes toward community involvement. In a similar vein, Marby’s (1998) study did not detect statistical significant differences in post course personal values and civic attitudes between groups spending different numbers of community service hours. Yet, she selected a statistically significant positive change in civic attitudes within the group that conducted fifteen to nineteen service hours. Furthermore, she reported that service learners who spent fewer than fourteen hours conducting community service perceived significant less academic gains than other students. In K-12 schools, Billing and Broderson (2007) found that the duration of service-learning activities was positively related to valuing school, civic engagement, social responsibility, and locus of control.

**Qualitative Analyses**

Similar to the organization style of the previous sections pertaining to NGO professionals, administrators, and faculty members, this section is arranged into two main parts. It opens with a brief description of the participants: Adham, Farida, Mostafa, and Theresa. The discussion then turns to analyzing the data as they relate to the four research questions guiding this study. Table 27 provides an overview of the student participants in the study.
Table 27

Overview of Student Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonyms</th>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Community Engagement Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adham (أدهم)</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Message (رسالة)</td>
<td>Tutoring children and poverty alleviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farida (فريدة)</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Alashanek ya Balady (عشتاك يا بلدي)</td>
<td>Grant writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostafa (مصطفى)</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Alwan wa Awtar (ألوان وأوتار)</td>
<td>Grant writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Street Children</td>
<td>Entertaining children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Descriptions

**Adham (أدهم).**

Adham, a young man, was a senior with a major in Electronics Engineering at AUC. He was the 2010/2011 President of a student-run club, Message. His responsibilities included setting the vision of, seeking external funds for, and coordinating with, the other officers and members to realize the goals of the club. Reflecting on the development of the club, Adham noted that it began with charitable activities; each semester, students would visit several underprivileged communities and provide services, such as offering monetary support, giving out clothes, and building homes. In 2011, a significant “transformation” in the strategic planning of the club occurred so as to target sustainable development rather than charity. Specifically, the club leadership decided to focus on one community for an extended period of time where the club members would stay longer so that they could see the impact of their work on that community.
In the 2010-2011 academic year, the club chose to focus on a low-income community called El-Doeka (الدويقة). The club executive board developed plans for several activities in that community, such as matching jobless individuals with employers and reenrolling children who dropped out of the traditional school system in community schools. The club’s plans also included offering English and computer classes to improve the English and technology skills of community members, thus enhancing their access to good job opportunities. To help generate income for women, the club planned on marketing their embroidery products. Given the busy schedules of students, the club leadership feared they would not be able to manage and sustain all these projects. Therefore, they decided to follow a step-by-step approach in which they would start with a few projects and gradually undertake more projects. The major project in 2010/2011 was offering weekly classes for children where members of the club would teach community children introductory-level courses on ethics, morality, and etiquettes. Discussing the value of these courses, Adham stated that instead of wasting their time playing on the streets, a typical behavior among children in underprivileged communities, these children gathered around AUC students on Fridays and learned basic lessons about decent social behavior. Besides this project, the club’s members surveyed the community to identify jobless individuals and children who quit schools. To address the first issue, the club established relationships with business persons who could potentially provide job opportunities for community members. To tackle the second issue, the club started raising funds for enrolling children in community schools.

1 Community schools are educational institutions whose mission is to retain students who quit schools before graduation. These schools offer intensive curricula to help dropouts catch up with what they have missed and prepare them for high school diplomas.
As the President of Message, Adhm’s responsibilities went beyond running the internal activities of the club to establishing relationships with other entities on- and off-campus. For example, he reached out to corporations to convince them to sponsor the club’s events and/or provide trainings for its members. Also, Adham alongside other Message’s officers and members launched on-campus campaigns to increase the visibility of the club among the campus community. Moreover, he collaborated with other student-led clubs on campus as well as individuals outside of the campus community to enlarge the club’s capacity to provide more services to poor communities. An example of these collaborative initiatives was launching a fundraising campaign to raise money to purchase meat then distribute it among the needy in poor areas in Cairo, such as Ean El-Sera (عين الصيرة), Maser El-Kadema (مصر القديمة), in addition to El-Doeka (الدويقة). The Clothes Campaign—typically known as El-Koswa (الكسوة) which takes place before festival days—was another popular and regular collaborative effort between Message and both the campus community and external donors. In this campaign, the club encouraged students to donate clothes and urge their friends and relatives to donate as well. The club members then washed and ironed the donated clothes to ensure that they would be in good shape before distributing them among the needy. The club used online social media tools, such as Facebook, to market its campaigns.

In addition to his involvement in community service activities, Adham held a student job at the Career Advising and Services Office on campus where he helped plan and implement several activities, including preparation for conferences. He also took part in several trainings on leadership and communication skills. To Adham, AUC is a
distinct university in that it offers students a wide range of extracurricular activities to engage in their communities and advance their interpersonal skills; he felt that students who do not seize these opportunities miss out significantly from their college experience.

**Farida (فريدة).**

Farida, a young woman, was a junior in the Anthropology department at AUC. She was born and raised in Austria by her Egyptian father and Austrian mother. Farida spoke English and Arabic in addition to her native language, German. She came to Egypt to study for a bachelor’s degree at AUC. *Rhetoric 410: Grant Writing for Community Building* was her first and only CBL course at the time of this dissertation. Before this course, Farida was involved with an NGO, Alashanek Ya Baladey (علشانك يا بلدي), with whom she continued to work throughout her CBL course. Based on the course goal, Farida and one of her classmates developed a grant proposal to seek funding for an educational facility in a poor neighborhood. This proposal illustrated how the funds would be used to establish a library and buy books thus increasing the level of education among the community members of this neighborhood.

Farida had been in Egypt for almost four years. Reflecting on her experiences when she first arrived in Egypt, she mentioned that she was quite shocked to see widespread poverty in Egypt in the rich and poor neighborhoods alike. Farida was also disturbed by the power relationships and hierarchies in society. She explained that although people were supposed to be polite and respect each other, individuals from the upper- and middle-class were not expected to form friendships with those from the lower classes, especially those with menial jobs, such as maids, waitress, and janitors. Farida’s
primary motivator for engagement in community work stemmed from her desire to bridge the wide gap between the rich and the poor. She was also inspired by the youth activist movement which had been growing rapidly in Egypt in the past decade.

**Mostafa (مصطفى)**

Mostafa, an eighteen-year old male, was a freshman at AUC. He descended from an Egyptian family, but lived almost half of his life abroad in several countries in Europe and North America. Mostafa expressed a desire to settle in Egypt. He took one course with a CBL component, *Rhetoric 410: Grant Writing for Community Building*, in which he learned how to write grant proposals. To satisfy the community component of the course, Mostafa and his classmates teamed up with several NGOs to understand their goals and then develop grant proposals to ask for funding to help accomplish these goals.

In his project, Mostafa and three of his classmates worked alongside an NGO, Alwan wa Awtar, to write a grant proposal for a new initiative undertaken by the organization at this time. Specifically, Alwan wa Awtar developed a new program entitled, Live and Learn, which aimed to employ innovative learning tools to provide children with enjoyable learning experiences. To emphasize that learning can occur beyond the school setting, the new program encouraged children to learn in different settings. To stress that knowledge can be gained from both academicians and community members, the new initiative offered children network opportunities with people within and outside of their community. Mostafa showed a positive attitude toward CBL courses, expressing his willingness to take more CBL courses in the future.
Mostafa reflected on the January 25th Egyptian Revolution noting that his family supported the revolution, but was reluctant to let him participate in it for fear over his safety. However, he did participate on a sporadic basis. For example, he went demonstrating on January 28th, which is known as Friday of Anger; the Arabic translation is (جمعة الغضب). On that day, Mostafa said that he went to a low-income neighborhood, El-Sayeda Aayesh (السيدة عائشة), near the Citadel where he saw acts of vandalism and people setting fire to government buildings. By the time he arrived there, the government had drawn the police forces and released criminals from prisons. He remembered seeing the streets blocked by the Neighborhood Watch Groups2. However, Mostafa felt that he had to stay home to protect his family.

When the situation became less tense, Mostafa went to Tahrir Square twice. He was most involved on February 11, the day on which former Egyptian President Muhammad Hosni Mubarak (محمد حسني مبارك) stepped down. Mostafa regretted leaving the square two hours before the announcement was made, yet, he recalled being in the car with his uncle and cousins when he heard Omar Suleiman (عمر سليمان), former Chair of Egyptian Intelligence, via the car’s radio stating, “The President stepped down.” The Arabic translation is (تنحى الرئيس عن السلطة). He remembered seeing people cheering, honking horns, and dancing in the streets. To Mostafa, that “was a day to remember.” He continued to take part in the protests following the uprising, the aim of which had been to exercise pressure on the Supreme Council of Armed Forces to take practical steps

---

2 After the withdrawal of police forces from the streets during Egyptian Revolution in 2011, civilians stepped out to protect their families and properties. For example, they sat roadblocks, checked and searched incoming cars, and patrolled the streets.
toward bringing about the positive social change to which people aspire and for which thousands of Egyptians sacrificed their lives during the revolution and beyond.

**Theresa.**

Theresa, a young woman, was a sophomore with a double major in Political Science and Sociology at AUC. She identified herself as an African American U.S. citizen from the State of Louisiana. Theresa took three courses with community components—*Sociology 201: Introduction to Sociology; Political Science 310: Introduction to Development;* and *Community Development: SOC/ANTH/PSYC 240.*

Reflecting on the Sociology course, Theresa noted that the class did not establish relationships with communities yet it incorporated a reflection component, which she thought was a good start for freshmen courses. In the Political Science course, students with advanced Arabic language skills were selected by the course instructor to visit a number of community-based organizations on a weekly basis. Based on these visits, the students developed critique papers on the culture of civil society in Egypt.

The community development course developed a relationship with an NGO that focused on street children. Theresa and her fellow classmates conducted weekly “street observations” on El-Haram Street (شارع الهرم) where they observed the street children that the NGO had identified. During these observations, Theresa and her classmates tried to speak to these children and inform them about the available opportunities at this organization, such as safe spaces to sleep, take shower, or have food. In addition to these courses, Theresa was heavily involved with several NGOs through her work at the Gerhart Center. She worked with other students and staff members at the Center to first
gather information about community-based organizations, such as their contact information and activities, and second create a database and upload this information onto the CBL website.

Driven by her interest in Islam and strong passion for Arab culture, Theresa studied Arabic for four years before she came to Egypt in 2008. She continued to take Arabic courses as part of her bachelor’s degree at AUC. Commenting on her steady commitment to learning Arabic, Theresa stressed that a thorough understanding of a particular culture necessitates learning its language. Recalling her memories about the January 25th Egyptian revolution, she stated that her Egyptian host family refused to allow her go to Tahrir Square during the uprising. At first, Theresa felt angry for having been barred from going to the square. Then, however, she accepted this decision; Theresa elaborated that she would have hated to feel that her participation in the protests as a U.S. citizen might have delegitimatized the revolution, especially on the days when the claims about foreign conspiracies were made. She explained that although she had lived in Egypt for three years, her life was not restricted by the old government. As such, she felt that it was not her “place” to go protest in Tahrir Square. Rather, she thought that it was important to support Egyptian people during that critical period. In addition to being in solidarity with the protesters, Theresa felt a responsibility for conveying the complexity of the situation to the people in the outside world. Specifically, she got angry with judgmental views made by foreigners about the pro-Mubarak regime and the individuals who did not participate in the revolution. She wanted to play a role in explaining the multiple facets of the situation and the diversity of opinions among
Egyptians as the events of the revolution unfolded. Overall, Theresa felt that the revolution “was a great experience.” Although she wished that she could have gone to Tahrir Square during that time, she stated that she had learned more about herself and those in her circle of acquaintances by not going. Also, Theresa was impressed by how relationships among people were redefined because of what happened during the revolution.

**Themes**

**Partnership motivations.**

The theme of desire to contribute to their communities and boost their academic and professional growth describes students’ motivations for participating in AUC-NGOs collaborations. This theme was evident when students spoke of the reasons why they enrolled in CBL courses and other courses with community components. The subsequent sections shed light on both components of this theme: contributing to the community and advancing their academic and personal growth. Table 28 provides a summary of student motivations.
Table 28

**Student Motivations for Participating in CBL Partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desire to contribute to their communities and boost their academic and professional growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Desire to contribute to their communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- addressing extreme poverty and diminish economic disparities between the rich and the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- self-fulfillment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- awareness of one’s privilege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- sense of interconnectedness to fellow humans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Boosting academic and professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- earning practical experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- gaining unique learning experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- acquiring professional development experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- satisfying the requirements of academic degrees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contribute to the community.**

In response to a question about their motivations for enrolling in CBL courses, many of the participants cited their goals to learn about and benefit their communities. For example, a survey respondent stated, “To learn more about my community, get more involved, and be able to participate in helping others.” Another survey respondent noted, “To combine my education with the duty I have as a citizen to benefit/contribute to my community.” These comments indicate that students were motivated to join CBL partnerships by a sense of social responsibility for their communities.

**Addressing extreme poverty and diminish economic disparities between the rich and the poor.**

While students spoke of a wide range of societal issues that they hoped to address through CBL courses, extreme poverty and economic disparities between the rich and the
poor were the most frequently cited issues. Mostafa’s motivation for taking a CBL course shed light on the economic injustices issue:

Just in between home and AUC, just walking in the streets, you remember the disparity between classes, the huge difference between the upper class and the lower class, the socioeconomic gap. It reminds you of how privileged you are and how lucky you are to live the way you do. And makes you want to help.

In this quote, Mostafa unequivocally noted that the noticeable economic differences between the poor and the rich, which along with an awareness of his economic privilege led him to want to help his community. Farida’s comments highlight the issue of acute poverty:

When you step out of the house, it doesn’t matter where you are, if you’re in El-Zamalek (الزمالك)، or in El-Maddi (المعادي)، [or] in any [other] rich neighborhood, still you will step out and see poverty. You can see it even in rich neighborhoods. There is no place where you won’t see poverty. So, this affected me a lot and it was a real shock. I knew that it [Egypt] has poverty, but that it is so obvious and right in front of you.

These words show how Farida was so disturbed by seeing poverty spread everywhere in Egyptian society that she wanted to work to help diminish it. She referenced Egyptian activists, particularly youth, as having a significant influence on her involvement in community work, “There are a lot of Raghda El-Ebrashi3 (رغده الإبراشي). She’s Egyptian and she started everything. There are a lot of Egyptians who also care... There was this that motivated me to look for something to help.” Farida’s comments demonstrate that youth can empower each other. Her words also indicate that youth leadership can act as role models and provide a sense of direction for college students.

3 Raghda El-Ebrashi was a recent AUC alumna. During her collegiate years, she and other students started an organization, Alashanek ya Balady [For You My County] in 2002. The organization was registered as an NGO in 2005. The organization targets four major goals: learning, entrepreneurship, employment, and activism.
While Farida highlighted the role of senior colleagues in encouraging her to seek community service opportunities, other students spoke of the role of fellow students. For example, a survey respondent stated: “it [the CBL course] was recommended for me from a previous student” which suggests that students may take CBL courses based on advice from fellow students who had taken these courses.

_Awareness of one’s privilege._

Similar to Mostafa, other students cited their critical consciousness of their privileged backgrounds as a motivator for their community work. For example, Adham, who characterized himself as belonging to a middle-class family, offered the following perspective:

> Since I am on campus on a free scholarship, I very grateful. (الحمد لله) [can be translated into English as “thanks me to God”] that I have something that so many people have applied for they did not get it. I did. The least thing you can do to pay back is to help others as you have been helped.

Adham felt privileged to be accepted into AUC on a full scholarship and thought that making contributions to the community was the minimum he could do to show gratitude for the opportunity he earned, unlike many applicants who did not receive it. When asked whether or not he was motivated by religion, Adham explicitly asserted:

> Definitely, (الحمد لله) [can be translated into English as thanks me to God], I am a Muslim and I think I was saying a big part of thanking Allah (God) for all the gifts He’s giving me is to at least pay back a little bit which is just nothing compare[d] to what I have (الحمد لله) [can be translated into English as “thanks me to God”]. Definitely, it’s a big part of what motivates me is my religion, definitely.
This quote again demonstrates that Adham is aware of his privilege as compared with compatriots and views community service as a means to thank God in addition to give back to his community.

While Adham stressed religion as a main motivator for his engagement in the community, other students did not highlight religion as a major factor influencing their decisions to join CBL partnerships. For example, Mostafa thought,

Regardless of your religious views, I think everyone has this need. Everyone wants to do good for the community. Everyone wants to see... goodness spread. They want to see more good in the world and less bad.

Implicit in Mostafa’s words is the belief that individuals are motivated to contribute to their communities by a secular concern for the common good.

Students’ comments revealed that they were motivated to take CBL courses as a way for gaining a sense of accomplishment. For example, Adham spoke of a collective goal of students who are involved in community service activities, “Our own aim is sort of self-fulfillment.” Likewise, a survey respondent mentioned that she took CBL courses “for the need of giving.” These quotes indicate that some students viewed CBL courses as opportunities to make a mark on their communities, and thereby gain a feeling of efficacy and fulfillment.

Students’ desires to take part in service-learning courses as a means for self-realization can be best understood in light of the political situation in Egypt prior to the 25th January, 2011 revolution. During that period, youth were excluded from public spaces. The Youth Activism and Public Space in Egypt Report (YAPSER) (2011) highlighted several examples of the trends of youth exclusion including “unemployment,
declining health, delayed marriage, and labor market segmentation” (p. 10). In spite of their marginalization by the previous government, youth actively exercised their citizenship in various ways, such as establishing not-for-profit organizations, joining online social media, and engaging in arts (YAPSER, 2011). Students’ comments suggest that they viewed CBL courses as another outlet through which they can demonstrate their right of civic participation.

*Sense of interconnectedness with fellow humans.*

Other students took CBL courses because of their sense of interconnectedness to fellow humans. In this regard, Theresa, who identified herself as a U.S. citizen, offered the following perspective:

I don’t really think there is a point to life if you are not trying to improve or help others. . . . Lots of people like to harp on the problems in society or in the world today. But, a lot of the discourse doesn’t necessarily connect a lot of the fault in society to the fact that we as people some where down the road have forgotten that we depend on each other and it is not just each man for himself. . . . I mean let’s say that you may disrespect a person who picks up the garbage. He picks up the garbage that is his function. But without him, you would have to get down from your high horse to pick up the garbage or the garbage would stay there and you will have environmental repercussion.

Similar to Theresa’s views, a survey respondent stated:

I love community-based learning because it always reminds us that we are part of the community and that we are all the same. We deserve to be equal in all aspects and CBL gave me the opportunity to help share this with a social class that I might be surrounded with, but never dealt with.

These comments suggest that CBL courses enable students to live meaningfully in ways which allow them to further their ideals. For example, through her engagement in CBL courses and other community service work, Theresa was able to live in a meaningful way by helping others. Likewise, CBL courses allowed the survey respondent an opportunity
to spread her belief in the equity of people among others, especially those who were typically outside of her sphere.

**Boosting academic and professional Skills.**

In addition to their desires to benefit their communities, data analysis revealed that students sought CBL courses to advance their own learning and professional growth. The section that follow discusses students’ references to this theme.

**Earning practical experiences.**

Some students enrolled in CBL courses to gain practical experiences. In this regard, a survey respondent noted that she took a CBL course because it “gives a practical aspect to the theory that is covered in class.” Similarly, another survey respondent stated, “It [the CBL course] seemed interesting and practical experience is always useful.” Analogous to several other nations, education in Egypt generally places high emphasis on theory with little attention to the practical application of knowledge (Cochran, 2008). As such, students are hardly offered opportunities to apply theoretical concepts learned in the classroom in real-life situations. The prevalence of such a pedagogy in Egypt explains, in part, students’ quest for practical experiences. Consequently, some students were attracted to the CBL program because of the practical nature of its courses.

**Gaining unique learning experiences.**

Besides gaining practical experiences, some students sought CBL courses to learn different approaches to their academic interests. For example, a survey respondent explained, “I minor in Psychology and wanted a diversity of psychology concepts in the
courses I studied.” Other students thought that CBL courses would enable them to gain new learning experiences. A survey respondent put it this way: “I enrolled in CBL courses to try something different in university.”

*Acquiring professional development experiences.*

Other students mentioned that they were motivated to take CBL courses hoping to acquire professional development experiences. Students referenced a host of interpersonal effectiveness skills, including leadership, C.V. building, and preparation for the labor market. For example, a survey respondent joined CBL courses, “To gain experience and improve my leadership skills.” Mostafa thought, “This is something I am going to be very happy to put on my C.V. to say that I co-wrote a grant proposal during my freshman year. So, I feel that I am benefiting very much.” Another survey respondent took a CBL course to “learn skills that I’ll use in my future work.” These findings confirm those of Scheibel et al. (2005) about the value of participating in university-community partnerships for students in building their skills and résumés, and gaining opportunities for career exploration.

*Satisfying the requirements of academic degrees.*

Finally, a group of students indicated that they enrolled in CBL courses simply because these courses were mandatory to fulfill the requirements of their academic degrees. Here are two examples from survey respondents: “I was obliged to enroll as a part of my curriculum” and “I took the course as a core capstone level.” These comments call attention to the role academic departments can play in integrating service-learning into students’ core courses. However, there is a debate in the literature concerning the
pros and cons of mandating service-learning courses for students. On the one hand, a number of scholars call for making service-learning courses mandatory for college students, arguing that engaging students in civic activities is very important, and thereby should be integrated into the curriculum (Boyer, 1990; Butin, 2006b; Holland, 1999; Jacoby, 1996). On the other hand, another group is concerned about the adverse effects of forcing students to take these courses against their will. This group poses questions of whether or not behavior done under external pressure actually leads to internalization of prosocial values and behavioral intentions (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1987). These scholars argued that if mandated students start to perceive that they provide help only when required or rewarded, their intentions to freely engage in volunteer service in the future may be reduced (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1991; Kunda & Schwartz, 1983; Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999).

The findings of this study are mixed in this area. That is, data included evidence for and against mandating service-learning courses. Examples of the data supporting the value of making service-learning part of the core curriculum included, “In the beginning, it was a requirement, but then I became interested,” a survey participant said. Another survey respondent explained:

I was required to take a human spirit course as part of my core curriculum requirements, that was the reason actually. But of course, things have changed as I have advanced in the course. I am convinced with the idea of community service and civic engagement and so on. And I have been doing so for more than five years now. I was not expecting that much from the course I have taken, but it indeed gave me much more different experience than the ones I have gained from the activities that I have been part of.
These comments illustrate how students first learned about service-learning in their core courses. Based on these obligatory experiences, students developed genuine interests in community service activities. Logically then, one could argue that these mandatory courses played an important role in introducing these students to service-learning; students might not have developed a passion for community service had they not taken these compulsory courses.

In contrast, other participants advised against the idea of making service-learning courses obligatory. For example, Mostafa offered the following perspective:

I think making it [CBL course] a requirement might be a mistake. . . . When we see that with some courses where there is required volunteering, in my opinion, that sort of defeats the purpose because volunteering means that you’re doing something out of your willingness to do it, out of the goodness of your heart. If it’s required volunteering, then you don’t have the necessary motivation. You just do it for a grade. I mean it might if you’re doing it just for the grade, it could actually harm the organization, it would be harming the community rather than benefiting the community. So, that’s one thing I think we shouldn’t do.

In this comment, Mostafa drew attention to the potential negative consequences on the community had students taken CBL courses for the sole purpose of earning a grade for a course. There is conflicting evidence for and against integrating service-learning into students’ college experiences making this area fertile for future investigation. For example, research could focus on exploring the advantages and disadvantages of mandating service-learning courses, along with identifying the factors, such as institutional type and students’ class level, which may affect students’ views regarding this issue.

While many students were motivated to enroll in CBL courses by one reason, others were attracted to these courses by multiple motivations, including learning new
experiences, earning credits toward the completion of their academic degrees, and
benefiting their communities. Here are two examples demonstrating the multiplicity of
students’ motivations: “It's a new experience. The idea of the course encouraged me; I’d
help the community and at the same time I am taking a course that counts towards my
degree requirements” said a survey respondent. Likewise, Farida mentioned:

I read about the course online, but I was very spontaneous because I needed to fill
a capstone requirement course. So, I looked it up and there were several writing
courses and I felt like I wanted to take a writing course. And then I found this one
and I read the information about the course, the description and I thought it was
perfect. So, that’s why. So, I’m getting even more; I’m getting credit for it; I’m
getting the core requirement out of the way; and I’m doing something good for
the community. So, it’s really great.

These findings show that students are attracted to CBL courses by a sense of
social responsibility for their communities, a concern for the public good, and a spirit of
activism, as well as the opportunity to enhance their own academic outcomes and gain
professional development experiences. Such findings reinforce Frank’s (1996) argument
that individuals are motivated to give by egoistic as well altruistic factors. According to
42). Rather, they signify “complex intentions of the giver” (Frank, p. 16). Clearly,
students’ voices illustrate their different motivations to participate in service-learning
partnerships. The sections that follow present the second theme pertaining to the
relationships among CBL partners.

**Partnership relationships.**

Similar to the previous groups, the theme of transactional relationships along with
aspirations to engage in transformative partnerships characterizes students’ perceptions of
CBL collaborations. This theme captures students’ descriptions of the activities and goals of these collaborations and their reflections on issues pertaining to reciprocity, partners’ attitudes toward the program, and their interactions with one another. The subsequent sections explore these dimensions in greater detail. Table 29 shows the dimensions of the relationships theme.

Table 29

Students’ Perceptions of CBL Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional relationships along with aspirations for transformative partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- nature of CBL activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- interaction with community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Partners’ goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Reciprocal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Partnership vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Positive attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nature of CBL activities.**

Students described how CBL partnerships engaged them in a wide array of activities. One survey respondent, self-identified as a male, stated that he did the following activities:

- Interviewed parents of children with disabilities then analyzed and coded the interviews; mentored children with intellectual and motor disabilities, participated in a fund-raising campaign to renovate a ward in the El-Abyssyia [العباسيه] Mental Health Hospital; painted beds in the Abbasyia Mental Health Hospital; provided capacity building for a local NGO on how to design, implement, and evaluate community-based programs that tackle social issues.

Other survey respondents highlighted examples of a variety of other CBL activities including, “Tutored elders, tutored kids, taught English to the workers of [the] University, participated in campaigns that collected money to help underprivileged families,” “I was
documenting stories of African refugees' daily life in Cairo,” “in one class we developed a planning system for a Cairo-based NGO. In the other class, we're currently developing a website for the New Cairo community as well as a development and promotion plan,” “painting, physical exercises, games, talking to the children about their condition and situation. Talk with members of an NGO to construct a questionnaire targeting the poorest communities in Cairo to ask them about employment opportunities,” and “tutoring children and playing games with orphans.” Clearly, CBL partnerships engaged students in a wide variety of activities ranging from basic tasks, such as painting walls and tutoring children and adults, to more sophisticated actions, such as interviewing underprivileged groups and developing evaluation instruments.

Adler and Goggin (2005) grouped civic engagement efforts into four main categories: civic engagement as community service, civic engagement as collective action, civic engagement as political action, and civic engagement as social change. The aforementioned examples imply that CBL partnerships engaged students in civic engagement initiatives that focused primarily on community service and collective action with minimum attention to social change, and hardly any consideration to political action. As the literature review chapter revealed, a number of scholars tend to emphasize the relationship between civic engagement and political actions (Gorham, 1992; Marullo & Edwards, 2000). Yet, another camp suggests the notion of continuum in which civic engagement includes both political and apolitical activities (Colby et al., 2003). Although there is no agreement in the literature on the superiority of one category of civic engagement over the other, basic community service activities generally
characterize transactional relationships whereas political action endeavors typically
describe transformative partnerships (Robinson, 2000).

**Interaction with community partners.**

Students had quite limited interactions with community partners. For example,
Mostafa stated: “To be quite honest, we haven’t really gone out that much for the
community-based course. I mean it’s only really been twice and one of those times, I
wasn’t around.” Likewise, the survey respondents also mentioned sporadic
communication with NGO professionals. Here are three illustrative examples: “There
were only two visits to the organization,” “we very rarely visited the organization,” and
“community interaction was not all semester long.” In addition to the limited
communication, CBL partnerships were characterized by short-term projects. Theresa
thoughtfully discussed the issue of short-term interventions in regard to her CBL project
with the Street Children organization:

> With the Street Children, I mean to them, it was normal. We [Theresa and her
classmates] weren’t the first people to come and work there [at the NGO]. That’s
one of the things I have a problem with because . . . [it] kind of became normal to
people coming [pause] to see them [street children] or to study them. And, I mean
they [street children] had fun with us; they joked with us, but I don’t know if there
was any real, meaningful connection; like we didn’t work with them long enough
for them to want to [pause], I don’t know, call us and talk to us about problems. I
am not trying to diminish our [actions] because I think they appreciated us and I
think that we respected them in a way.

When asked whether or not she felt that the street children perceived her and her fellow
classmates as role models, Theresa offered this perspective:

> I would . . . hope that they didn’t think of us as role models because we didn’t
come back and I think that this is one of the most detrimental things to kids. . . .
A lot of these kids left home because they have been beaten by their families, like
abandoned moms and these all issues. And so I would really hate it if one of the
kids had gotten really attached to me and I didn’t go back to the organization. . . .
With kids . . . you cannot formulate these boundaries like you can do with older people. I mean some older people are skeptical; they don’t expect you to always be there for them. But, you can tell that the kids get attached really fast and then you have to leave. And that’s why I didn’t think that working with the street children was a good option for a short-term community-based project for that reason because I feel like they deserved people who were committed to be there for a long period of time to actually be able to be there and to talk to them and that sort of thing. Because by doing this for only three months or four months, . . . it seems as if [pause] they are animals at the zoo or something.

As indicated in the quote above, Theresa acknowledged that her CBL project allowed a group of street children served by the organization with which her class partnered to have moments of fun. Yet, her words call attention to the potential harmful impacts of short-term CBL projects on community members, particularly children. Specifically, Theresa expressed a concern about these children’s perceptions of the people outside of their world by using an analogy between these children and zoo animals that people typically visit merely to watch and have fun with no genuine concern for their well-being. Also, she raised doubts about whether or not such activities had any real meaning for the children. Moreover, she questioned whether or not short-term interactions led to trust building between the children and AUC students. As such, Theresa hoped that these children did not get attached to any of AUC students lest their feelings get hurt when students stop visiting them after the completion of their academic projects.

Significantly, the findings of previous research confirm Theresa’s concerns. For example, the community partners in Tryon et al.’s (2008) study expressed concerns about the emotional distress associated with short-term service-learning for their clients, especially children. For example, a community member stated, “Sometimes kids will say “where’s so-and- so after a few months of depending on them for homework help or they
knew they had someone to play checkers with” (p. 19). Another community partner in that study explained:

We do not want to have students come in, meet with them [the children] for a few weeks, then start to get connected and have them drop off the face of the planet. That is not healthy for these kids. They really need to have strong role models in their lives. (p. 19)

These comments mirror Theresa’s concerns about the adverse effects of short-term service-learning on the populations served by community-based agencies, particularly children.

Past research showed that the amount of time invested in the community is positively correlated with gains, such as civic responsibility, life skills, and post-college activities for students engaged in the service (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999). Moreover, this study revealed that the amount of time student service-learners spend in the community appears to affect the satisfaction level of agency professionals with service-learning partnerships. Similarly, past research reported that community partners want students to stay adequate periods of time to justify the administrative cost of hosting them and to make meaningful contributions to agency clients (Sandy & Holland, 2006; Tryon et al., 2008). However, more research is warranted to investigate the impact of short-term service-learning projects on the community members constituting the staff and clients of community-based organizations.

In spite of the repeated stress on the value of long-term service-learning activities, Bowman et al. (2010) found that short-term, sustained service-learning yielded positive impacts on students’ learning when ensuring thoughtful integration of the service components into traditional courses. More studies are needed to explore the differences
between the impact of short- versus long-term service-learning projects on the participating students, faculty members, administrators, and community-based organizations’ professionals and clients.

**Partners’ goals.**

**Congruent goals.**

Students felt that CBL course instructors were keen on partnering with organizations whose goals align with the CBL course goals. For example, Farida drew on her experience with choosing a site for her CBL course, Grant Writing for Community Building, explaining how she and a group of her classmates had to move from one organization with which they wished to work to another one so that they could practice the skills relevant to the course objectives. She explained:

> We [Farida and a group of her classmates] were with another NGO at first downtown that we wanted to work with. And they [NGO staff] wanted us to write for an application for a prize for the NGO, but we were supposed to write a grant proposal. So, we couldn’t work with them because they couldn’t offer us one [idea for a grant proposal].

Likewise, Theresa observed that University officials overseeing the CBL program had considerably succeeded in ensuring alignment between the course goals and organizations’ goals. Theresa said, “I think that CBL has gotten better with kind of talking with organizations, saying what they would want, like matching the organization’s goals with the students’ goals.”

In a similar vein, Adham discussed how community service activities can be beneficial for students, NGOs, and community members:

> Our own aim is sort of self-fulfillment and getting experience of dealing with the people. We do get that big time. The main target of the people is to get help. They
definitely do get that. The NGO in the place its main target is to get help from others that can help to help actually people. They do that very successfully. . . . What I think is that everybody gets what they want at the end. I think it’s fulfilling for everyone.

*Incongruent goals.*

Although Adham indicated that community service activities were advantageous to the parties involved, he felt that sometimes university goals and priorities may conflict with those of the community. To illustrate these differences, he shared the following incident:

One time, we [Adham and fellow AUC students in RESALA club] wanted to take pictures for documentary of the event to show people how the place looks like and everything. They [NGO staff] didn’t really like it. So, we said, “It is not a problem.” We thought of another idea for documentary. And it was successful (لله الحمد) [can be translated into English as “thanks me to God”], we didn’t need to do it [take photos].

As Adham explained, students intended to take photos of a community space during an event they held there in order to document their efforts and share them with the university community. However, the partnering community-based organization did not appreciate this goal, and were reluctant to allow students to take photos of the community.

This incident cues attention to two major issues. First, it highlights the cultural differences between the university and the community. While the university constituents may be thrilled to publicize their contributions to the community, NGO staff and community members may feel offended by circulating photos showing the miserable conditions of their communities. Thus, documenting partnership achievements must be handled with sensitivity and using mechanisms deemed appropriate by the parties involved. Discussing such issues among parties at the initiation phase of the partnership
can be a successful strategy to avoid such conflicts. Second, this incident demonstrates that students were not shut off when the NGO rejected their request to take photos. Rather, they achieved their goal by generating another idea for documenting the event, thereby maintaining friendly relationships with the organization and community. These findings indicate that students’ involvement in community service work can enhance their negotiation skills and capacity to work across differences.

Similar to Adham’s comments on the differing goals of the university and community-based organizations, Theresa shared the following experience from her CBL course with the Street Children Organization:

We wanted to do these amazing things with the children... [but] she [the director of the NGO]... was like, “Well, that’s great, but we need to make money.”... The only request that they [the NGO staff] had that we [Theresa and fellow classmates] try to help them and sell some of the artwork the street children had drawn so that they can make money for them.

Theresa went on to explain that she and her fellow classmates declined the organization’s request to market the children’s paintings. When asked about the reason why they chose to do so, she replied, “If we just went and did what the NGO told us to do without us benefiting, where is the reciprocal learning in that? I mean there should be some sort of common ground.” In response to the researcher’s comment that Theresa and her classmates should have considered the organization’s goals in addition to realizing their own learning goals, she lamented, “That was the flaw of the whole project.” However, Theresa insisted, “They [the NGO staff] should think about our learning goals as supposed to just their own benefit.”
Theresa’s story provides another example of the potential tension between students’ goals and those of the partnering organizations. To avoid such tensions, service-learning instructors must carefully choose organizations whose missions are relevant to the course topic(s), as well as design service activities that help fulfill the goals of all the parties involved. It is not unusual for misunderstandings and/or disagreements to occur; however, if conflicts arise between students and community-based organizations’ staff/clients, service-learning instructors can help resolve these issues by capitalizing on common areas of interests and/or facilitating dialogues between them to discuss different viewpoints.

Besides the conflicting goals, Theresa pinpointed another important issue pertaining to the discrepancy between the job description the organizations publicize for student service learners and the actual needs of the organization. In the following quote, Theresa elaborates on this issue:

One of the problems I had was that either the organization made a really fancy job description and then whenever we went to the organization, we didn’t really do anything that important. So, even though they formulated their action plan to meet the goals of what they thought CBL wanted them to be, upon our arrival, it was different.

Theresa’s words indicate that some community-based organizations craft job descriptions for student service learners to meet their learning goals rather than to realize the actual goals of the organizations. Such a finding illustrates how issues of power between the university and the community may materialize in practice. Some NGOs may perceive potential benefits associated with partnering with institutions of higher education and may be motivated to act in ways to make themselves attractive to universities. While
following this strategy may encourage universities to partner with these organizations, it raises concerns about whether service-learning partnerships yield real benefits to community-based organizations or they are merely an added burden to organizations with already heavy responsibilities. This issue demonstrates the prevalence of the notion of the superiority of the academy over the community in Egypt. This finding underscores the role culture may play in influencing university-community partnerships. Creating channels of dialogues between the university and community constituents facilitated by moderators from both worlds can be effective in helping community members realize the assets they bring to their collaborations with universities. This, in turn, may encourage community partners to ensure that their involvement with these collaborations is meaningful to their agencies and clients.

**Reciprocal relationships.**

Establishing reciprocal relationships between universities and communities is a core goal of service-learning partnerships in higher education (Benson, et al., 2007). Analyses showed that the AUC students mostly perceived their relationships with community partners as a form of exchange in which each party contributes resources and benefits from this relationship. For example, Farida described the CBL partnership as follows:

It’s a give and take relationship because we [CBL students] are asking for certain information that they [NGO staff] might not ask themselves, or not come up, and then later understand how we would have needed that. And, we’re learning a lot because we’re learning how we write it [grant] in the first place and still get credit for it. And the NGO also gets a certain service, provided that [the grant proposal] will most probably be a good quality because the professors are supervising it. So, in that sense, both of them [students and NGOs] are benefiting from that [CBL courses].
She felt that her CBL partnership was beneficial both to students and the partnering community-based organization. Significantly, Farida believed that CBL instructors play an important role in ensuring the quality of service-projects. This finding suggests that the faculty members teaching CBL courses are not only accountable for student learning, but also for service-learning outcomes for community partners. This is an unexplored area in the literature that warrants future research.

Similar to Farida’s perspective, Adham described the interaction between AUC’s Message club and their community partner as a two-way relationship in which each partner shares resources. In discussing community partner’s contributions, he offered the following perspective:

To be honest, they [NGO staff] helped us a lot. I cannot deny this. I mean something we could not have known without having people from inside the place. . . . It was really nice to have them help us. . . . They [NGO staff members] [are] all educated. The man who founded the NGO is a Professor of Management and he is really famous . . . I learn a lot from him.

Reflecting on students’ contributions to community partners, Adham stated:

Our role was more of networks; we [students] knew people. They [NGO staff] sometimes did not really know how to act on things; we help them. Sometimes we have better funds than they have. I mean in times, in (Udhiyah\textsuperscript{4}), for instance, we almost distributed twice the amount they did, which was great for them and for us, definitely. Not all the time, to be honest. One more thing, for instance, sometimes, they need the ideas, they need to know how to implement

\textsuperscript{4} Udhiyah refers to the animal (camel, cattle, or sheep) that is sacrificed as an act of worship to Allâh, during the period from after the Eid al-Adha prayer on the Day of Nahr (Eid al-Adha) until the last day of Tashrîq (the 13th day of Dhul-Hijjah), with the intention of offering sacrifice. Allâh says: "Say (O Muhammad (sallallahu alaihi wasallam)): 'Verily, my prayer, my sacrifice, my living and my dying are for Allâh, the Lord of the Alâmîn (mankind, jinns and all that exists)." [Sûrah al-An‘ân (6): 162] (K. Abou Zaid, personal communication, February 5\textsuperscript{th}, 2012)
something. . . . They [NGO staff] had a problem with marketing so they just shut down. I think (الله إن شاء الله) [can be translated into English as “God willing”] with all the marketing background we [students] have here in the club, we get them [community members] to work.

Adham’s experience exemplifies how the knowledge, skills, talents, and resources of the community and the university can complement each other in ways that enrich both parties and the greater community. Furthermore, his comments highlight the role of community-based organizations as a liaison between institutions of higher education and communities.

Similar to fellow student participants in this research, Mostafa acknowledged the contributions made by community members. However, he went the furthest of any of the participants by asserting that community partners’ contributions were more critical than those of students. As he explained:

Quite honestly, I think we [students] need them more than they [NGO staff] need us because they can go to a bunch of places to get this service [writing the grant proposal] done. They can go to a bunch of professionals to get a grant. But instead, they choose a group of students who are still learning while they write it. . . . It’s a risk on their side. And also, this is a huge skill to learn. This is something I am going to be very happy to put on my C.V. to say that I co-wrote a grant proposal during my freshman year. So, I feel that I am benefiting very much and I am very happy they’re actually helping us do this.

As shown in the aforementioned comments, students acknowledged and appreciated the role of community partners in CBL collaborations. They provided several examples of the contributions community partners made to the partnership, with a special reference to their role in educating college students. These findings affirm the theoretical perspectives that service-learning partnerships can be mutually beneficial to the university, students, and community (Jacoby, 1996, 2003; Vernon & Ward, 1999). The
findings also challenge the common perceptions of community members as mere receivers of university resources and suggest the importance of strengthening the relationships between universities and community-based organizations to better understand and address community issues.

While Farida, Adham, and Mostafa felt that AUC’s relationships with community-based organizations were mutually beneficial, Theresa took a more cautious stand. She acknowledged that reciprocity was a core concept to the CBL program, but expressed a concern about the capacity of the program to translate the rhetoric of reciprocity into action. Theresa noted: “I know CBL learning goals talk about reciprocal learning and that’s important. But, when it goes from theory to practice, that’s the problem.” Specifically, she was “very cautious about the CBL program that it be conducted in a way where is seen as if the rich kids from AUC are coming to help the NGO, to help the poor people from El-Matarea⁵ (المطرية), or something like that.”

According to Theresa, the following strategies can help promote reciprocal CBL relationships:

Definitely in the monitoring, evaluation, and stuff, I would want to make sure that there is something of reciprocity going on as supposed to the subjects or the people on the receiving [end] . . . [and] attracting these people [community members] as supposed to feeling them rejected, or inferior, or incompetent so much that these people [university constituents] had to come in and help us [community members] out.

As expressed by the CBL program director and other participants, reciprocity is one of the central ideals of the program. However, adopting an ideal does not necessarily guarantee its implementation. Therefore, Theresa’s concern about whether or not

---

⁵ El-Matarea is commonly known as a poor neighborhood in Cairo.
reciprocity is realized in the interactions between university constituents and community partners is legitimate. Given the wide disparities in socio-economic conditions between AUC students and the community members they encounter at service sites, her concern suggests the importance of taking precautions to ensure that CBL partnerships will respect the dignity of community members.

Theresa provided two insightful suggestions. The first one, pertaining to integrating evaluation into the partnership, is consistent with conventional wisdom and previous research highlighting the crucial importance of conducting ongoing assessment of service-learning partnerships (Scheibel et al. 2005). Past research stressed the importance of evaluating the impact of service-learning partnership on the parties involved. This, in turn, can support the case for its institutionalization in higher education (Vogel et al., 2010). However, Theresa’s suggestion adds to the existing literature by calling attention to the need to evaluate the reciprocity of university-community relationships. As such, it provides practical guidance to academic institutions and community partners when embarking on such partnerships.

Theresa expressed a concern that CBL partnerships might cause community members to feel lower than the academy when they see that AUC constituents initiate projects to help them. Accordingly, she offered a second suggestion to institutionalize mechanisms that diminish the likelihood of the occurrence of such negative feelings. This finding can be best interpreted in light of Freire’s (2007) theory of critical consciousness. This theory posits that the world is divided into two groups: the oppressors and the oppressed. The first is typically the individuals with economic and
political power while the latter are those with little power. In this study, AUC’s constituents—students, faculty, and administrators—might be the oppressor whereas community partners—NGO professionals and clients—might be the oppressed. Freire proposed the idea of honest dialogue as an effective strategy that can help both groups end the dehumanizing conditions in why they co-exist. Through honest dialogue, Freire explained, the oppressed begin to recognize the limitations in the oppressor and value their own knowledge. In a parallel manner, the oppressors begin to appreciate the wisdom of the oppressed, whom they used to reject as ignorant or indolent. Informed by Freire’s wisdom, CBL partnerships must be carefully designed using an asset- rather than deficit-based model. Employing this model may enable community members to realize that they exchange benefits with AUC as opposed to being served by the University.

Students’ comments on the short-term relationships with community partners, limited communication with organizations, and issues facing reciprocity suggest that CBL partnerships were characterized by transactional relationships. However, it seems that CBL partnerships are likely to progress toward transformation. The potential for transformative partnerships was evident when students spoke of their preferred ways to address societal problems, their hopes for long-term relationships with community partners, as well as their positive feelings about the CBL program and their impressions about the attitudes of community partners. The sections that follow explore these ideas.
Partnership vision.

While students acknowledged the merits of both charity and sustainable development approaches, they perceived the latter as more effective in tackling community issues. For example, Mostafa offered the following perspective:

I am not saying that social change is a hundred percent better than charity because you need both. You need to appease people’s needs now while also investing in a better future so those needs are appeased tomorrow. . . . It just goes back to the expression, “If you give a man a fish, he’ll eat for a day. But, if you teach a man to fish, he’ll eat for a lifetime.”

Likewise, Adham described a shift in the strategic planning of Message from charity to sustainable development:

When we first started during the charity phase of the club, like two years ago, . . . we used like go around in different places. Each semester, we pick a different place and all we do was mostly charity so not sustainable development. And this was the huge transformation that we carried out in the beginning of this year when we thought that we should stay in one place and stay for a little longer than one semester to actually see the impact of the work on the people there.

Adham used the length of the relationship between the club and the NGO as evidence to signify as a major factor to differentiate between charity and sustainable development. According to Adham, short-term projects are indicative of charity activities while long-term projects are associated with sustainable development. Theresa echoed Adham’s perspective about the value of long-term relationships with community partners. In discussing her experience at the Street Children organization, she lamented the fact that they collaborated with the organization for a short period of time and wished that the class stayed longer. Theresa regretted, “If we would able to participate with them longer!” These comments support a previous finding of this study that the duration of the
partnership is an indicator of the depth of the relationship between the university and community.

Moreover, students’ comments reveal that the length of the partnership, coupled with the nature of the projects may provide insights into understanding the orientation of the partnerships. Morton (1995) theorized three approaches to understanding students’ preferences to community service activities: “charity,” “project,” and “social change.”

Bringle et al. (2006) found that “charity” was the most favorable type of service to student participants followed by “project” while “social change” gained the least preference. Unlike the findings of Bringle et al., students in this study clearly indicated their preference for project-based service activities.

Students’ inclination to value long-term relationships with community partners, as well as the champion roles played by young people—many of whom were college students—in the 25th January Egyptian Revolution of 2011 suggest that college students yearn to generate real positive change in their communities. Surprisingly, however, students’ comments included neither clear nor direct references to investigating the structural causes of societal ills. Rather, they repeatedly stressed their commitment to enhancing the individual capabilities of unprivileged groups in the hope that such efforts would increase their opportunities to access a decent life. For example, in response to an explicit question about whether she prefers short- or long-term relationships with community partners, Farida answered, “I want it to be sustainable.” She went on to explain:

If you give people a piece of bread, they’re going to eat it and be hungry again. So, if people are hungry, I would want them to have a little . . . shop, for
example, so, they get income, so they can have bread every day. Or, give them a
certain education so they can get a certificate and then get a job, which gives them
opportunity to provide for their family.

Likewise, Adham explicated how students planned a future project with a community-
based organization to generate job opportunities for community partners. He elaborated:

So, they [NGO staff] have a sewing place (workshop مشغل). They have old
machines and everything, but [they are] not working; [they are] just there. We
have been thinking about how to get [them] to work, get people to work on
[them], to generate money, and then market the things and (إن شاء الله) [can be
translated into English as “God willing”], this is going to start in this semester.

These comments demonstrate that students understand the importance of sustainable
development activities, and that they recognize that the structural causes that have led to
the community members’ impoverished conditions have been largely overlooked.

With this understanding, students decided to develop sustainable projects to increase
these individuals’ life chances. As the quote above indicates, Farida thought that helping
low-income people start small projects or gain education would enable them to work,
thus earning money. This strategy, she believed, would enable the poor to support their
families. Similarly, Adham and fellow students, wanted to help a group of impoverished
women by fixing old sewing machines in the community-based organizations where
these women live. As Adham stated, students thought that fixing the old machines and
marketing the products would generate a source of income to this group of women.

Students’ ideas and initiatives can probably lead to a positive difference in the
lives of unprivileged groups. However, by focusing solely on improving the individual
skills of a particular oppressed group, we run the risk of treating the symptoms of societal
ills without any attention to their core causes. According to Marullo and Edwards (2000),
unless some resources are allocated to correcting the underlying causes of social problems, “we exhaust our ability to create the social structures that operate for the greater good and create a permanent underclass” (p. 910). Thus, service-learning instructors are advised to devote part of class time to discussing the root reasons that create social problems, and to deliberately design activities that urge students to engage in solving these problems. It is particularly important to help students become aware of what Banks (2008) referred to as the role of power and privilege in establishing systems and structures. Students should also become aware of how specific rules and regulations create unfair conditions that help privilege some people and cripple others. This way, students may start to think critically about the conditions of underprivileged groups and realize that irrespective of their individual abilities, the existing systems perpetuate social inequalities among people. Therefore, improving the life conditions for disadvantaged groups requires changing those systems.

Positive attitudes.

In addition to students’ hopes for establishing long-term relationships with community members, their positive attitudes toward the CBL program and community partners provide additional evidence of the potential for these collaborations to progress toward transformation. For example, Farida commented on the positive attitude of NGO professionals in this way: “They were from the beginning very warm-hearted, very friendly people.” She went on to describe their reactions to her demands for immediate information: “Even when I am pushing and saying ‘We need now and we need this and we need that,’ they are still very friendly, very nice people.” Similarly, Adham spoke of
the positive attitudes of NGO professionals and community members toward students:

“People just love them [students] and they love when they [students] come and they miss them [students] around when they don’t come. They [NGO staff and community members] call and ask, ‘Why didn’t you come today and stuff?’” These comments suggest that students were connected with community partners through positive and caring relationships.

Furthermore, students expressed positive attitudes toward the CBL program. For example, Mostafa expressed his willingness to take more CBL courses: “This is the first CBL course I’ve taken. I’m open to taking more as soon as I find them.” Similarly, Theresa stressed her admiration to the program this way:

I am a very avid proponent of the CBL course in its, I guess, perfect ideological form and what it has a potential to do especially within the AUC society and in kind of reviving the sense of companionship [within] civil society, volunteerism in Egypt and maybe the Middle East as a whole.

As indicated in Theresa’s comment, she admires the concept of service-learning and sees its potential in promoting the NGO sector and spirit of volunteerism in Egypt and probably the region. Students clearly support the CBL program. While the literature is ripe with theoretical arguments and empirical evidence of the role of institutional leadership in integrating service-learning in higher education (Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Vogelgesang, 2004), there is little attention to the role of students. The findings of this study suggest that bottom-up support by groups, such as students and junior faculty members, can be helpful in promoting service-learning on higher education campuses. Additional research is needed to determine how such support may facilitate its institutionalization.
Partnership challenges.

The theme of organizational, cultural, and political barriers shapes students’ perceptions of the challenges facing CBL partnerships. This theme was evident in the data when students spoke of the difficulties they encountered at their service sites and the obstacles imposed on their involvement in CBL courses by cultural norms and the political situation in Egypt during the spring of 2011. The sections that follow discuss each barrier in detail. Table 30 summaries students’ perceptions of the challenges to CBL partnerships.

Table 30

Students’ Perceptions of the Challenges to CBL Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural, organizational, and political barriers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Cultural-related issues</td>
<td>a- perceived mission of higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b- community partners’ perceptions of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c- language competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d- parent rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e- trust issues between the university and the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Organizational-related issues</td>
<td>a- lack of clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b- centralized structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Political-related issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cultural-related issues.

Perceived mission of higher education.

Five major cultural issues were identified as obstacles in establishing CBL partnerships. One of these obstacles is the lack of familiarity with the notion of the civic mission of the university. Adham described this challenge as follows:
A university would be basically focusing on the learning of the students and since we don’t have that much sense of community involvement . . . When you go to college, you don’t really go to college to work, to do field work. You go to college to learn. This sort of awareness is not there in all universities.

Adham’s words imply that higher education in Egypt perceives its role mainly in terms of enabling students to acquire theoretical knowledge and technical skills whereas the concept of university engagement in community is atypical. As explained in the second chapter, Literature Review, the mission of the university is perceived in different ways; one group of scholars contended that the central goal of the university is the transmission of knowledge and skills (Finn & Vanourek, 1995) while another group argued that there is a broad agreement that institutions of higher education have civic and public purposes, including the preparation of enlightened and productive citizens as well as engaging in scholarship that responds to critical problems and functions as a “mirror to society to allow self reflection and correction” (Saltmarsh, et al., 2009, p. 3). Still another group believed that the university bears responsibility for both the educational and civic goals (Robinson, 2000).

Furco (2002) suggested that true institutionalization of service-learning may take five to ten years. However, this estimated time period may be longer at institutions that still uphold their traditional goals of knowledge acquisition while negotiating their civic mission, as is the case at Egyptian universities. Those who believe in the civic role of higher education and who advocate for service-learning can help build a supportive culture for service-learning partnerships on their campuses. Evaluation data demonstrating the benefits of service-learning partnerships can be an effective strategy
for building such a supportive culture. In this respect, Vogel et al. (2010) found that evaluation data of service-learning could help the case for its institutionalization.

*Community partners’ perceptions of students.*

The ways in which some NGO professionals interact with students appeared to constitute an obstacle that impedes students’ work with NGOs. Mostafa discussed how communication between his classmates and the partnering NGO was sometimes quite slow. When asked whether or not the communication between AUC and his NGO was difficult, he offered the following perspective:

> I don’t know about AUC. But for us [Mostafa and his classmates], we have had a little bit of difficulty. We respect that they [NGO professionals] are very busy people. They have a lot of work on their hands, but sometimes they’re a little late responding. I think there was one time when we sent an e-mail and they took a really long time to respond and I think they responded after the deadline for turning in the assignment. So, that was frustrating. Maybe it’s because we’re just students. If it was an official from AUC, if it was like President [the name was omitted for confidentiality purposes], I don’t think lateness would be an issue very often.

When asked if he and fellow students tried to follow-up with the NGO via phone calls, Mostafa responded: “Yes, we did. They answer phone calls, but sometimes they’re in meetings. So, I think maybe with more high profile people, important people like the Dean or the President of AUC, they would definitely answer.” This finding suggests that community-based organizations’ perceptions that students are less important than the university’s high-level administrators negatively influence the way they interact with students. Mostafa acknowledged the NGO’s slow response to the students’ inquiry may be attributed to the busy schedules of its staff members. Yet, he felt that such a slow
response would not have been the case had the interaction been made with upper-level administrators, such as deans or the University president.

While other students cited the slow communication with their respective NGOs as an impediment to their participation in CBL partnerships, Mostafa was the only student who attributed NGOs’ slow responses to their perceptions of students. Accordingly, it becomes difficult to ensure the accuracy of his assumption or to assume that this is the case with other NGOs. However, the dynamics of Egyptian society support Mostafa’s impression. That is, past research on youth in Egypt showed that the Country is going through a demographic transition, “youth bulge,” which refers to “a period in which the numbers of its youth in its population is increasing significantly compared to other age groups.” (Assad & Barsoum, 2011, p. 8). While youths make up a large percentage of Egyptian population, young people have been systematically excluded from optimum participation in society in several arenas, including education, work opportunities, forming families, and exercising leadership (Assad & Barsoum). Similarly, El-Tarboulsi (2011) noted that the practices of the Mubarak government caused common Egyptians—mainly youth—to feel lonely, alienated, and excluded.

In addition to these research findings, it is important to take into consideration that people’s interactions in Egypt are shaped by the traditions of Eastern culture where age and status are important factors influencing the way people deal with each other. Specifically, elder individuals and those with higher status are typically given more attention and respect than younger ones and those with lower status. Thus, as Mostafa
felt, NGO professionals may maintain prompt communication with individuals holding institutional leadership positions, but not with students.

_Parental opposition._

Parents’ disapproval of their children’s involvement in community service activities while pursuing academic degrees in higher education emerged as another barrier facing CBL partnerships. Adham highlighted this challenge by sharing a personal experience. He recalled that “in the first one and half years, my mom and my dad would always be like, ‘Do study. Why are you wasting all this time [in doing community service work]?’” When asked whether he felt that parents’ resistance poses a challenge to CBL partnerships, Adham answered, “Big time.” Such a response indicates that parents neither expect nor encourage their children to take part in community service work while attending college. On the contrary, parents may direct their children away from such an engagement. According to Adham, it was only when his mother attended one of the community service activities in which he was involved that she started supporting his involvement in the civic endeavors. Adham described the shift in his mother’s stand as follows:

“In the beginning they [my parents] weren’t really convinced. I mean until the beginning of this semester, my mom would tell me to stop these activities until she came and attended a conference, a political awareness conference that we had. And she was amazed how it was, (الحمد لله) [can be translated into English as “thanks me to God”], . . . around the news and Twitter and everything. And she was so amazed by it and that is why she was like, (ربنا يوفقك خلاص) [can be translated into English as “That’s fine. May God guide you to success.”] Go ahead and do whatever you want.”
This finding suggests that higher education administrators’ efforts in promoting university-community partnerships must involve students’ families. Parental support of these partnerships could greatly facilitate students’ engagement in their communities.

Language competency.

Another challenge described by a number of international students was the language barrier, which caused feelings of exclusion and alienation. For example, Farida stated that the meetings with the NGO were conducted in Arabic. Although she was able to follow the conversations, she felt that her limited Arabic language skills put her in an uncomfortable situation when she had to ask many questions to ensure comprehension of what was being said during the meeting. Also, she felt that her native Arabic speaking partner was better connected with the NGO. Farida expressed her feelings as follows:

My [class] partner. . . speaks Arabic to the contact person, the NGO, and I understand a lot. But it still puts me in a place where I . . . need to translate first and then I ask, “Is this what you’re saying? Okay, this and that.” So, I feel like they [Arabic speaking classmates] have a stronger connection than I do.

Similarly, a student from Kenya reported that the meetings between students and community professionals proceeded in Arabic in some organizations which made it difficult for international students to follow the meeting proceedings, and thus they felt singled out. According to this survey respondent:

Some organizations forget that some of the students are international students. Hence, they end up not taking into consideration that these students will require to have the discussions and material translated for them. It would be helpful if these organizations speak and understand English to have these meetings presented in English so that the international students feel included in the proceedings of the meetings.
Interestingly, the student’s words are indicative of her feelings that organizations overlook the fact that a number of CBL students are international students with limited or no Arabic language skills. Therefore, these organizations do not take into account communicating in English with the students or translating relevant materials into English so that they feel engaged in these meetings. While the student’s assumption may be true in some cases, it could also be biased against NGOs, particularly the grassroots ones. In other words, this student ignored the probability that some organizations might have neither human resources with English language competencies nor adequate financial resources to afford hiring translators, making them unable to accommodate the language needs of international students.

Unlike fellow international students, Theresa held a unique perspective regarding the language issue. She felt that it is not crucial, stating, “This whole language barrier thing, it doesn’t go as far as you think.” She then offered the following perspective:

It depends on what you’re doing and where you’re working . . . of course, I don’t think that an international student should go to the NGO by himself if he doesn’t know any Arabic, that’s problematic. But, if you have a group of students and you have lots of Arabic-speaking students and there is one English [speaking student]. So, that person could be translated for and they [English only speaking students] can do tasks that don’t necessarily need base-base [face-to-face] communication. And in anyways the fact that this person is not obviously not Egyptian is going to, especially if it is kids, . . . attract the kids to them in the first place so that they don’t need really talk because the kids will be trying to communicate whatever they can.

While Theresa acknowledged the challenge posed by the language, she did not see it as an absolute barrier. Rather, she believed that the language obstacle is relative depending on the specific service site and activities. Significantly, Farida’s experience support
Therese’s perspective; when promoted to reflect on her experience at the partnering NGO, Farida stated:

They [NGO staff and clients] have been mostly interested because most of the people in that NGO are Egyptians. So every time I go, they’re very curious about my background and what I’m doing and would I speak Arabic?

Farida’s comments indicate that community partners were mainly interested in her because of her international student status which arouse their curiosity and led them to interact more with her.

To address the language issue, Theresa offered several ideas. For example, she suggested that students with limited or those who lack Arabic language skills should visit community partners in the company of fellow Arabic-speaking students who can translate for them. Or, they may engage in activities that do not require extensive use of Arabic language. Theresa went even further by arguing that international students may actually become better connected than their Egyptian counterparts to the organization clients, especially children. She felt that since international students look different, children might be more curious to learn about them. This curiosity will motivate children to interact with international students using modes of communication other than language.

Moreover, Theresa argued that the struggle of international students with the Arabic language could be a profound learning experience for them, emphasizing how people learn the most in difficult situations. She further explained that such situations push people to focus more on the elements of the environment and the others with whom they interact. Theresa articulated her argument in the following way:

That’s a whole learning process. I think you learn the most when you get stuck somewhere. You don’t understand what’s going on. [Then] . . . you have to
concentrate on the person and try to figure out, pay really close attention to your surroundings.

Ultimately, Theresa emphatically stressed the importance of engaging international students in CBL partnerships. She argued that such an engagement would enable them to both learn about themselves and understand the local culture. She believed that body language might make up, to some degree, for their limited Arabic language competencies. As Theresa explained:

If you are looking at their [international students] benefits, not only can they begin to understand the culture they have been living in for a semester or a year, but you learn more about yourself; you learn to delve further outside face value. . . You become able to read people. And that way, if you learn how to read people’s body language, you don’t need the language so much to an extent.

The aforementioned quotes by Theresa and her fellow international students present mixed findings about the language as an issue standing in the way of international students’ optimum engagement in CBL partnerships, particularly those with modest or no Arabic language skills. While some students voiced concerns about working with Arabic-only speaking organizations, Theresa felt that the issue of language may actually be an opportunity for these students to deepen their understanding of themselves and the local culture alike.

The differences in international students’ perceptions of the language as a barrier to their participation in CBL partnerships can be attributed to individual differences among students, such as demographic characteristics, capacity to cope with unfamiliar situations, and willingness to tolerate ambiguity. Since this study focused on the collective vision of students as they constitute one of service-learning partners rather than on the individual views of each student, no detailed information about students’
demographic characteristics or personality traits was gathered. As such, it becomes difficult to reach definitive conclusions as to why these students perceived the language issue differently. Nonetheless, these findings clearly demonstrate that language is a significant factor affecting international students’ involvement in service-learning partnerships. Therefore, this factor should be given due attention when planning and implementing these collaborations, especially on the campuses where international students constitute a large segment of the student body.

In practice, there is no easy solution or one single effective strategy to address the language issue. For example, if AUC chose to tackle such a challenge by simply restricting the circle of its service-learning partnerships to organizations with bilingual staff members, this would defeat a major goal of these collaborations: building capacity in the community where it is needed the most. That is, the organizations with only monolingual staff are likely to be grassroots with dearth resources, and thereby in a bigger need of such partnerships than resourceful organizations with bilingual staff. By establishing partnerships with such organizations, AUC would be addressing real and significant community issues. Mostafa drew attention to this point, noting:

The organizations AUC works with are usually bilingual, Arabic and English. But I’ve met NGO representatives who only knew Arabic which is…it’s not a flaw or anything because we are in Egypt, but I mean they only knew one language. They weren’t very proficient with e-mails, I guess. But, those aren’t the organizations that AUC works with. But, I think these are the organizations that need the most help.

Mostafa’s perspective raises crucial questions pertaining to universities’ criteria of choosing community partners and the implications of such choices for the orientation and goals of partnerships as well as the relationships among partners. Additional research is
needed to identify such criteria and explore whether or not and in which ways they differ by institutional type.

Another possible strategy through which CBL instructors can address the language issue is to form groups of students with both Arabic and English language competencies so that Arabic speaking students translate for their counterparts with limited Arabic skills. However, this strategy must be followed with caution lest international students feel dependent on their Arabic-speaking fellow students. Service-learning instructors should strive to establish interdependent relationships between both groups of students so that each benefits and contributes in meaningful and equitable ways. The question of how to design service-learning activities that cultivate interdependent relationships between partners warrants future research.

_Trust issues._

Students reported that the lack of trust between students and community partners was another barrier to CBL partnerships. For example, Adham described how community members, particularly the elders, were apprehensive to students’ visits to their communities. He shared the following experience:

Older people a little bit, in the beginning, they were so suspicious; kids from the American University! They are probably here [in the community] to spread weird ideas in our heads. They are probably here for evil causes. But then as we go, when they actually touch that we don’t really want anything from out of the place. We don’t really take anything, no information, nothing, we don’t ask for personal information unless we are going to help [community members] using this information, they begin to be o.k. with us. They start to like us and then to invite us for things. So, this is how it goes.

Adham’s description suggests that trust issues become even more intensified when service-learning partnerships occur between local communities and foreign institutions as
is the case with CBL collaborations at AUC. Given the historical context of colonialism as well as present cultural, political, and religious tensions between the East and the West, trust issues between local communities and foreign institutions reflect broader issues of trust between both worlds. Handling trust issues between AUC and local communities should take into account cultural differences between Egypt and the U.S., as well as the time, ongoing co-operation, and patience needed for trust building between universities and communities. Additional research exploring more strategies for building trust between the academy and the community, especially at unique institutions like AUC, is needed to inform future planning of such collaborations.

**Ideological differences between the academy and the community.**

Students identified ideological differences between institutions of higher education and community-based organizations as another barrier to establishing partnerships between both entities. For example, Theresa described how the academy typically focuses on theoretical concepts whereas the community deals with practical issues:

I think it’s because of the nature of both institutions. I mean universities drive off abstractions and theories . . . NGOs are built in the real world. What’s on paper is different from what you encounter in daily life. And so, I think there can be a communication issue between people who are used to dealing in theoretical and maybe expecting something to be ideological. . . . The university may have to take it into consideration that. . . it’s dangerous in the neighborhood or the people might not show up one day, random stuff like that, . . . or that aren’t accounted for, I guess, in theory. I mean you take everything kind of a face value. And vice versa that maybe what the goals that the university want[s] is in a more theoretical fashion and maybe that the organization doesn’t understand how that goal is supposed to be applied.
In Theresa’s explanation to the barriers impeding CBL partnerships, she pointed to inherent differences between the academy and the community. Universities traditionally focus on theories with substantially less emphasis on the practical implications of these theories, while the opposite is true in the case of community-based agencies that address practical issues on a daily basis. As Theresa noted, this difference may create miscommunication between both entities. This finding is consistent with theoretical perspectives in the literature highlighting the cultural issues between higher education and communities (Holland, 1999; Walshok, 1999).

As suggested by the finding of this study and previous research, ideological differences may give rise to major communication issues between both entities. These differences, however, may also provide opportunities because service-learning partnerships offer constituents of higher education, especially students and faculty members, rich venues to test the theories discussed in the classroom in real-life situations. As such, academicians may refine those theories on the basis of their fieldwork in the community and construct practical theories. This, in turn, will enable higher education to produce knowledge with direct and practical implications for society, and thus become a civic enterprise rather than an ivory tower.
Organizational-related issues.

Organizational-related issues included students’ perceptions of the barriers to establishing CBL partnerships between AUC and NGOs. Students cited two major issues pertaining to NGOs’ obscure identity and centralized management style.

Lack of clarity.

In terms of obscurity, students explained that some NGOs do not have a clear sense of direction which makes it difficult for institutions of higher education to partner with them. For example, Farida stated, “The course requires the NGO to have a clear mission statement, clear goals and objectives, and everything. If an NGO is not clear about that, then you cannot really work with them.” These words indicate Farida’s belief in the necessity for NGOs to have a clear mission and set of goals in order to establish CBL relationships with institutions of higher education. This finding suggests that developing clear visions and mission statements are important factors in influencing universities’ decisions to partner with community-based organizations. However, one should be mindful of the differences between the operating systems of NGOs in different regions. In the case of Egypt, for example, most NGOs are youth-led grassroots initiatives, and thus it may be unrealistic to expect such organizations to develop well-articulated missions and visions. Institutions of higher education should respond to the specific needs of their communities. Therefore, universities in Egypt should not shy away from partnering with grassroots organizations. Rather, they should develop CBL courses specifically geared toward assisting those organizations in developing a clear sense of direction based on their wishes rather than those of higher education.
Centralized organizational structure.

The second organizational issue focused on the prevailing centralized management style which characterizes the majority of NGOs in Egypt. Students voiced concerns about the centralized organizational structure of NGOs. For example, Theresa explained:

The head woman is like the boss and nobody knows how to answer any sort of questions about anything that’s going on besides her. And so, if she is not there, which she is usually not because she is the boss [she can] do whatever she wants to do. Then there is always communications problem in NGOs because it’s so centralized.

Theresa illustrated her concern with the following example:

One of the students wanted to work at an NGO that sold like Bedouin art, something like that, but he was trying to get in touch with the NGO to see if he could intern or not. . . . The head of the NGO was not there. So, everybody [organization staff] told him, “We don’t know if we could tell you if you could work here or not. We don’t know what he thinks. He is the head of the NGO.” And, he [the student] was like, “Is there anyway you can contact him so that I can have an appointment? Anything that can help me out, just don’t say you don’t know.” And they were like, “No, we cannot really call him, but we can give you his e-mail and then you can call him.” And there is that huge problem with him working at the NGO because he really wanted to work there, but the boss was like so busy flying back and forth from Upper Egypt to collect items to here [Cairo] that he didn’t have time to meet him [the student].

Through Theresa’s involvement with NGOs in Egypt, she observed that they function within a centralized organizational structure. As evident in the quotes above, such a structure may hinder the establishment of effective relationships between students and community-based organizations in several ways. Theresa’s concern should be viewed from the perspective of the overall Egyptian organizational structure in which centralization prevails. In such organizations:
The top or central positions in the structure maintains control over the subunits by controlling all the major power resources (i.e. authority to allocate capital, recruit and assign personnel, and to make and interpret rules) of the organizations. (Weed, 1977, p. 113)

This description mirrors the organizational structure dominating the majority of organizations in Egypt, especially the state-owned enterprises. In such organizations, all decision-making power is controlled by the executive-level administration that is usually reluctant to share information with, or delegate important responsibilities to, lower-level employees. These findings, along with the ones emerged from the faculty data analysis, serve as a starting point to understanding the organizational factors within community-based agencies that facilitate service-learning partnerships. As such, these findings fill a noticeable void in the literature.

**Political-related issues.**

Another major challenge to CBL partnerships described by students was the political situation in Egypt during the spring of 2011, the period in which this study was conducted. Students identified the January 25 uprising in Egypt as a cause of reduction in both time invested in CBL courses and visits to NGOs. For example, Farida reported that as a result of the Egyptian Revolution, the University was closed for two weeks after the mid-year holiday, and thus the spring semester started later than usual. This was translated into time pressure on students to finish their courses on time despite the delay. Additionally, students were not able to focus on their courses as their attention was paid to the volatile political situation. According to Farida:

Maybe it’s just this semester where we have a short semester and . . . everything is crazy because of everything that’s been happening. So, we’re very distracted easily and everything takes more time. . . We’re under a lot pressure when it
comes to time. We definitely are.

In addition to starting their academic semester later than usual, Farida reported that restrictions were put on students’ visits to community-based organizations, particularly the ones in downtown, after the revolution. As she explained, “Especially this semester because someone mentioned from the Gerhart Center that . . . if we go downtown to the NGO, we should go with, or we are advised to go with security.” Likewise, Mostafa cited the issue of security explaining that the University was concerned about students’ safety after the revolution, and therefore mandated security guards to accompany students during their NGO visits. He stated, “Especially during post-revolution . . . times, they [university officials] were a little bit worried about sending us to particular areas because they were afraid they might be a little dangerous with the lack of police at the time.”

As demonstrated by students’ quotes above, both the unfolding events in Tahrir Square during the January 25 uprising and the aftermath of the uprising influenced their participation in CBL partnerships. Despite the seemingly negative impacts discussed above, the revolution provides a marvelous opportunity for promoting students’ engagement with their communities through CBL collaborations. That is, the period preceding the revolution was marked by the exclusion of many groups in Egypt, especially youth, from public space (El-Taraboulsi, 2011). The World Development Report (as cited in El-Taraboulsi) identifies five life transitions that are central to youth inclusion: education, work, health, forming families, and civic participation. According to El-Taraboulsi, young Egyptians were stuck in “a waithood period” (p. 13) and excluded from all these transitions. El-Taraboulsi revealed that in spite of such
exclusion, youth were actively exercising their citizenship in different ways, such as establishing NGOs, taking part in social media, or engaging in art.

Youth participation in civic life reached its peak during the January 25th revolution which was sparked by young people. Equally important, youth were the driving force behind the changes that took place in the uprising’s aftermath. To ensure that the voices of young people will continue to be heard, youth must aggressively engage in addressing their community issues. Service-learning partnerships are potentially valuable opportunities for youth to continue to exercise their citizenship in positive ways and become champions of positive social change in their society.

As noted above, students perceived three major barriers to CBL partnerships: cultural, organizational, and political. The cultural barriers focus on the conception of the mission of higher education primarily as the transmission of knowledge and technical skills, perceptions of college students as “kids,” parents’ opposition to their children engagement in the community as part of their college experience, as well as ideological and language differences between the university and the community. The organizational barriers pertain to the lack of clear sense of directions of some community-based organizations and the centralized management style characterizing the vast majority of these organizations. The political barrier as reflected in the January 25 Uprising resulted in reductions of time spent in the class and in the community. The discussion now turns to students’ suggestions for improving CBL partnerships.
**Partnership improvements.**

The theme of fostering a nurturing environment for service-learning best describes students’ discussions of improving CBL partnerships. This theme was evident when students spoke of their hopes for more CBL course offerings, greater publicity for these courses, and enhancements in the theoretical and practical aspects of these courses. Students’ perceptions of developing a nurturing environment for service-learning addressed two major areas: ideas for within-institution actions and suggestions for strengthening the institution’s relationship with the community. These areas are described next. Table 31 summarizes students’ suggestions for enhancing CBL partnerships.
Table 31

Students’ Suggestions for Enhancing CBL Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fostering a nurturing environment for service-learning and increasing university impact on the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-</strong> Fostering a nurturing environment for service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- increasing the number of CBL course offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- advertising CBL courses on campus and in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- creating online designation for CBL course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- integrating CBL courses in the core curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Student role</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- increasing enrollment in CBL courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- employing creative thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Faculty role</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom component</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- devoting a portion of class time to work on assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- building a sense of community between students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- facilitating reflection activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community component</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- introducing students to a wide range of community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e- ensuring the commitment of partnering organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f- clarifying the expectations of students’ roles at community agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g- increasing the amount of fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h- allowing students a choice of community agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Administrator role</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- emphasizing the CBL program in the university goal and vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- shifting perception of college students as children to adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c- recognizing student engagement in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- building resources for the CBL program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fostering a nurturing environment for service-learning.**

Students provided a fairly broad set of suggestions for building a supportive culture for CBL partnerships within the institution. The most frequently stated suggestion was to increase the number of CBL course offerings and promote the publicity
of these courses. Here are three examples from survey respondents, “There should be
more CBL courses because they are very few and at the same time not well-known,” “I
think there should be more of it. I benefited a lot from it! It should be advertised on
campus to let all students be aware of its existence,” and

    Make more CBL courses, many students don't think about taking a CBL course be]cause it's not well advertised. Hence, they don't know it exists, or they are
generally unaware of what they have to do in the course.

These quotes clearly indicate the scarcity of CBL courses at AUC and the limited
publicity of such courses.

    The author’s experience confirms students’ opinions. While collecting data at
AUC, she noticed that the Gerhart Center that administers CBL partnerships is located in
a remote area on campus away from academic buildings and student gathering spaces.
On several occasions, she asked students for directions to the Center; none knew its
location nor its function. Students’ responses led the author to believe that the CBL
program was not adequately advertised on campus. The under-representation of the
Center suggests a need for aggressive efforts to raise students’ awareness of the program
on campus.

    Students stressed the importance of raising awareness of CBL courses among the
student body. As one survey respondent noted, “Make a better understanding for
students about CBL courses.” Participants offered concrete examples of mechanisms
through which the University can promote the CBL program. Offering more CBL
courses, as indicated by students’ quotes above, could be an effective strategy. Creating
a designation for CBL courses is another strategy suggested by Mostafa. As he stated:
I think a lot of students don’t know what CBL courses are. But, one way of getting this out there is just having . . . a label next to each course. If I am looking through lists of courses and I see a little star next to it that says, “CBL,” I am going to wonder, “What is CBL?” And I’m going to click on it and it will say, “CBL courses are blablabla,” and just from the definition, I’ll think “It seems to be something beneficial; I’ll do something for the community, but I’ll also learn and get a grade.”

Launching advertising campaigns, distributing flyers, and sponsoring sessions by the program are other strategies recommended by Theresa. As she noted, “I think that the most money would go towards the marketing like making the flyers and trying to make lectures sponsored by CBL.” Similar to Theresa, a survey respondent stressed the need for advertising CBL courses and suggested including them in the core curriculum: “I think there should be more CBL courses offered and better advertised. AUC should make an effort to include it in their core curriculum.” Advertising CBL courses in the newspapers was another idea inspired by Farida. As she explained:

I’m not sure that students know about it. I didn’t know about this course until I was searching online for a while. So, . . . they could have, for example, in the newspapers upcoming, “If you want to help Egypt, this is what you can do with your courses. If you want to help your community,” and then you can list the community courses.

Students’ suggestions for enhancing the publicity of the CBL program hold important implications for higher education. For example, the suggestion about offering more courses denote the need for attracting more faculty members to teach CBL courses. The idea of creating a designation for CBL courses may require the reorganization of the online system for course offerings. The recommendation of developing marketing campaigns on campus directs attention to the importance of allocating adequate amount of financial resources for the program and poses questions about the sources of funding.
for community engagement initiatives. The call for making CBL courses part of the core curriculum would necessitate a major restructuring of academic degrees requirements, a very challenging issue as revealed by AUC senior administrators in the previous sections. Finally, advertising CBL courses in local newspapers would raise awareness of these courses within the institution and beyond. This, in turn, may help create a critical mass of service-learning advocates, thus promoting CBL partnerships. Future research is needed to examine the differing impacts of these strategies and identify others.

In addition to raising student awareness of the CBL program, some participants spoke of the need for awareness-raising among community-based organizations as well. For example, when prompted to provide suggestions for improving CBL partnerships, a survey respondent wrote, “Raise awareness of Community Psychology [title of a course] and CBL among organizations.” In response to a similar question, Adham stated, “NGOs have to learn that colleges have a lot to offer them.” Holding information session and/or fairs regularly on campus and inviting representatives from community-based organizations to participate in these activities can be an effective strategy to inform these organizations of the CBL program and other possibilities to connect with the University. Besides these general ideas for boosting CBL partnerships, participants specified responsibilities for students, faculty members, and University administrators. The next sections discuss these responsibilities in detail.
**Student role.**

*Increasing enrollment in CBL courses.*

In terms of student role, participants noted that students should take CBL courses and urge fellow students to do the same, thus increasing the enrollment in the program. As a survey respondent articulated, “Take more CBL courses and encourage others to do the same.” Past research highlighted student vital role in supporting and sustaining service-learning (Holland, 1999; Vogel et al., 2010). Similar to the findings of this research, participants in Vogel et al.’s study described a unique role for student leaders in promoting service-learning on campus. For example, students’ testimonies about the value of service-learning were found to contribute considerably to its sustainability.

*Finding creative solutions.*

Students stressed the importance of tackling the issues facing their engagement in the community in creative ways. In this regard, Adham offered the following perspective:

> Sometimes you need to think outside the box big time to find solutions. Sometimes you need to get transportation for the members. You have no way of doing it. We start thinking carpooling sometimes like a ride and come back. Sometimes, we just take taxies and pay.

This quote shows how as a student leader, Adham addressed the issue of transportation from the campus to the community by finding untraditional solutions to this obstacle.

*Faculty role.*

With regard to the role of faculty members, students wished for faculty support with both the classroom and the community components of CBL courses.
Classroom component.

For example, Farida hoped for designating some time to work on course assignments inside the classroom. As she explained:

I would actually like this course . . . to have time during class to write on it. Because all our writing is at home and it is a lot of writing. I would really appreciate it if we would have some class time at least in the last period of the semester to have some time inside the class. That would help . . . and you can go and ask the professor right away and I think it would be beneficial definitely.

Similarly, a survey respondent hoped for more class activities: “I would recommend more class activities so that students can be closer.” Implicit in this quote is a student’s wish for having connections with fellow students. This is an interesting finding; the typical discourse of university-community partnerships is built on the premise that the university and the community represent two different cultures. Therefore, one of the primary goals of service-learning partnerships is to help establish relationships between those entities. This quote reveals that efforts should be geared toward building relationships among the university community before embarking on building partnerships with the communities outside of the campus premise. This finding merits future attention.

Another survey respondent pointed to reflection as a distinct component of CBL courses, thus highlighting the role of faculty in planning and facilitating reflection activities: “Since CBL classes involve a lot more guided reflection, I liked and benefited from CBL classes and started seeking them as an undergraduate.” Intentional reflection has been repeatedly cited in the literature as essential for building the habit of interrogating one’s experiences in different ways (Eyler & Giles, 1999; O’Grady, 2000;
Rhoads, 1997). Notably, this student connected the reflection component of his CBL course to his level of satisfaction with, and benefit from, this course, as well as his commitment to taking more of these courses. This finding is consistent with previous research in stressing the value of reflection in service-learning courses and offers additional insights into the impacts of reflection on students’ learning and attitudes toward service-learning. Future research is needed to better illuminate the influence of reflection on the areas specified in this finding—students’ contentment, gains, and future decisions to enroll in CBL courses—as well as explore additional impacts, if any.

**Community component.**

Additionally, students called for faculty support with the community component of the course. For example, a survey respondent called for “more assistance from professors regarding student work in community. For instance, giving them opportunities to meet people from different NGOs.” Another survey respondent called upon CBL faculty members to ensure the commitment of all levels of the partnering organization(s) to working with students: “First and foremost, instructors at AUC should ensure that there is buy-in from every level of management of a community-based organization students will be working with, not just at the top level of management.” Furthermore, students advised CBL faculty members to clarify the expectations of the students’ roles at the community-based organizations and ensure that they are involved in meaningful work compatible with their capacities. As a survey respondent articulated:

Instructor should come to a common understanding with the NGO representatives about how to define the role his\her students are expected to play within the organization for the coming semester. Sometimes students have more to offer than the ability to volunteer to do mundane activities that will not add to their skill-set.
Moreover, participants expressed a desire to increase their fieldwork in the community and stressed the importance of allowing students freedom to choose the service sites. For example, a survey respondent stated, “I would recommend devoting some of the time we spend in class to being in the communities.” Similarly, another survey respondent noted, “There needs to be more interaction with real-life experiences outside of AUC with NGOs and nonprofit organizations that work with specific populations that are of interest of the student.”

In the same vein, Theresa shared an experience showing students’ disappointment when forced by the course instructor to work with a particular organization of his choice. As she described:

The XX [name of NGO was removed for confidentiality purposes] organization, none of our class volunteers was part of the organization. That was the teacher’s organization. . . . He asked us to submit proposals for projects that we wanted to do. But, he did not appreciate any of them because that was not what he was interested in . . . . I mean this was a man who has done his Ph.D. on XX [name of the specification was removed for confidentiality purposes] and he was pretty much the founder of the organization. . . . So, it felt more we were furthering his academic goals or dreams . . . . We [were] kind of disappointed.

Theresa’s story illustrates how she and fellow classmates were pushed into a relationship with an organization merely because of the instructor’s interest in this organization.

Although students identified topics of their interest, as implied in the above quote, the instructor disregarded students’ ideas and assigned them to an organization with which he had an established relationship. The instructor’s attitude can be explained in light of prior research. Past research by O’Meara and Niehaus (2009) revealed that faculty involvement with service-learning was directly connected with their present and past experiences. Furthermore, this study found that the faculty rationales for employing this
pedagogy were related to personal commitments to addressing a particular social cause. Given these findings, it is expected that faculty practice of service-learning will be influenced by their prior experiences and geared toward confronting specific causes of interest. Faculty members, however, must strive to let students decide on the focus of their projects and choose their service sites. Allowing students freedom of choice in such issues and encouraging them to play leadership roles may influence their engagement in, satisfaction with, and outcomes from, service-learning partnerships.

Students’ comments illustrate their commitment to enhancing CBL courses and their suggestions underscore the important faculty role in advancing CBL partnerships and in improving the classroom and the community components of CBL courses. In the classroom, students wanted more time to work on course assignments during course sessions, demonstrating their need for immediate feedback from the instructor. Additionally, students hoped that their instructors would facilitate more classroom activities, indicating the faculty role in building a sense of community among students.

As for the community component, students wished that their instructors introduce them to different community partners and ensure the commitment of the organizations at all levels to working with students, as well as allow them opportunities to spend more time in the field working with the community. Furthermore, students wanted their instructors to engage them in meaningful work at the service sites. Finally, students expressed their desires to have a choice of service sites. Students’ comments clearly portray the central role of faculty in strengthening the relationship between students and partnering communities. Past research deemed faculty members’ role in
institutionalizing service-learning in higher education as critical (Eyler & Giles, 1999). These findings confirm such a role and present salient examples in the voice of students about the roles faculty members may play to support and sustain service-learning partnerships.

**Administrator’s role.**

*Emphasizing the CBL program in the University’s goal and vision.*

Students were interested in cultivating a culture of community engagement in the University and proposed several ideas to feed this culture. One of these ideas was to emphasize the CBL program in the University’s goal and vision. For example, Mostafa advised the AUC administration to inculcate community engagement as a new goal of the University, thus encouraging faculty members to get engaged with the program. He offered the following perspective:

The administration’s job [is] to encourage teachers to make CBL courses or to say that AUC now has a new goal that says, “We’re trying to get more CBL courses done or students to become more involved in the community and just having that as part of the vision. I think that would get more teachers involved. I mean if they just said, “We’re trying to do this, they might get some people to sign up.

This quote illustrates Mostafa’s awareness of the connection between faculty participation in service-learning and university support for such work. Past research recognized and emphasized this relationship. For example, Hinck and Brandell (2000) found a positive relationship between the extent to which administrators value service-learning and the degree faculty engage in it.
Shifting perceptions of college students as children to adults.

To Adham, shifting the perception of college students from mere children and youths to responsible adults was another idea for cultivating a culture of community engagement inside the University in which students play active roles in their communities. Adham called upon higher education to conceive of students as adults, thus providing them with leadership opportunities. As he explained:

I would say that universities have to understand . . . [that] the whole view of college students as kids is not supposed to be there any more, (خلاص) [could be translated into English as enough]; they are men. They’re going to lead the Country in two or three years. . . . They should be given more responsibility. They should be given more opportunities.

As noted in previous discussions, youth exclusion was a prominent feature of the culture shaping Egypt in the pre-revolution era. The revolution was fueled by young people. Since then, they have been craving opportunities to get their voices heard and be included in the circles of decision making and power.

Recognizing student engagement in the community.

Participants’ perspectives varied regarding the idea and nature of acknowledging students’ involvement in CBL courses. For example, Mostafa thought that presenting awards to highly engaged students could be an effective strategy to attract more students to taking CBL courses. As he explained, “An award for students who are the most socially/civically responsible might also get more involvement from the students’ side.” However, Farida had a reserved opinion about student recognition. When asked whether or not featuring CBL students in the University internal publications, such as flyers or magazines, would be useful, she offered the following perspective:
You could do it. Honestly, I’m not really looking for that myself because …I’m not doing it to be put in a newspaper. But, I wouldn’t mind being in a newspaper if more students would ask to be in such a course afterwards. So, that would be very good.

As revealed by Farida’s words, her involvement in CBL courses was not motivated by publicity purposes; she was not looking to gain fame through her community service work. Thus, she accepted the idea of acknowledging student engagement with CBL courses only for its potential to increase the enrollment of fellow students in CBL courses. Theresa held a view similar to that of Farida. She explained: “Me personally, it would not help me feel good because . . . I think a lot of people like that. I wouldn’t. . . . But, I think that’s a good way to attract students.” As the quote indicates, Theresa felt that some students would be pleased to be highlighted in the University publications, but she stated that this practice would not be an incentive for her. Yet, she acknowledged that following this strategy may encourage more students to engage in CBL courses.

While Theresa acknowledged the perceived benefits of featuring CBL students in the University publications, she cautioned against the heavy emphasis on short-term strategies for rewarding students’ engagement in the program. As she explained:

But, also this has to be filtered somewhere because it’s kind of like the clubs here; a lot of students are attracted to the popularity and the fame that comes with it as supposed to being actually interested in the cause.

For the same reason, Theresa was not enthusiastic about awarding financial scholarships as a reward structure for CBL students. She put it in this way, “. . . I would just be cautious of having a CBL scholarship or something because I feel like someone would apply . . . because of the scholarship.” Rather than publicity and financial rewards, Theresa proposed symbolic and long-term reward structures. As she explained:
Maybe if you take so many CBL courses, there can be like a certificate, some sort of accolade on your degree. I think that would be good because most people will only do that if they really wanted. . . . I definitely think that putting something on the degree could be beneficial for the person and it would be like a good even a way to display that.

According to Theresa, awarding students certificates and recognizing their engagement in the community on their diplomas would serve a dual purpose of rewarding the individual student and enhancing the publicity of CBL courses. This finding reinforces the calls of an emerging body of literature for universities to develop service-learning certificates, majors, and minors (Butin, 2010c). Further investigations are warranted to explore the impacts of different reward structures on students’ involvement with service-learning.

Building resources for the CBL program.

Students suggested building resources for the CBL program. For example, a survey respondent offered the following perspective: “Establish something like [a] periodical to be a pool of term papers submitted every year because students' paper[s] encompass theories and experiences. And that will enrich this field.” Given CBL administrators’ complaints about the lack of resources available for the students, this suggestion could be a starting point for generating rich resources. Newly enrolled students in CBL courses may obtain helpful insights from reading the work of previously enrolled students. This finding prompts a direction for future studies to explore the impact of peer support on students’ enrollment in CBL partnerships.

The parts discussed above present students’ vision as to how to cultivate a supportive culture within the University for service-learning partnerships. The sections
that follow delineate students’ recommendations for enlarging the University’s impact on the community.

**Increasing the University’s impact on the community.**

Students provided several suggestions with regard to how the University may deepen its impact on the community. The following sections describe these suggestions.

**Broadening the circle of community partners.**

Participants suggested that the University broadens the circle of its community partners to include more community-based organizations, as well as assist them in connecting with each other. This suggestion was articulated by two survey respondents as follows: “Branch out to more than one NGO” and “Establish networks with community service organizations.” Other survey participants suggested the introduction of a broader set of activities and addressing multiple issues in the community simultaneously rather than focusing on one issue at a time. As these students wrote, “Make there [in the NGO] a wider range of activities we could do to help develop the community like, for example, in economics courses, giving workers training or help them find jobs that suit their qualifications since it's a big problem in Egypt” and “Not to focus on just one area, but to try to improve multiple areas at once.”

Students’ suggestions to integrate a variety of activities into service-learning partnerships and tackle several problems in the same time cue attention to the relationship between service-learning and interdisciplinary studies. That is, societal ills—whether social, economic, or political—are typically complex and multi-faceted; it is less likely that the expertise of one single discipline would address these problems effectively.
Rather, eliminating such issues necessitates the collective expertise of multiple disciplines. Therefore, institutionalizing service-learning in higher education can lead to the promotion of interdisciplinary studies as well. This area has not been investigated adequately and deserves future exploration.

Publicizing effective service-learning partnerships to other universities and schools was another major suggestion made by the participants. Mostafa’s comment is typical:

What I would like to see is . . . AUC encouraging this with other universities and with schools and then having that spread to the little guys: to the small NGOs because I feel that this would have a larger impact and would also get the term, “CBL” and the whole idea more coverage.

Mostafa further stressed the value of establishing partnerships with small grassroots community-based organizations, explaining:

There are certain NGOs here in Egypt that everybody knows like Alashanek Ya Balady (عشقانك يا بلدي), Nahdet El-Mahrous (نهضة المحروسة), Message (رسالة). . . I guess these are the type of organizations that AUC would work with because they’re high profile. They’re bi-lingual. They look good on our CVs, things like that. But if they were linked to smaller ones; the smaller ones are the ones that need help. They are the ones that need exposure. They are the ones that need students to write grant for them for free, things like that.

Several other students shared Mostafa’s opinion. For example, a survey respondent echoed Mostafa’s argument for initiating partnerships with small organizations. This student wrote:

AUC only partners with bilingual/high-profile organizations. This is understandable since the official language of education at AUC is English. However, this limits AUC’s impact on the community because it doesn’t reach the areas that need the most help. There needs to be some way for AUC to extend its reach.
Conversely, an international student self-identified as Kenyan provided the following perspective:

AUC should work primarily with well-established NGOs because these are the ones that have the means to run several programs at a time. That means they are more flexible in assigning students to a new role\program if unforeseen circumstances occur. And some circumstance[s] happen every semester at AUC. For example, a revolution or a swine flu scare etc.

Unlike Mostafa and other students, the Kenyan student felt that AUC should partner mainly with entrenched organizations because, as he argued, such organizations are better able to include various activities, accommodate students’ different interests, and safeguard against unpredictable events. Obviously, this student’s view represents a negative case and might be shaped by a negative experience he had experienced at a small organization. The development stage of this student could be another plausible explanation of his view; his comment indicated that he was focused exclusively on students’ gains from service-learning partnerships with almost no consideration of the community impact of these collaborations. As noted earlier, the methodological intent of this study was not to examine how students’ views were influenced by their demographic characteristics or personal traits; rather to understand the collective vision of each group of participants as they constitute service-learning partners. Thus, it is difficult to reach a definitive conclusion as to why his view regarding the type of organizations with which AUC should partner was quite different from fellow students participating in this study.

Except for the opinion of the Kenyan participant, students emphatically urged AUC to expand the circle of community partners to include small organizations. They also encouraged the University to go beyond the local communities and include
partnerships with other universities and schools outside of Cairo. While students understood the rationale of why AUC was inclined to partner with well-established organizations, they still called upon the University to partner with starting grassroots organizations. Students’ views demonstrate their serious commitment to affecting their communities in authentic and significant ways. Students’ willingness to work with struggling organizations with monolingual staff, thus sacrificing the comfort and benefits they would likely to gain when partnering with famous organizations, provides evidence contrary to the prevailing image of AUC students as careless, distant from the community, and blind to the suffering of underprivileged fellow Egyptians. While AUC might encounter more administrative and other difficulties when partnering with small organizations, the University should not shy away from so doing. Rather, AUC should focus on building the capacity of small organizations, thus honoring students’ wishes, extending its impact on the community, and providing more opportunities for a greater number of students from different disciplines to be engaged in the CBL program. Expanding CBL partnerships beyond Cairo might involve practical issues, such as transportation, communication, time, and staff. Therefore, careful planning, coordination among various stakeholders, and allocating sufficient resources would prove critical when embarking on such collaborations.

*Establishing long-term relationships with community partners.*

Establishing long-term relationships with community partners was another significant recommendation made by students. As a survey respondent articulated, “I suggest introducing an element of continuity where students work on one project or with
one community partner for a whole academic year, two consecutive semesters.” This suggestion pinpoints time as an important factor leading to strengthening university-community relationships. Students’ call for extending the relationship with community partners reinforces their aspirations to establish transformative partnerships with community partners.

Assessing community perspective and impact of CBL partnerships.

Finally, students posed questions about the community partner perspective and impact of service-learning. For example, when asked about her perception of the impact of the CBL program on the community, Theresa responded, “That’s one of the things that I have actually been wondering.” She went on to elaborate:

I honestly don’t know how they [community partners] feel. And I think it’s a story that should be done because even though yes they [University officials] take into consideration how community organizations feel or what they should get out of it. I don’t know if I have actually seen any research done talking to the community-based organizations to understand what they liked about this program, what they didn’t like about this program, how they feel it could improve or not.

Theresa’s comment clearly indicate that the assessment component of the community partner perspective and impact has been absent from CBL partnerships. Her words also imply a belief in the importance of conducting such an evaluation. This finding reinforces previous claims that service-learning research on the community perspective is rare and recent (Worrall, 2007) and that there is bias in the literature toward student outcomes of service-learning (Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). However the failure to grapple with understanding the community perspective may cause misunderstanding between institutions of higher education and community partners (Sandy & Holland, 2006). Thus, it is important that institutions of higher education plan carefully for, and allocate
sufficient resources to, assessing the community perspective on, and impact of, service-
learning partnerships. Likewise, community partners are encouraged to develop their
own evaluation tools to assess the impact of such partnerships on their agencies and
clients. Conducting an ongoing evaluation of service-learning collaborations would
provide useful information about the value of these partnerships to all the parties
involved. Also, such an evaluation might promote reciprocal relationships between the
university and the community, provided that each party would recognize its contributions
and gains.

As shown above, students’ vision for improving service-learning partnerships
emphasized creating a supportive environment for community engagement in the
University, as well as deepening the University’s impact on the community. Students
specified responsibilities for themselves, fellow students, faculty members, and the
university administration. Students’ suggestions seemed to situate the University at the
center of service-learning partnerships. That is, students were more vociferous about
what the University’s constituents should do to enhance these partnerships than the
responsibility of the community for the same purpose. This observation does not
necessarily mean that students did not value the community partners’ role in these
collaborations because they did, as is evident by their remarks presented in the
relationship section. Rather, this observation may suggest that students are aware of the
wide gaps in power and resources between the University and the community. Or,
students’ emphasis on the University’s role may exemplify engrained cultural beliefs in
the superiority of the expert knowledge in the academy over the practical wisdom of
community partners. Each of these explanations is equally plausible and holds important implications for higher education. Engaging students in carefully chosen readings that address the concepts of power, reciprocity, resource sharing, and social change, along with providing them with safe spaces to discuss these concepts openly would enable students to rethink their assumptions regarding the roles of the university and community in furthering service-learning partnerships.
Summary

This section presented students’ perceptions of the partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations. The first part of this section introduced the students who were interviewed for this study, including background information about each and their involvement with community-based activities. The second part described students’ motivations for engagement with these collaborations, revealing that making contributions to their communities and advancing their academic and professional skills were the primary motivators for students’ engagement with their communities. The third part discussed students’ perceptions of the relationships among CBL partners, which indicated that CBL partnerships are characterized by transactional relationships with hopes for the progression toward transformative partnerships. The fourth part delineated students’ perceptions of the challenges to CBL partnerships, showing that the organizational structures of community-based agencies, cultural norms, and political situation in Egypt during the spring of 2011 were major barriers.

Noteworthy, the January 25th uprising of 2011 in Egypt was cited as an obstacle to students’ engagement with their communities. However, it must be remembered that the obstacle constituted by the Revolution was only temporally. The revolution, indeed, presented a golden opportunity for increasing students’ involvement with service-learning partnerships. Specifically, it changed the political situation in positive ways that afforded students opportunities to participate in civic life. Additionally, the Revolution led to the emergence of a new culture in which universities are becoming more open to negotiating the civic mission of higher education. Likewise, parents are becoming
accepting and hopefully supportive of their children’s engagement in their communities as an integral part of their formal education. Most importantly, the leadership role of youth during the Uprising and in the aftermath of the revolution led to a cultural shift from traditional perceptions of college students as a vulnerable group to a new vision of students as reliable and capable of bringing about substantial change in their communities. The fifth and last part presented students’ vision for improving CBL partnerships, which emphasized the importance of nurturing a supportive environment for community engagement in Egypt and increasing the University’s impact on the community emerged as the key strategies.
Cross Group Analysis

The previous sections presented the findings of the four groups under examination in this study: NGO professionals, students, administrators, and faculty members. The purpose of this section is to present cross group analyses of these findings. Specifically, this section highlights the commonalities and differences emerging from the data analysis section of each group. This discussion is organized into four parts around the research questions guiding this inquiry. As such, the first part focuses on the groups’ motivations for engaging in CBL partnerships; the second examines the groups’ perceptions of these collaborations in light of Enos and Morton’s (2003) framework; the third addresses the groups’ conceptions of the challenges to CBL partnerships, and the fourth illuminates the groups’ perspectives as to how these collaborations can be effectively established and maintained. This section concludes with a discussion of the most notable findings across the service-learning partners under study.

Partnership Motivations

Commonalities.

A close look at the themes emerging from each group reveals the presence of two common motivations: contributing to the community and advancing students’ education. Participants in the four groups referenced their goals to contribute to their communities and enhance student academic and personal growth. With regard to the community motivator, NGO professionals were encouraged to join CBL partnerships to make a difference in their communities by raising students’ awareness of economic privileges, the plight of the poor, socioeconomic disparities, and unjust structures in society.
Similarly, students took CBL courses to contribute to their community, practically by addressing acute poverty issues and economic disparities between the rich and the poor. Likewise, administrators initiated CBL partnerships in order to promote the university’s goals for community service. Faculty members were also partially motivated to teach CBL courses to contribute to the community, especially after the university’s move to a new campus in a remote area in Cairo, as well as the Egyptian revolution of January 25th, 2011.

Advancing college students’ education and growth is the other communal motivation across the four groups. NGO professionals spoke of their desire to educate the next generation of decision makers. Similarly, administrators strongly emphasized their goals of advancing students’ academic learning and personal growth through CBL partnerships. Students enrolled in CBL courses with the hope of gaining new and practical experiences, learning different approaches to their disciplines, gaining professional development experiences, and satisfying the requirements of their degrees. Faculty members perceived CBL as a progressive pedagogy to enhance student learning. In particular, they believed that providing students with experiential learning opportunities would help them better comprehend course concepts, connect theory to practice, and acquire new skills. Past research is consistent with the faculty participants’ perceptions of the potential of service-learning pedagogy. For example, Zlotkowski (2001) demonstrated that service-learning can be a means for collaborative learning, problem-based learning, learning communities, critical thinking, enhanced
communication skills, and multiculturalism. Similarly, Ward (1999) showed that the use of service-learning can lead to the development of a coherent curriculum.

**Differences.**

While NGO professionals, students, administrators, and faculty members had common motivations, each group expressed distinct goals for participating in CBL partnerships. For example, NGO professionals emphasized the importance of promoting cross cultural boundaries between students and community members through these partnerships. They repeatedly spoke of their desires to “expose” each group to the other for the benefit of both and the greater community. Additionally one NGO professional, Mohammad, wanted to engage AUC students in experiences that hopefully would lead them to take pride in their country. As discussed earlier, colonialism has had an enduring impact on Egyptians’ perceptions of their culture and that of the colonizer. Unfortunately, many Egyptians believe in the superiority of the colonizer’s culture to that of their own. As such, Muhammed thought to expose students to bright facets of their local culture, such as the beautiful artwork and multiple climate zones existing in Egypt, in the hope of encouraging students to feel proud of their country and appreciate its uniqueness.

Students’ motivations to join CBL partnerships for self-realization were quite unique. Students took CBL courses to gain opportunities through which they could make a difference in their communities. As described earlier, the marginalization of young people in Egypt prior to the Egyptian revolution of January 25\textsuperscript{th}, 2011 may account for such motivations. Moreover, students’ sense of interconnectedness with fellow humans
is another distinct motivation for their involvement in CBL partnerships. Such a feeling led students to develop moral commitments to furthering the common good in any given community.

Administrators were motivated to establish CBL partnerships with communities by a unique goal of furthering the ideals of liberal arts education. They emphasized their commitment to the goals of AUC as a private liberal arts university. Explaining the goals of liberal arts institutions, Garth (1999) stated:

Private liberal arts institutions . . . not only consider student learning their preeminent goal but indeed set their sights for this learning intentionally high, nurturing students to aspire not just for jobs but for meaningful careers that can contribute to society, not just for a knowledge of civics but for sustained involvement in responsible and active citizenship. The intent is that graduates should find a moral imperative in improving their world. (p. 9)

Commonly stated goals of service-learning include advancing students’ knowledge about democracy and their overall sense of civic responsibility (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Hunter & Brisbin, 2000; Yates & Youniss, 1998), and promoting comprehension of the course content and greater appreciation of the discipline (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). Clearly, the mission of liberal arts institutions is quite harmonious with the goals of service-learning.

Faculty members’ sense of civic responsibility for improving their communities was a distinct motivation to their engagement in CBL partnerships. In addition to enhancing students’ learning goals, faculty members’ motivations for teaching CBL courses stemmed from personal experiences and commitment to addressing specific causes, such as women and children issues. These findings confirm those of O’Meara and Niehaus (2009) who reported that service-learning was a means for satisfying an
autobiography for some faculty members who expressed personal commitments to particular social issues.

**Partnership Relationships**

**Commonalities.**

The theme of current transactional relationships along with aspirations to transformative partnerships is present in the four groups’ perceptions of CBL partnerships. A general consensus existed between all participants on the short-term relationships characterizing current CBL partnerships. Specifically, all groups referred to the minimum interactions between the university constituents and community partners, as well as the clear boundaries between the academy and the community. Such attributes along with the fact that the program was in its early stages clearly describe transactional relationships in light of Enos and Morton’s (2003) framework. Despite the transactional relationships describing current CBL collaborations, the potential exists that these collaborations might progress toward transformative partnerships in the future. Indications included the friendly relationships between university and community partners, as well as partners’ general positive attitudes toward the program and each other. The most compelling evidence for the potential of transformative partnerships is participants’ hopes for long-term partnerships and their awareness of the key concepts of transformative partnerships: reciprocity and community empowerment.

**Differences.**

Participants’ comments were often complementary to each other with regard to the relationship theme. However, their references to support this theme were slightly
different. For example, NGO professionals repeatedly emphasized the limited time students spent at their agencies, and their minimum interactions with faculty members and program staff. But, they provided almost no comments on reciprocity. The omission of reciprocity might be attributed to NGO professionals’ unfamiliarity with the concept or might be understood in light of the earlier discussion on how the academy is typically perceived as superior to the community. Substantial work is indeed needed to encourage community constituents to resist those cultural norms rather than perpetuating them.

Unlike NGO professionals, faculty members often reflected on reciprocity, expressing concerns about the threats whether it occurred in CBL partnerships. For university administrators, reciprocity was a take-for-granted issue in the sense that they considered it a pillar of the program, but they did not adequately investigate whether or not it took place in their interactions with community partners. Nonetheless, the program staff members were conscious of the transactional relationships characterizing their interactions with community partners as they emphasized that CBL partnerships were being established at the class level as opposed to the university level.

Aside from the ideal of reciprocity, there was a general agreement between NGO professionals, faculty members, and administrators on the alignment between the course goals and those of the organizations. However, students reported minor tensions in this area. Since students directly serve, their voice should inform the strategic planning behind these collaborations to ensure mutual benefits for all the partners involved.
Partnership Challenges

The differences between the academy and the community were a convergent challenge perceived by the four groups. All participants often highlighted the challenge of reconciling the academic calendar with the ongoing nature of community-based organizations’ work as a major impediment to CBL partnerships. The differences between the university and the community were also illustrated in the theoretical approaches academicians tend to prefer as compared with the practical approaches community constituents typically employ in tackling any given issues.

Concerns pertaining to cultural-related issues were common in the student and NGO professionals groups. Both groups cited their unfamiliarity with connecting coursework with community service, trust issues, and parents’ opposition as impediments to CBL partnerships. Additionally, students identified language as a cultural barrier to international students with limited or no Arabic language competencies. Cultural-related issues did not seem to constitute a challenge to faculty members or administrators. However, those from outside Egypt cited limited Arabic language skills and insufficient knowledge about the local culture as barriers to their engagement with community partners.

While organizational-related issues were a shared concern among faculty members, students, and NGO professionals, these issues were most prevalent among the faculty group. Some faculty members expressed their frustrations with some agencies for a variety of reasons, including their bureaucratic systems, the reluctance of some staff to share information about their organizations, the insufficient experience of some staff
members, and the weak commitment of some organizations to CBL partnerships. Similarly, students voiced concerns about the obscurity of the missions and goals of some community-based organizations and the hierarchical structures within those organizations.

In the same vein, NGO professionals spoke of the limited capacities of their agencies. As such, the organizational-related issues identified by faculty members and students must be considered with caution. That is, these issues could be attributed to the limited capacities of these agencies rather than the attitudes of their staff members. For example, the origins of the seemingly insufficient commitment and reluctance of some agencies to share information with academicians might be traced to these organizations’ limited financial and/or human resources. Typically, well-established organizations are better able to accommodate larger numbers of student and allocate staff member(s) to maintain timely communication with university constituents. Future research should investigate how the capacity of community-based organizations affects their service-learning partnerships with institutions of higher education.

Administrators hardly mentioned any concerns about organizational issues. The personalized relationships between the program director and NGO professionals could explain why administrators were satisfied with their partnering organizations. University-community partnerships are often established based on personal connections between individuals in both settings. Such personal relationships can be valuable in the initiation phase of partnerships. However, as the partnership matures, these relationships must be institutionalized to ensure their sustainability. Otherwise, these collaborations
would be subject to termination should these individuals leave their positions for one reason or another.

Student-related issues were another common theme among faculty members, NGO professionals, and administrators. Participants in these groups named several issues, including student resistance, lack of interest, inadequate preparation, immaturity, busy schedules, and safety. In a parallel fashion, students voiced concerns about their interactions with these constituents. For example, Mostafa felt that some community-based organizations’ views of students as “less important” than senior administrators resulted in NGO staff members being slow in their communication with students. Theresa was dissatisfied with a faculty member’s policy that forced students into working with a specific agency based on the faculty member’s choice rather than that of students. Adham lamented how higher education typically perceives its mission solely in transmitting academic knowledge into students and preparing them for the workforce.

A noteworthy finding is that the program staff members perceived the barriers to establishing and maintaining effective CBL partnerships primarily in terms of institutional issues. Specifically, they felt that the lack of institutional support resulted in scarce financial and academic resources available to the program. Administrators referred to conflicting interests in the university, and criteria for university ranking systems as other major issues impeding the university’s capacity to promote the CBL program.

Similar to administrators’ views, faculty members cited institutional-related issues as major deterrents to teaching CBL courses. These issues included logistics, poor co-
ordination between units on campus, as well as lack of funding and administrative support. As such, faculty members’ perceptions of the challenges facing CBL partnerships intersected with the views of the program staff and university administrators. However, faculty members identified other difficulties beyond the institutional-related ones, with the considerable time associated with teaching CBL courses being the most frequently cited issue. Also mentioned as deterrents to teaching CBL courses were the tenure and promotion system and the under-appreciation of faculty involvement with CBL partnerships by colleagues and university administrators. Additionally, pedagogical-related issues were distinct challenges faced by the faculty group. These issues related to unfamiliarity with teaching CBL courses as well as difficulties connecting academics to service, planning meaningful service projects, achieving the course goals, and assessing CBL courses.

The political situation in Egypt was another common challenge to CBL partnerships across the four groups. However, each group addressed this challenge in somewhat distinct ways. For community members, the political challenge manifested itself in the bureaucracy and lack of democracy in Egypt prior to the Egyptian revolution of January 25th, 2011. According to community members, such an environment considerably restricted their work, and thus limited their organizations’ capacities to responding to increasing community needs. Administrators voiced concerns about student safety given the Egyptian revolution and other uprisings in several neighboring countries which occurred simultaneously during 2011. As a precaution, the University administration decided to send members of the university campus safety unit to
accompany students in their visits to community-based organizations, especially in the beginning of the semester. This new safety measure posed a small financial burden on the University’s budget. Likewise, some students noted that the political unrest in Egypt posed a challenge to their engagement in CBL partnerships during that time. Students reported restrictions imposed by the university administration on their visits to their respective community-based organizations during the spring of 2011. These restrictions reduced students’ visits to their agencies and minimized their interactions with community members.

Similar to administrators’ perspectives, faculty members spoke of accountability for students’ safety and how the political unrest in Egypt intensified such issues. However, faculty members’ perceptions of the political challenge went beyond the Egyptian uprising to the political situation in Egypt prior to the revolution. For example, Jack explained that the undemocratic practices of the previous government discouraged youth participation in civic life. As such, the goals of the government prior to the revolution conflicted with those of CBL partnerships regarding preparing students for active citizenship. Therefore, he was concerned about engaging students in the CBL program, noting that doing so might risk students’ safety and overall well-being.

As indicated above, the political situation, particularly the Egyptian uprising, was identified by all groups as a challenge to CBL partnerships in the spring semester of 2011. However, the adverse effects of the revolution on CBL partners should not be exaggerated for several reasons. For example, while the revolution reduced students’ visits to, and minimized their interactions with community members, students spent
limited time at their service sites irrespective of the revolution. Also, the communication between university and community partners was minimal prior to the revolution. As such, the revolution might have reduced the level of interactions among university and community partners, but was not the core reason behind those types of relationships. Moreover, revolutions usually lead to major changes in all facets of life in any society where they take place and are typically followed by periods of instability. Therefore, the seemingly negative impact of the revolution on CBL partnerships should be regarded as a short-term effect. In actuality, this uprising potentially opens windows of opportunities for advancing CBL partnerships given the political reform in Egypt to which the revolution may lead.

**Partnership Improvements**

**Commonalities.**

The need for rigorous work to sustain the CBL program was a prevalent theme throughout participants’ suggestions for improving CBL partnerships. NGO professionals stressed the need for the strategic planning of these partnerships including specifying clear connections between the service component and the curriculum, facilitating logistics, increasing student and faculty involvement, following a step-by-step approach for engaging students, and developing a clear vision for the program. Interestingly, the latter suggestion corresponds to students’ complaints about the unclear missions and visions of some organizations. Thus, the lack of clarity is an issue for students as well as community partners. Therefore, the academy and the community
should invest time in clarifying their goals and articulating how their service-learning partnerships may help promote these goals.

Students perceived the cultivation of a nurturing environment as necessary for sustaining and advancing CBL partnerships. For example, they highlighted the importance of stressing community service in the mission and goals of the University. They also suggested increasing the publicity and resources for the program. Program staff members underscored the need for institutionalizing the program in the University such that it would have an infrastructure and institutional budget. They also stressed the importance of cultivating a supportive culture for community engagement. In this vein, they called for ensuring institutional leadership support, acknowledging community service in tenure and promotion policies, and activating the role of academic departments in advancing this work. Significantly, many of the faculty participants’ suggestions intersected with those of students and administrators. Like students, faculty members suggested increasing the publicity for the program. Similar to administrators’ comments, faculty participants recommended building a support system for faculty including establishing a service-learning office on campus, revising the tenure guidelines and reward structures, and ensuring the University leadership’s commitment to their service-learning work. Also, they recommended diversifying the program’s funding sources.

Assessing the community perspective and impact of CBL partnerships was the other overlapping theme across the four groups. NGO professionals called attention to the importance of ensuring community involvement in the planning of these collaborations and suggested assessing the program, especially the community impact
component. Significantly, NGO professionals emphasized the need to promote the capacity of partnering community-based organizations rather than focusing solely on the clients served by these agencies. Likewise, students spoke extensively about the importance of enlarging the university impact on the community. In this regard, they suggested expanding the circle of community partners to include small organizations, building long-term relationships with partners, and assessing community perspective of, and outcomes from, the program. Program staff echoed students’ suggestions for ensuring community voice and conducting program assessment. They also stressed the importance of enlarging and diversifying community partners so as to establish partnerships with other universities in the region and beyond. Likewise, faculty participants’ suggestions for enlarging the circle of community partners and assessing community impact of CBL partnerships converged with those of NGO professionals, students, and administrators.

Differences.

While the groups’ recommendations for improving CBL partnerships overlapped in some areas as discussed above, each group expressed unique suggestions as well. For example, NGO professionals underscored the importance of tailoring the CBL program to an Egyptian context. They also suggested developing orientation sessions to inform community partners about the history and success stories of service-learning partnerships. This latter suggestion is consistent with Freire’s (1970) argument that the highest stage of learning, conscientización, necessitates placing social issues in their historical contexts. As such, sharing the historical progression of service-learning and its success stories with
community members would promote their understanding of the concept of connecting academic coursework to community service, and enable them to learn lessons from previous partnerships. These orientations would also better facilitate community members’ interactions with university constituents.

Students provided many unique suggestions for advancing service-learning partnerships. For example, they called upon their fellow students to take CBL courses and encourage their colleagues to enroll in these courses as well. Moreover, they aspired to gain the instructor’s assistance with a wide range of issues pertaining to the instructional and community aspects of CBL courses. In particular, they suggested that faculty designate a portion of class time for students to work on course assignments, build a sense of community between students, and facilitate reflection activities. With regard to the community component, students recommended that faculty introduce them to multiple agencies and allow them the choice of the partnering organizations, clarify the expectations of student roles at these agencies, ensure the commitment of community partners, and increase the time students spend at their service sites. Furthermore, students called upon the university officials and the community at large to perceive them as adults capable of leading change in society. Finally, students thought that the university’s acknowledgement of student service-learners could be a means of attracting more students to these partnerships.

Significantly, students’ unique recommendations draw attention to a number of important issues. First, their suggestions highlight the role of bottom-up and top-down support in advancing service-learning partnerships. Second, students’ conclusions that
service-learning partnerships can be improved by increased involvement of faculty with both the classroom and community components confirm those of past research about the importance of faculty participation in service-learning pedagogy (Pribbenow, 2005; Zlotkowski et al., 2006). Third, students’ demands for increasing the time allotted for the service component correspond to those of NGO professionals who called for more students’ involvement with their organizations.

Faculty participants made distinct suggestions for promoting of CBL partnerships. These suggestions included reducing the teaching load for CBL faculty members given the substantial time required for teaching these courses, and offering opportunities for team-teaching CBL courses, as well as recruiting professors of practice. Motivated by a sense of accountability for students and community partners, one faculty participant, Jack, recommended establishing formal structures to guide the CBL collaborations between the university and community-based organizations.
Summary

In conclusion, this section provided cross-group analyses of the findings of NGO professionals, students, administrators, and faculty members. The analyses were structured around the research questions guiding this study. As such, the discussion focused on four main areas: motivations for, challenges to, and improvements of service-learning partnerships at AUC, as well as the relationships between partners in light of Enos and Morton’s (2003) framework for transactional-transformative partnerships. The analyses revealed commonalities and differences between the four groups. As illustrated above, participants’ comments frequently converged, especially in the relationship area in which the four groups agreed on the transactional partnerships characterizing current CBL collaborations with aspirations to transformative partnerships. Some of the participants’ motivations for joining CBL partnerships also overlapped, particularly those concerning community development and student learning. Likewise, some of the participants’ comments intersected regarding the challenges to CBL partnerships. For example, the four groups highlighted the differences between the academy and the community as well as the political situation in Egypt as major barriers to their collaborations. Participants held similar views with respect to the strategies for improving CBL partnerships. Specifically, the four groups emphasized the importance of nurturing a supportive culture for CBL partnerships and the necessity for evaluating their work, especially the community aspect.

In addition to these commonalities, each group of participants offered unique perspective that reflected their own identity. In particular, NGO professionals focused on
issues pertaining to their organizations, their causes, and the specific population they serve. Students provided unique perspectives on how they negotiate their roles in CBL partnerships given common perceptions of youth and the mission of higher education in Egypt. Administrators’ views were distinct in their repeated emphasis on institutional barriers to promoting CBL partnerships. Finally, pedagogical-related issues were unique to faculty participants’ perceptions of CBL partnerships. Significantly, the collective vision of the four groups led to the generation of a complex and holistic portrayal of service-learning partnerships at AUC.
Chapter Five: Conclusion

This chapter is arranged into five major sections; the first provides an outline of the study, summarizing its findings and results. The second explicates the connection between the qualitative and quantitative components, showing how each component complemented the other. Based on the findings and results of the study, the third section offers recommendations for policy, practice, and research. The fourth and fifth sections discuss the study’s limitations and contributions, respectively.

Summary

A concurrent transformative design with an embedded strategy (Creswell, 2009; Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2008) was employed in this study to explore service-learning partnerships at the American University in Cairo (AUC). Qualitative and quantitative data were gathered simultaneously from April to July of 2011. The study was driven by the qualitative procedures with a supplemental quantitative component.

Qualitative component.

The purpose of the qualitative data was to understand these partnerships in terms of the motivators of their initiation, the relationships between the involved partners, the difficulties of establishing and sustaining them, and the opportunities for enhancing them. Qualitative data were collected through face-to-face interviews with eighteen participants representing four groups: NGO professionals, administrators, faculty members, and
students. The next section summarizes the study’s findings in relation to the research questions.

The qualitative component of this study sought to answer four questions. The first one was: What motivates CBL partnerships at AUC? Analyses showed that contributing to the community, enhancing students’ learning and growth, and achieving the civic mission of the university were primary motivators for partners’ engagement in CBL partnerships.

The second question was: What does the nature of CBL partnerships look like in terms of Enos and Morton’s (2003) transactional and transformative relationships? Findings revealed that the four groups perceived their CBL relationships as transactional with aspirations for elevating to the transformative level (see the first chapter for a detailed discussion on differences between the two types of relationships). Within Enos and Morton’s typology for the development of campus-community partnerships, the vast majority of CBL partnerships examined in this study fall in the Short-Term Placements category. The early stages of the program along with the issues facing it account for its placement in such a category which is characterized by limited accountability and minor changes to existing structures at the university and community-based organizations. However, AUC’s CBL partnerships with Alwan wa Awtar and some of the partnerships administered by the Psychology Department can be described as Ongoing Placemats, Mutual Dependence because of their sustained nature over time. As Enoss and Morton theorized, service-learning partnership at this level is experienced and inferred with sufficient depth that allows the partners to appreciate the complexity of the specific
challenges they tackle and promote their understanding of broader issues. Thus, there is a potential for significant learning and transformation to occur in this stage.

The third question was: What are the challenges facing CBL partnerships? Analyses revealed a host of issues related to culture, politics, organizations, the institution, pedagogy, and students constitute barriers impeding CBL partnerships at AUC.

The fourth question of the qualitative component was: How can CBL partners help promote their partnerships? Participants’ suggestions focused on four major areas: following strategic thinking and planning, institutionalizing the program in the University, cultivating an institutional culture supportive of community engagement, and deepening the University’s impact on the community.

Cross group analyses revealed that groups’ perspectives overlapped in several areas. For example, there were striking similarities between the four groups concerning the relationship theme; participants felt that their CBL relationships are transactional, but hoped for developing transformative relationships in their future collaborations. Also, the need for program evaluation was a recurring theme across the four groups; participants underlined the importance of assessing the program with special attention to community perspective and impact of these partnerships. In general, the consistency of data across the groups contributed to the validity of the study’s findings.

**Quantitative component.**

The goal of the quantitative component was to determine the relationship between students’ scores on the Community Awareness and Interpersonal Effectiveness scales and
their demographics as well as course experiences. Quantitative data were collected via a survey questionnaire developed by the researcher to gather demographic information on students’ age, gender, academic major, ethnicity/race, enrollment status, current grade point average, class level, and citizenship status. The survey included two scales authored by Moley et al. (2008). The 38–item self-reported questionnaire yielded a total of 61 responses; 41 of them were submitted electronically using an on-line survey while 20 hard copies were completed manually using paper-and-pencil.

Analyses investigating the relationships between students’ scores on the two scales employed and course experiences did not detect any statistically significant relationships except that there was a positive low relationship between students’ scores on the Community Awareness and their overall participation in community activities inside and outside the classroom. Likewise, analyses showed that there was a positive moderate relationship between students’ scores on the Interpersonal Effectiveness scale and their overall participation in community activities inside and outside the classroom. Similarly, analyses examining the relationships between students’ scores on the two scales employed and their demographic characteristics did not reveal any statistically significant relationships with the sole exception of a statistically significant difference between departments on the Community Awareness scale; students’ scores on this scale were lower for the students who took CBL courses in the Rhetoric department than those who took CBL courses in other departments.
Connection between Qualitative Findings and Quantitative Results

As explained in detail in the methods chapter, quantitative and qualitative methods were combined in this study for complementarity purposes. According to Greene et al. (2008), the intent of a complementarity design is “to use the results from one method to elaborate, enhance, or illustrate the results from the other” (p. 136). In this study, quantitative and qualitative methods were employed to examine different facets of the phenomena under investigation, service-learning partnerships at AUC. The sections that follow describe how quantitative and qualitative methods complemented each other in this study.

The results of the quantitative data showed that the majority of students—forty seven (77.0%)—spent only one to five hours per week at their respective organizations while a mere (1.6%) spent 15-20 there. Qualitative data analysis illustrated these results by revealing that CBL partnerships at AUC were characterized by transactional relationships. Students’ few visits to the NGOs and the short time they spent there were among the evidence for these transactional relationships. Reflecting on his interactions with his service site, Mostafa said, “To be quite honest, we [Mostafa and fellow students in the same group] haven’t really gone out that much for the community-based course. I mean it’s only really twice and one of those times, I wasn’t around.” In a similar vein, quantitative data analyses revealed that the vast majority of students—fifty one (83.6 %)—took 1 to 2 CBL courses, 9 (14.8%) took 3 to 4 courses while only 1 student (1.6 %) took 5 or more courses. Qualitative data analysis enhanced our understanding of these numbers by identifying the lack of publicity of CBL courses as a serious issue facing
CBL partnerships; participants’ voices stressed the need for rigorous efforts to publicize CBL courses among students. For example, Farida said: “I’m not sure that students know about it [CBL course]. I didn’t know about this course until I was searching online for a while.” Similarly, Theresa stated:

I don’t think that CBL courses are that well publicized yet. I definitely don’t. I mean I learned about it through the [Gerhart] Center. So, just because I know a lot about them doesn’t mean that a lot of people do because a lot of people don’t. In addition to adding depth to the numbers, qualitative findings helped resolve a dilemma raised by the quantitative results. Specifically, the quantitative analyses detected a statistically significant difference between departments ($t = -4.30$, $df = 57$, $p = .001$). The differences between groups ($M_{Rhetoric} = 38.56$, $M_{other\,department} = 44.19$, $SD_{Rhetoric} = 5.79$, $SD_{other\,department} = 4.27$) showed that students who took their CBL courses in the Rhetoric department scored lower on the Community Awareness scale than their counterparts who took these courses in other departments. This result was confusing and quite unexpected given the background information about the CBL program; in particular, the founding director of the program was a faculty member in the Rhetoric Department who was known for her dedicated efforts in promoting the program. For example, Mostafa cited his meeting with the director as a motivator for him to take a CBL course. He said: “My motivation was [that] I actually met the founder of [the] CBL program at AUC and she told us in detail about her thought process when making a CBL course and how it works. And she told us about the specific class I am taking.” In addition to the role of the program director in promoting CBL courses among students, the Rhetoric Department offered a significant number of CBL courses at AUC which
denoted that its faculty members had a good grasp of this pedagogy and were enthusiastic about teaching CBL courses.

To investigate the reasons for the seeming contradiction between the quantitative results and the background information about the program, additional analyses were conducted to examine a) if there was a difference in students’ scores on the Community Awareness scale based on semester, and b) if there was an association between department and semester. Results showed that there was a statistically significant difference in students’ scores on the Community Awareness’ scale ($t = -3.89$, df $= 57$, $p = .001$); students who took CBL courses in 2011 scoring lower than their counterparts who took these courses in earlier semesters: ($M_{spring\ semester} = 39.75$, $M_{earlier\ semesters} = 44.91$, $SD_{spring\ semester} = 5.61$, $SD_{earlier\ semesters} = 3.76$). Also, analyses yielded a statistically significant association between the department and semester: $\chi^2 (1, N = 57) = 14.87$, $p = .001$, showing that the majority of students who took CBL courses in the Rhetoric Department enrolled in these courses in the spring of 2011.

Qualitative findings significantly enhanced the understanding of these results. In particular, analyses illustrated that the Egyptian Revolution of January 2011 had several implications for students’ participation in the CBL courses during the spring semester of the same year. In particular, the University was closed for two weeks as a result of the revolution. Although the spring semester started later than its scheduled time, its end was not extended to account for this delay. As such, students were rushed to finish their service-learning projects by the end of the semester. Furthermore, students’ attention during this semester was directed to the unfolding events of the revolution, thus affecting
their focus on their service-learning projects. For example, Farida complained about the time pressure, offering a suggestion for designating a portion of class session for students to work on assignments:

I would really appreciate it if we would have some class time at least . . . Maybe it’s just this semester where we have a short semester and . . . everything is crazy because of everything that’s been happening. So, we’re very distracted easily and everything takes more time. . . but we’re under a lot pressure when it comes to time. We definitely are.

Moreover, students’ visits to their respective community-based organizations were restricted by the new safety measures imposed by the University’s administration to protect students. Farida highlighted this issue noting, “Someone mentioned from the Gerhart Center that . . . if we go downtown to the NGO, we should go with, or we are advised to go with security.” These measures further confined students’ opportunities to interact with community partners. Taken together, these factors provide plausible explanations as to why students who took service-learning courses in the Rhetoric Department during the spring of 2011 were less satisfied with their courses than their counterparts who took these courses in other departments in earlier semesters. These analyses provide a powerful example of how qualitative findings assisted in explaining quantitative results.

Qualitative findings helped clarify and illustrate the results of the quantitative analyses. Specifically, quantitative analyses showed statistically significant correlations between students’ overall participation in community activities inside and outside the classroom and their scores on the Community Awareness and the Interpersonal Effectiveness scales, respectively: \( r = .26, N = 61, p = .046 \), \( r = .39, N = 61, p = .002 \).
These results were illustrated by the qualitative data in two significant ways. First, almost all student participants were engaged in community service activities other than their service-learning courses. For example, Farida noted, “I’m involved with an NGO anyway.” Likewise, Mostafa mentioned, “I was involved in the sustainable campus committee.” Second, students repeatedly spoke of the influence of other experiences on their sense of civic awareness rather than advocating for service-learning as the only path to engagement. For example, when asked to share a meaningful CBL experience, Theresa responded:

For me personally, it’s not limited to CBL courses because I think that most of my experiences happened from moving around, listening to people talk, talking to other people, whether it be, just I don’t know, taking the metro, things like that, you know what I mean?

These results and findings underscore the importance of offering students multiple opportunities for community service through both curricular and extra-curricular activities. They also send a powerful and clear message that promoting students’ civic engagement is a shared responsibility between all the campus constituents rather than the obligation of a sole specific unit/center on campus.

The consistency between the quantitative results and qualitative findings increased confidence in the analyses, and thus contributed to the validity of the study’s findings and results. The analysis of the type of participation in the CBL program—mandatory versus optional—is an effective example of such a consistency. Quantitative analyses did not detect a statistically significant difference in students’ scores on the two scales employed based on the type of participation. Qualitative analyses pertaining to the
same issue reflected in the disagreement between participants regarding mandating service-learning courses. A number of student participants believed that CBL courses should be mandated in the curriculum. For example, a survey respondent said, “AUC should make an effort to include it in their core curriculum.” Likewise, Theresa felt that students “have to be kind of introduced to it [the CBL course].” In contrast, Mostafa advised against mandating CBL courses, offering the following perspective:

Making it [the CBL course] a requirement might be a mistake, in my opinion. When we see that with some courses where there is a required volunteering, in my opinion, that sort of defeat[s] the purpose because volunteering means that you’re doing something you’re willing to do it out of the goodness of your heart. If it’s required volunteering, then you don’t have the necessary motivation. You just do it for a grade. I mean . . . if you’re doing it just for the grade, it could actually harm the organization; it would be harming the community rather than benefiting the community. So, that’s one thing I think we shouldn’t do.

Finally, quantitative analyses did not detect any statistically significant relationships between students’ demographics and their scores on the two scales employed. Qualitative findings further support and elaborate on these quantitative results. The religious orientation variable is an illustrative example. Specifically, qualitative findings indicated that while religion was a key motivator to some students’ engagement in community service work, others were encouraged to do so by secular-based motivators. For example, Adham highlighted the role of religion in motivating him to take part in community service activities, stating:

A big part of thanking Allah [God] for all the gifts He’s giving me is to, at least, pay back a little bit which is just nothing compare to what I have, (الحمد لله) [thanks me to God]. Definitely I guess, it’s a big part of what motivates me is my religion, definitely.
On the other hand, some students indicated that religion was not a primary motivator to their engagement in community work. For example, when asked if his involvement in community service activities was motivated by religious motivations, Mostafa offered the following perspective:

No, not necessarily. Regardless of your religious views, I think everyone has this need; everyone wants to do good for the community. Everyone wants to see, I guess, goodness spread. They want to see more good in the world and less bad.

The above examples illustrated how the qualitative findings clarified and elaborated on the quantitative results. Clearly, students’ voices added depth to the numbers. The combination of both methods helped create a detailed and sophisticated picture about CBL partnerships at AUC.

**Implications: Policy, Practice, and Research**

As revealed in the findings section, the full potential of university-community partnerships for service-learning at AUC is yet to be realized. Thus, the subsequent sections offer recommendations for policy, practice, and research. Taken together, the goal of these recommendations is to institutionalize and promote effective service-learning partnerships at AUC and in Egyptian higher education.

**Implications for policy.**

The lack of institutional support to service-learning partnerships emerged as a major barrier to institutionalizing these collaborations. Eliminating institutional-related barriers requires Egyptian Ministry of Higher Education to formulate a national policy initiative to stimulate a transformational role of Egyptian higher education such that it supports and encourages the university engagement in the community and stresses civic
learning outcomes for students. These policy changes may be realized through implementing several initiatives. The following section provides recommendations for changes and their rationale. The recommended initiatives are organized into six broad areas: cultivating a culture of community engagement, creating awareness of engaged scholarship, building support mechanisms for, promoting scholarship on, encouraging local, national, and international collaborations on service-learning and community engagement, and preparing future generations for community engagement.
Cultivating a culture of community engagement.

- Reviewing the mission of the Ministry such that it clearly articulates its civic goals, thus legitimizing the university’s engagement in the community.

- Collaborating with the Ministry of Education to encourage service-learning as pedagogy and a path to engagement in pre-collegiate education. Doing so would help cultivate a culture of community engagement in society and lead parents to become familiar with the concept of connecting coursework to community service.

- Collaborating with other policy-maker entities, such as the Ministries of Interior Affairs and Social Solidarity. Such an effort would serve multiple purposes: broadening and diversifying community partners, developing familiarity with the concept of the university’s engagement in the community, eliminating structural barriers to university-community collaborations, and facilitating student service at community-based organizations.

Creating awareness of engaged scholarship.

- Generating formal reward structures for recognizing campuses’ commitment to community engagement. Such recognition would highlight the importance of this work, generate a sense of pride and accomplishment to campuses committed to civic engagement endeavors,
and motivate more campuses to adopt similar practices. These structures could be similar to the Carnegie Foundation’s elective classification for Community Engagement.

- Sponsoring national research awards to recognize distinguished contributions to advancing the scholarship of engagement in higher education. Such awards would display the Ministry’s serious commitment to this type of scholarship, bring a sense of fulfillment to the winners, and motivate more scholars to include such work in their research agendas. Examples of these awards include the Thomas Ehrlich Civically Engaged Faculty Award by the campus Compact and the Ernest A. Lynton Award for the Scholarship of Engagement for Early Career Faculty by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education.

**Building support mechanisms for service-learning and community engagement.**

- Establishing an Egyptian national network or organization that assumes leadership responsibility for compiling and disseminating resources on service-learning and community engagement; and securing internal and external funds for institutionalization. Examples of these networks in other regions of the world, include the U.S. Campus Compact, the National Canadian Alliances of Community Service-Learning, the Australian Alliance of Community Service-Learning, the Latin American Center for Service-Learning, and the Campus Engage Network for the Promotion of Civic Engagement in Irish Higher Education.
• Designating national funds to endow centers for service-learning and community engagement at institutions of higher education across the Country. The establishment of these centers would help build infrastructure for engaged scholarship, engage more partners, and build university-community partnerships tailored to the specific issues of the different areas within the Country.

• Encouraging private funding from individuals, corporations, and nonprofits to support the scholarship of engagement in higher education. This support can take several forms, such as sponsoring public awareness campaigns, featuring speakers, and providing donations. This initiative would increase the resources for civic engagement efforts, thus increasing their impact. For example, in the U.S., the Spencer Foundation has designated funding for a research program, the New Civics Initiative, to explore civic action among youth and college students.

• Establishing centers for fundraising, documentation, and assessment to provide resources, build a history, and ensure quality and equitable university-community collaborations.

_Promoting scholarship on service-learning and community engagement._

• Launching research academies, summer institutes, and regular workshops to provide professional development opportunities for university and community partners, such as developing familiarity with the literature,
building skills, learning about research methods, shaping research projects, and exchanging ideas.

- Hosting research conferences focusing on cultivating civic engagement in higher education. These conferences would bring civic engagement into the forefront of the university’s mission in Egypt and provide professional development opportunities for constituents of higher education and communities. Examples of these conferences in other countries, include the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement and the National Outreach Scholarship Conferences in the U.S., the Asia-Pacific Regional Conference on Service-Learning, and the Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning Conference.

- Launching academic journals and other publication outlets that focus on university-community partnerships, service-learning, and civic learning outcomes, as well as devoting special issues of other journals to addressing engagement-related issues in different disciplines. These publication channels would effectively promote engaged scholarship and bring more attention to the civic mission of higher education. Examples of these journals in the U.S. include the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, and *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic Engagement*. The *Australian Journal of University-Community*
Engagement is another example of scholarly journals that disseminate scholarship on community engagement in higher education.

**Encouraging local, national, and global collaborations.**

- Building networks for administrators, faculty and staff members, students, and community professionals to allow for peer support and an exchange of ideas. These networks could be convened though physical gatherings and/or online discussions using e-mail listserv, forming groups on digital media networks, and webinar meetings.

- Issuing grants with eligibility criteria necessitating joint application development by constituents from institution of higher education and community-based organizations to encourage collaboration between them.

- Initiating collaborations with civic engagement centers worldwide to allow for exchange of ideas between Egyptian scholars and their foreign counterparts. Potential collaborations could be established with U.S. universities that are known for institutionalizing community engagement, such as Portland State University’s International Institute on Partnerships, and the Center for Community Engagement at Indiana State University.

- Given the historical leadership role of Egypt in the Arab world and continent of Africa alike, the Ministry of Higher Education should collaborate with its counterparts in these regions to promote the civic goals of higher education. These collaborations could build a sense of
unity among these nations, and thus better enable them to address common issues and realize shared goals. Ma’an Arab University Alliance for Civic Engagement is a good example of these collaborations.

**Preparing future generations for community engagement.**

- Emphasizing ethos of community service in the education of teachers and doctoral students, thus preparing engaged educators.

- Energizing youth through involving them in the decision making process, and providing them with opportunities to lead change on campuses and communities. Validating youth as key constituents of the Ministry’s efforts to connect universities to communities could lead to a cultural shift from typical perceptions of youth as unreliable children to responsible adults. Such a change would increase youth self-efficacy and facilitate their work in the community.

Given the central operating systems dominating organizational structures in Egyptian government, passing legislations that help realize the above initiatives would considerably eliminate the institutional and cultural barriers to institutionalizing service-learning and other civic engagement initiatives on college and university campuses. Higher education leaders would become willing to embrace the civic mission of their institutions and provide adequate support to realize this mission. This, in turn, would increase public trust in, and support to, higher education. Also, these policies would foster the concept of community service as an integral component of formal education in Egypt, thus cultivating a broader support for service-learning. Moreover, these
legislations would allow college students opportunities to be a catalyst for positive change in society, therefore benefiting the Country from invaluable human resources, which have been systematically ignored in the past two decades.

**Implications for practice.**

As shown in chapter four, partners indicated a host of barriers to sustaining service-learning partnerships and made several suggestions for improving these collaborations. Based on partners’ perspectives along with expert advice generated from the literature, the following section presents recommendations for ensuring effective service-learning partnerships at AUC. Similar to the previous section, these recommendations are organized into ten broad areas: fostering an institutional culture supportive of community engagement; advocating for service-learning and community engagement on campus; enhancing the visibility of service-learning courses on campus and in the community; building infrastructure for the program with talented staff; advancing collaborations and communication between university and community partners; building support systems for faculty, and students; engaging with the community in a strategic manner; striving for democratic partnerships; and conducting ongoing assessment for service-learning partnerships.

**Fostering an institutional culture supportive of community engagement.**

- Articulating clearly the civic component of the University’s mission, vision, and strategic goals clearly to legitimize faculty and student involvement in service-learning and encourage civic initiatives across the campus.
• Encouraging community service activities through both curricular and extracurricular offerings, thus engaging more students and strengthening the culture of service at AUC.

**Advocating for service-learning and community engagement on campus.**

• Exhibiting top-down administration’s support to community-based work, thus validating it as a legitimate form of scholarship. Senior administrators’ support can be demonstrated in various ways, such as stressing the importance of service and civic outcomes in their formal speeches, providing verbal recognition to engaged parties; offering grants to faculty to develop courses with service-learning components; and sponsoring lectures/events, research projects, and awards to celebrate exemplar service-learning partnerships.

• Providing bottom-up support to service-learning partnerships, thus demonstrating a demand for promoting them on campus. For example, students may call for courses with community service elements. Junior faculty members can incorporate community-based work into their research agendas and apply for institutional funding and/or external grants to develop service-learning courses.

**Enhancing visibility of service-learning courses on campus and in the community.**

• Launching aggressive marketing campaigns both on campus and in the community to increase the visibility of CBL program. The program can be advertised through multiple forms, including internal publications, flyers, local newspapers, a series of lectures/talks, and on the University’s website.

Appointing service-learning representative(s)/ambassador(s) among faculty,
students, staff, and community could be an effective strategy to raise awareness of service-learning among these groups.

- Creating a designation for CBL courses on the online course offerings system to raise awareness of these courses among the student body and attract international students.

- Increasing the number of CBL course offerings to attract a greater number of students.

- Increasing visibility of community partners on campus in order to raise awareness of potential opportunities of collaboration between the University and the community. This awareness raising could be realized by various strategies, such as inviting community professionals to campus events as participants or guest speakers; initiating fair days in which community representatives introduce their organizations and discuss potential opportunities for joint work with faculty members; and building booths for the partnering organizations as well as providing them with rent-free offices on campus.

**Building infrastructure with talented staff:**

- Building infrastructure for the program, such as a center or an office that manages the University’s relationships with the community. This unit should be placed in a visible spot on campus near to academic buildings and students’ gathering venues. The establishment of such a unit could effectively handle administrative matters and facilitate logistics. The program director’s advice that this unit
should report to an academic officer is consistent with past research findings (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000b; Morton, 1996).

- Hiring an adequate number of staff members to co-ordinate the campus relationships with community partners. Zlotkowski (1999) noted that the presence of only one staff member, no matter how energetic and competent, is insufficient to build a comprehensive service-learning program. Employed staff should be fluent in Arabic and English; familiar and comfortable with both the academy and community cultures and possess effective interpersonal skills. Staff members with these competencies would be able to build positive relationships among partners and smooth any conflicts that may arise in the course of developing these partnerships.

- Allocating an institutional internal budget to the CBL program. Such funding would provide stability to the program; preparing academic and financial resources readily available to partners; and allow for long-term planning, recruiting sufficient staff members, and advancing marketing campaigns.

**Advancing collaborations and communication between the university and community.**

- Maximizing interactions between the University and community partners. Increased interactions could deepen relationships, build trust, and eliminate boundaries among partners. Physical gatherings in carefully chosen venues as well as online meetings could effectively achieve this purpose.
• Educating partners on the historical development of service-learning and sharing success stories with them, therefore promoting their understanding of the pedagogy, its rationale, and potentials.

• Establishing a clear and simple administrative process for building service-learning partnerships with communities to minimize risks, increase accountability, and ensure quality partnerships and value to the parties involved.

• Increasing the quantity and quality of time that students spend at the partnering organizations, thus allowing for more interactions between students and organizations’ professionals and clients. Increased interactions would maximize learning for students and build genuine relationships between them and community partners.

• Enriching service-learning partnerships with the use of Web 2.0 technology to overcome logistic issues, such as the remote location of the new campus, physical distance among partners, and the difficulty of co-ordinating schedules of many individuals. Interactive online tools, such as wikis, blogs, and Google docs, provide valuable opportunities for partners to interact with one another simultaneously. Web 2.0 technology can also be used to create untraditional assessment tools for evaluating students’ learning in service-learning courses. Electronic portfolios are a great example of these tools.
Building support systems for faculty.

- Providing faculty members with support systems to assist them in planning, implementing, and evaluating their service-learning courses to eliminate the structural barriers to faculty use of service-learning and attract more instructors to consider employing this pedagogy.

- Restructuring faculty tenure and promotion guidelines such that they recognize and reward faculty members’ work in the community. Such reconsideration could provide a sense of fulfillment to engaged faculty and motivate others to include community-based research on their research agendas, thus advancing the civic goal of the University.

- Creating special support systems for foreign faculty members to familiarize them with the local culture and communities, hence encouraging them to undertake service-learning courses.

Building support systems for students.

- Validating students as central partners by informing the strategic planning of service-learning partnerships with their perspectives and allowing them freedom over the choice of community partners. Student involvement in the design was identified as a powerful component of effective service-learning (Morgan & Streb, 2003). Furthermore, past research showed that giving students a sense of freedom and autonomy reduces the negative impacts of requirements to volunteerism (Stukas, Suyder, & Clary, 1999).
• Assigning students leadership roles in planning, implementing, and assessing service-learning partnerships. Student involvement could take several forms, such as designing marketing tools, launching awareness campaigns, and working as staff members in the service-learning office/center. Cultivating high expectations in the community in college students would nurture a culture that respects, trusts, and values students on campus, at service sites, and in the greater community, as well as boosts students’ sense of self-efficacy and energizes them to bring about positive social change to their communities.

• Preparing students for service activities prior to the beginning of the partnership through orientation sessions that allow students to learn about the partnering organizations and community demographics. This awareness would enable students to become sensitive in their interactions with community members and excel in their work, thus experiencing successful engagement with community partners.

• Encouraging and supporting students by alleviating their anxiety over the lack of predictability and structure characterizing service-learning courses. Faculty may support their service-learning students both with the classroom and service components of the course. With respect to the classroom component, faculty could accommodate late submissions of assignments, extend assignment deadlines, and reward creative work, therefore encouraging students to take risks and try out new approaches. Also, faculty could encourage pair and group work to provide students with peer support. Moreover, faculty could introduce class
activities that build a sense of community between students, as well as create safe spaces for them to reflect—in private or in public—on their experiences. In regard to the community component, faculty could introduce students to various community members, clarify expectations of students’ roles at service sites, and intervene to resolve any issues between students and community partners. Faculty support could also provide students with a sense of ownership of their learning and enhance their satisfaction with service-learning experiences.

- Introducing students to readings that address issues of oppression, social justice, power differential, acute poverty, and privilege could promote their critical thinking abilities, thus increasing the likelihood that their involvement in service-learning would empower them to become agents of positive social change in society rather than perpetrators of the status quo.

- Eliminating the language barrier to non-Arabic speakers, thus encouraging more international students to engage in service-learning partnerships. This barrier could be overcome by forming groups of students that include native Arabic language speakers and international students and by engaging non-Arabic speakers in activities that do not require a heavy use of language.

- Inviting students’ parents to some civic events so that they appreciate the value of their children’s work in the community, thus supporting them. Parental involvement could also build a critical mass of support to service-learning partnerships.
Engaging with the community in a strategic manner

- Planning service-learning activities to ensure the presence of following characteristics: address a need mutually defined by the community and University; progress gradually (moving from simple to sophisticated), diverse, meaningful, engaging, and fulfilling to all the parties involved. Such activities would facilitate the development of effective, reciprocal, and equitable partnerships.

- Involving department chairs and full professors in discussing the institutionalization possibilities, thus activating the role of academic departments. Given their charges of the curriculum and course offerings, senior faculty members could promote institutionalization efforts by encouraging junior instructors to incorporate service-learning components into already existing courses and/or creating new courses with these elements.

- Institutionalizing community relations with AUC beyond personal relationships with certain professionals, thus ensuring their sustainability should these individuals leave their positions.

- Broadening and diversifying community partners to include communities beyond Cairo as well as entities, such as government bodies, corporations, schools, and hospitals, in addition to not-for-profit organizations. Such diversity would help institutionalize service-learning in more disciplines, attract more faculty members and students, provide students with a realistic and holistic picture of society,
address a wider range of societal ills, and build greater support to service-learning on campus.

- Forming service-learning partnerships aiming specifically to clarify the mission and vision of potential partnering community-based organizations, thus overcoming some organizational-related issues.

- Forging partnerships with small grassroots organizations to promote their capacity, thus increasing their capability to serve their clients.

- Employing creative thinking and solutions in addressing challenges to service-learning partnerships. For example, the problem of academic calendar could be addressed by forming a sequence of courses to ensure extended relationships with community partners.

- Taking proactive actions by identifying potential issues and/or points of tension and resolve them before they become problems and/or conflicts, thus maintaining positive relationships among partners.

- Turning obstacles into opportunities for learning and growth by holding positive attitudes.

- Aiming for transformative partnerships; having high expectations and dreams could allow these partnerships to strengthen communities and contribute to bringing positive social change in society in addition to achieving the specific learning goals of service-learning courses.
Striving for democratic partnerships.

- Tailoring service-learning partnerships to Egyptian context, thus effectively addressing local issues and building trust with indigenous communities.

- Employing an asset-based model when interacting with community partners by highlighting bright sides of the community and considering its contributions to service-learning collaborations. Using this model could break typical deficit-based thinking that the community is the source of problems, and possibly lead to democratic relationships between university and community partners.

- Striving to attain reciprocal relationships among partners, thus promoting democratic university-community partnerships. Examples of strategies to fulfill this goal include seeking community perspective and voice in the all the phases of service-learning partnerships, highlighting the assets of the community, inviting community constituents to co-teach and/or give presentations in the classroom, and openly discussing issues of imbalanced power structures between the University and local communities.

- Emphasizing community empowerment and capacity building as core goals of service-learning partnerships, thus promoting reciprocal partnerships with, and value to, the community.

Conducting assessment of service-learning partnerships.

- Conducting ongoing evaluation to the process and outcomes of service-learning partnerships with a special emphasis on community impact. The results of this
assessment could improve future practices and provide evidence showing the value of these collaborations to the parties involved, thus justifying their institutionalization at AUC.

As revealed in the second chapter, literature review, the commitment of institutional leadership is critical to institutionalizing service-learning and other community engagement efforts in higher education (Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Vogelgesang, 2004). As such, it could be reasonably argued that realizing the above recommendations for enhancing service-learning partnerships between AUC and communities would be dependent, in large part, on the level and magnitude of the University’s leadership attention and support to the civic component of its mission. However, one must be mindful of the practical challenges facing higher education leaders who consider endorsing service-learning and other community engagement endeavors. Traditional criteria for ranking universities—as the study revealed—are among these challenges. Therefore, efforts to institutionalize community engagement initiatives in higher education require major changes on the broader policies affecting higher education.

**Implications for research.**

This study provides an in-depth understanding of university-community partnerships for service-learning at one university in Egypt. While it has expanded knowledge about these collaborations in general, still an array of gaps remains in this area. Therefore, further research and lines of inquiry are needed to add depth and breadth to this study’s outcomes. Arranged by partners, the following sections offer directions
for future research. Each section opens with an explanation for the need for an investigation of the specific research point under examination, it then provides potential research questions, and ends by describing the potential value of research outcomes in this particular area.
Community partners.

Transactional-transformative partnerships.

The issue of university-community transactional versus transformative partnerships is a lingering one in the service-learning literature. Although there is a general assumption that transformative partnerships are desirable (Enos & Morton, 2003), past research findings documented community partners’ preferences for transactional partnerships (Bushouse, 2005). Community partners’ preferences for transactional relationships are attributed to several factors, such as limited capacities of NGOs (Bushouse), time constraints, and other obligations of each partner (Bringle et al., 2009; Clayton et al., 2010). Although these barriers exist and are even intensified in Egypt given the sizeable economic challenges facing the Country and the grassroots nature characterizing the vast majority of NGOs there, community partners in this study expressed persistent wishes for transformative relationships with AUC. They were motivated to join service-learning partnerships primarily for raising AUC students’ awareness of the greater community in society beyond their own bubbles rather than securing tangible benefits for their organizations and clients. The inconsistencies between the findings of this study and previous ones invite further research to illuminate understanding in this area. Examples of questions worthy of consideration include the following:

- What factors other than the above mentioned ones influence community partners’ preferences for transactional versus transformative service-learning partnerships with the academy?
• Does the cultural context of service-learning partnerships affect these preferences?

• Does the nature of community partner (e.g., NGOs, government bodies, corporations) influence their inclination to a specific type of partnerships? If so, how?

An exploration of these questions could illuminate the different factors affecting community partners’ attitudes toward service-learning partnerships, thus allowing institutions of higher education to tailor effective partnerships with diverse community partners in different cultural contexts.

*Community partners’ satisfaction with students.*

While community partners in this study were generally satisfied with students’ work, they expressed a few concerns about some students’ lack of interest in their NGOs and under-preparation to interact with their clients. These findings are consistent with prior research. For example, Tryon et al. (2008) cited community partners’ concerns about the obligatory nature of short-term service-learning courses, and thus partners had to handle the resentment of some students. Yet, in the Ferrari and Worrall’s (2000) study, community partners reported that students were reliable and offered valuable contributions to their agencies. These mixed findings invite more studies to better illuminate this area. Potential research questions include the following:

• What factors in addition to the ones revealed in this study cause community members’ dissatisfaction with student involvement with service-learning partnerships?
• How do students’ level of maturity, development stage, and demographic backgrounds influence community impact of service-learning partnerships?

• How do student-related factors affect community partners’ inclination to partnership orientation, transactional or transformative?

Exploring these factors would enable institutions of higher education to address potential student-related issues. This, in turn, could lead to positive interactions between students and community partners.

*Graduate versus undergraduate classes.*

A community partner, Muhammad, indicated a preference to working with graduate students, but did not provide a clear justification for this preference. However, Muhammad’s inclination to host graduate-level students could be understood in light of the student-related issues he and other community partners shared. The impact of class level—graduate versus undergraduate—on service-learning partnerships is an unexplored area in the literature. Future studies are needed to determine how and to what extent class level affects these collaborations. Examples of pertinent questions include:

• Do community partners have a clear preference to undergraduate or graduate students? If so, on which basis? For example, is this preference dependent on the nature of the partnering organizations (government bodies, corporations, NGOs, schools) or its beneficiaries (adults, youth, children)?

• Does class level affect community partners’ satisfaction with service-learning partnerships and/or perception of the university? Does it influence the nature of
service activities, basic versus critical? And does it affect how community partners interact with students?

Investigating these questions could provide useful data concerning the ways in which student demographics may influence the relationships between the university and the community.

Community partner’s perceptions of students.

Some students referred to community partners’ perceptions of students as one of the organizational-related barriers to service-learning partnerships. For example, Mostafa attributed the slow communication he had with the partnering organization to NGO professionals’ perceptions of students as less important than higher-level administrators. He felt that the NGO staff would maintain timely response were the communication conducted with senior administrators. This is an interesting finding warranting additional research. More studies are needed to further examine community partners’ perceptions of students. Research questions in this area could include the following:

- What role, if any, does the local culture play in shaping these perceptions?
- How may community partners’ cultural perceptions influence their interactions with students?
- Other than slow communication, how community partners’ low perceptions of students could be manifested in service-learning partnerships?
- How do community partners’ perceptions of faculty members and university administrators differ from those of students?
Exploring these questions would allow for deeper understanding of the relationships between community partners and different university constituents.

Organizational factors.

While several frameworks exist to illuminate our understanding of the institutional factors that affect community engagement (e.g., Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Furco, 2002; Holland, 1997), less is known about the organizational factors that facilitate university-community service-learning partnerships. By identifying factors related to the governance structure, management style, and culture of the partnering organizations, this study begins the conversation on this issue. More research, however, is needed to deepen understanding of these factors and investigate additional organizational factors that faculty members deem important for choosing partnering community-based organizations. Potential research questions in this area include the following:

- What are the organizational factors influencing university-community partnerships?
- How do organizational factors encourage or discourage universities from partnering with community-based organizations?
- What organizational changes, if any, are needed to facilitate community-based organizations’ engagement with higher education in service-learning?
- Could the university play a role in promoting the community capacity to join service-learning partnerships in higher education? If so, how?

Exploring the organizational factors influencing university-community partnerships for service-learning is of paramount importance in improving the practice of these
collaborations. Furthermore, unveiling those factors would demonstrate the community’s active role in shaping these partnerships, thus promoting reciprocity between the university and partnering community-based organizations.

**Administrators.**

*Top-down and bottom-up support.*

Similar to past literature, this study deemed institutional-related factors as of paramount importance to inculcating service-learning in higher educations. Congruent with other research findings (Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Vogelgesang, 2004), university senior administrators’ commitment was emphasized as insensible to institutionalization efforts. However, this study called attention to the importance of the university senate in promoting engaged scholarship on campus. Furthermore the study revealed that bottom-up support to service-learning is also important. These findings prompt suggestions for future research. Examples of potential questions include the following:

- How may bodies, such as the university board of trustees, alumni, students, and junior faculty members, promote civic initiatives on campus?

- To what extent does the support of these groups impact senior administrators’ attitudes towards engaged scholarships?

Identifying potential roles for each of these groups could help create a critical mass of support to service-learning, thus facilitating its institutionalization on campus.
Institutional leadership.

As administrators indicated, the CBL program was mainly initiated because of former University President John Gerhart’s belief in the value of connecting community service to academics, but the program struggled when he passed away. These findings suggest the need for institutionalizing service-learning in the institution so that it does not get sharply affected by change in institutional leadership. Furthermore, they raise important questions as to why civic initiatives flourish under the leadership of some university presidents, but fade away under the leadership of others. Potential research questions in this area include:

- Do leaders’ personal values and professional experiences influence their support to these initiatives? If so, how?

- Are leaders’ attitudes toward community engagement initiatives affected by other factors, such as the size of the institution, or its type—public versus private—or funding sources?

- Are leaders’ stances on promoting civic initiatives dependent on higher education issues, such as traditional criteria for university ranking systems, as the study revealed? What are other pertinent issues, if any?

- Do leaders’ stances on engaged scholarship vary depending on broader social, economic, and political factors surrounding their institutions?
An exploration of these questions would help develop a realistic and holistic understanding of higher education leaders’ attitudes toward promoting service-learning and other community engagement initiatives on their campuses.

**Institutional incentives.**

In discussing ideas for encouraging faculty members’ and students’ involvement in service-learning partnerships, participants leaned toward eliminating structural barriers to conducting community-based work, and getting long-term recognition rather than momentarily short-term awards. Specifically, faculty members offered creative ideas, such as facilitating logistics, team-teaching service-learning courses, and hiring professors of practice. Likewise, students suggested adding a form of accolade on diplomas to recognize students’ engagement in the community. These suggestions prompt directions for further research to examine questions, such as:

- To what extent is institutional leadership open to actuate these ideas?

- How do long-term recognition structures impact students’ and faculty members’ engagement in service-learning?

- What relationship, if any, between the type of institutional recognition and reward structures for engaged faculty and students, short- versus long-term, on the sustainability of service-learning on college and university campuses?

Exploring a wide range of recognition systems could deepen understanding of how different incentives and reward structures affect faculty and students, hence developing sustainable support to service-learning.
Students’ suggestions to integrate a variety of activities into service-learning partnerships and tackle several problems in the same time cue attention to the relationship between service-learning and interdisciplinary studies. Societal ills—whether social, economic, or political—are typically complex and multi-faceted, making it less likely that the expertise of one single discipline would address these problems effectively. Rather, eliminating such issues necessitates the collective expertise of multiple disciplines. Therefore, institutionalizing service-learning in higher education can lead to the promotion of interdisciplinary studies as well. This area has not been investigated adequately and deserves future exploration. Future research may focus on questions, such as:

- Is there a relationship between institutional commitment to service-learning and the prevalence of the interdisciplinary studies program/department? In other words, do institutions that exhibit a high level of commitment to service-learning have a well-established interdisciplinary studies program/department?
- Does service-learning promote relationships among students and faculty members from different disciplines? If so, how?

Answers to these questions would enhance our understanding of how service-learning and interdisciplinary studies may strengthen the case for each other.

Criteria for choosing partnering organizations.

Students’ comments raised crucial questions pertaining to universities’ criteria of choosing community partners. Additional research is needed to augment our
understanding of these criteria. Potential research questions in this area include the following:

- What are the criteria influencing the university’s choice of community partners in service-learning?
- Do these criteria differ by institutional type or funding structure? If so, how?
- What are the implications of these criteria for the orientation and goals of service-learning partnerships as well as the relationships among partners?

These research endeavors could unveil the role of universities in directing service-learning partnerships toward charity or social change orientations of service. Also, data of such research would be useful for organizations wanting to partner with institutions of higher education.

*Foreign institutions.*

Trust issues emerged as a mild challenge to building partnerships between AUC and local communities in Egypt, especially in the beginning phases. While these issues are not atypical in building relationships between universities and communities in general, trust issues are intensified when initiating such partnerships between a foreign institution and indigenous communities. The differences between such entities—be they cultural, social, political, religious, or language—add additional challenges to the inherent ones in building such relationships. This study brought light into this unique challenge. Given the growing number of universities opening branch campuses around the globe, additional research is needed to allow for deeper understanding of this challenge. Among the questions worthy of consideration in this area are the following:
In addition to lack of trust, what are other challenges posed by the differences between a foreign university and indigenous communities when embarking on service-learning partnerships?

How does the relationship between the home country of the foreign institution and that of local communities affect service-learning partnerships between the university and local community partners?

Do service-learning partnerships impact relationships between the home country of the foreign university and that of local communities? If so, how?

Could service-learning between a Western university and Eastern communities yield negative impacts? Could such partnerships perpetuate hegemonic practices? Could they facilitate a form of neocolonialism?

Outcomes of such research would be useful in generating strategies for building trust between the academy and the community, especially at unique institutions like AUC. Moreover, outcomes of such research may break new ground by directing attention to the potential impact of service-learning partnerships on broader relations among different countries and cultures.

Faculty Members.

Motivators and deterrents.

This study’s findings are largely consistent with prior research on the factors motivating and deterring faculty members’ involvement in service-learning partnerships. However, the study pinpointed new factors in these areas. For example, it revealed that the new location of AUC and Egyptian Revolution of 2011 provided additional
motivations for faculty to employ CBL courses. The study also revealed that faculty members’ concerns about student safety might deter them from participation in these collaborations. While these findings may be specific to the context of this study, they draw attention to the possible impact of changing the campus location and the political situation on encouraging or discouraging faculty members’ engagement in service-learning partnerships. Future studies are then required to assess how these factors may affect faculty members at other institutions of higher education. Examples of potential research questions include the following:

- How may the geographic location of the institution affect faculty use of service-learning? Do faculty members employed at institutions located in distant areas tend to employ service-learning more than their counterparts in campuses situated in metropolitan areas?

- How may the broader political situation influence faculty use of service-learning? For example, do grand political changes motivate faculty involvement in service-learning? Do politically stable conditions encourage faculty members’ engagement with service-learning?

Outcomes of such studies would enlarge understanding of the factors influencing faculty members’ decisions to use service-learning.

*Foreign faculty members.*

Ideally, service-learning courses should aim to address societal problems and improve the quality of life in communities while achieving course goals. For the most part, societal issues are context-laden, and hence addressing them requires extensive
familiarity with the local contexts. This, in turn, poses practical challenges to international faculty members with limited skills in local languages and little knowledge about local cultures. This area is relatively unexplored in the literature, and thus additional research is warranted to illuminate it. Examples of pertinent research questions include the following:

- What other challenges, in addition to language and culture, facing foreign faculty members wanting to engage in service-learning partnerships?
- How could the institution support foreign faculty members while teaching service-learning courses? What role could native colleagues and university administrators play in facilitating the transition of foreign faculty members into the local culture?

Outcomes of such studies would provide useful data on how to support foreign faculty members, thus benefiting service-learning collaborations from their diverse talents and expertise.

**Reflection.**

While the benefits of reflection to students are well-established in the literature (Eyler & Giles, 1999), substantially less is known about its value to faculty members. Administrators in this study demonstrated an awareness of the need to create structured opportunities for faculty members to reflect on their service-learning experiences. Investigating the value of reflection to service-learning faculty members is an area warranting future research. Potential research questions include the following:
• Is there a value of providing structured opportunities for service-learning faculty members to reflect on their experiences teaching these courses? If so? What?
• Are the benefits of reflection to service-learning faculty—if at all—similar to those of students? If so, what are the implications of offering faculty members such opportunities for their relationships with student service-learners and community partners?

Such an investigation could potentially direct attention to the benefits of service-learning to faculty members in addition to the current heavy emphasis on its value to students, thus strengthening the case for its institutionalization in higher education. This investigation could also provide useful data on how engaging faculty members in structured reflection may deepen their relationships with students and community partners.

*Course design: reciprocity.*

While the literature abounds with arguments underscoring the importance of ensuring reciprocal relationships between the academy and the community (e.g., Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Walshok, 1999), the question of how to apply this ideal in practice is persistent. An effective way to address this question is to first identify the barriers to reciprocity. This study pinpointed a number of threats to building reciprocal relationships between institutions of higher education and communities; faculty participants named social class divides, perceptions of the superiority of the university over the academy, and the huge disparities of power and resources between the university and the community daunting challenges to initiate and maintain reciprocal university-
community partnerships. Additionally, research is needed to deepen our understanding of these factors, and explore additional ones, if any. Examples of questions needing an exploration include the following:

- What are the barriers to building reciprocal partnerships between the university and the community?

- What role, if at all, does the cultural context of service-learning partnerships play in promoting or paralyzing the establishment of reciprocal university and community relationships?

- What is the relative importance of social class dynamics, socialization process, and differential powers in influencing reciprocal university-community partnerships?

Identifying barriers to reciprocity is a must-do effort to help actuate this principle in university-community partnerships for service-learning.

One of the striking findings of this study was a faculty member’s feelings that not only do students and faculty conceive of themselves as superior to the people they encounter at their service sites, but also community partners perpetuate these conceptions by assuming that university members are more knowledgeable than themselves. This finding challenges common perceptions that academicians bear a major responsible for hindering the establishment of reciprocal university-community relationships because of their perceptions of the superiority of the expert model in the academy to the practical wisdom residing in the community. As such, the study offers a new direction to the typical thought about the threats to reciprocity by suggesting that community members
themselves might be responsible, in part, for promoting the notions of the superiority of the academy over the community. Additional research is needed to test the validity of this notion. If found true or partially true, then joint efforts by the university and the community should be initiated to reshape the prevalent socialization process that is typically biased toward the expert knowledge in the academy. Additionally, institutions of higher education should consider empowering community members such that they recognize the assets that they bring to service-learning partnerships.

Students.

Peer influence.

The importance of peer influence on college students has been repeatedly emphasized in the literature (Astin, 1993; Damon, 1984). The study’s findings reinforce the influence of students on their fellows, particularly in making decisions to enroll in service-learning courses. The findings also suggest that the leadership of senior colleagues can empower youth to engage in their communities. These two areas are relatively unexplored in service-learning literature. Given the current momentum of youth activism in the Arab world, Wall Street in the U.S., and in other regions, future studies could address questions, such as:

- How and to what extent do peers and senior colleagues influence college students’ decisions to participate in service-learning and civic activities in general?
- To what extent does civic engagement momentum on campus and in society at large affect college students’ decisions to take part in community service activities on campus and beyond?
Addressing such questions would deepen our understanding of the role of culture both on campus and in society in shaping and/or bounding college students’ involvement in community service activities. Exploring these questions is particularly relevant to institutions of higher education seeking to capitalize on students in promoting their civic initiatives.

Religious motivations.

One of the study’s research questions focused on exploring participants’ motivations for taking part in service-learning collaborations. The study revealed that while some students underlined religion as a key motivator, others noted that they were motivated primarily by secular-based motivations. Past research examined the influence of religion on civic action. Several studies reported a positive relationship between religiosity and social responsibility (Hodgkinson, 1995). However, other studies showed a negative relationship between religious orientation and student activism (Dyke, 1998). These conflicting findings provide a direction for future research to investigate questions, such as:

- Is there a correlation between college students’ levels of religiosity and their involvement in service-learning and community engagement? If so, what does it look like?
- Do college students’ religious backgrounds affect their tendency toward a service orientation: charity, project, or social change? If so, how?
- Does the institution’s type—faith-based versus secular—affect its level of engagement in the community? If so, how?
• Does the institution’s type—faith-based versus secular—affect partnership orientation, transactional versus transformative? If so, how?

Findings in this area would expand our understanding of how students’ religious backgrounds may affect their engagement in community service. This, in turn, would better enable faculty members to develop fulfilling service-learning experiences to students with different religious orientations. Additionally, outcomes of such research would increase the knowledge base on how the institution’s type, faith-based versus secular, may shape its engagement in the community.

*Impact of the political context.*

Some of the students’ comments suggest that they viewed community service activities as an outlet through which they can exercise their right of civic participation. Such a finding prompts a direction for future research to explore the relationship between college students’ participation in academic community-based activities and their level of satisfaction with the opportunities afforded to them to take part in civic life within society. Pertinent questions include the following:

• Does the political situation in a given society influence college students’ participation in service-learning partnerships? If so, how?

• Are college students in Western societies afforded more opportunities to participate in civic life more than their counterparts in Eastern contexts? If so, how do these opportunities affect students’ involvement in academic service-learning partnerships?
• Do dictatorial regimes deter college students from participation in these activities? If so, how do students react? Do they feel discouraged and shy away from participation in such activities? Or, do they aggressively seek those opportunities as a reaction to their exclusion from civic life?

Investigating these questions would allow for a deeper understanding of how the political situation in a given society may affect college students’ participation in service-learning and other community-based activities.

Obligatory versus optional service-learning.

There is a growing emphasis on the role of academic departments in infusing service-learning into students’ core courses. On the one hand, scholars wanting to promote the civic mission of higher education call for mandating service-learning courses for college students, arguing that engaging students in community service during collegiate life is essential to the mission of the university, and thereby should be integrated into the curriculum (Boyer, 1990; Butin, 2006b; Holland, 1999; Jacoby, 1996).

On the other hand, psychologists cautioned against mandating service-learning courses, highlighting the adverse effects of forcing students to take these courses against their will. Specifically, they posed questions of whether or not behavior done under external pressure actually leads to internalization of prosocial values and behavioral intentions (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1987). These psychologists argued that if mandated students start to perceive that they provide help only when required or rewarded, their intentions to freely engage in volunteer service in the future may be reduced (Clary et al., 1991; Kunda & Schwartz, 1983; Stukas et al., 1999).
The findings of this study are mixed in this area; some students supported the inclusion of service-learning in the core requirements of academic degrees while others expressed concerns about so doing. These conflicting findings make this area fertile for future investigation. Potential research questions include the following:

- What factors may affect students’ views regarding optional versus mandatory service-learning courses? Research could focus on the influence of several factors, such as students’ areas of study, class level and/or demographic characteristics, as well as the type and size of their institutions.

- What are the effects—positive and/or negative—of mandating service-learning courses on several outcomes for students? Examples of these outcomes include students’ satisfaction level with service-learning courses and decisions to enroll in these courses in the future and conduct community service beyond the college context.

The study’s findings directed attention to the potential harmful impact on communities should students become obligated to conduct community service. Therefore, additional research is needed to enhance understanding of the impact of mandatory service-learning courses on the partnering organizations. Examples of research questions in this area include the following:

- Does the type of service—optional versus mandatory—impact community partners? If so, how?
• If a negative association were found between mandatory service-learning and outcomes of service-learning partnerships for students and/or community members, how could these negative effects be minimized?

Outcomes of such studies can be useful in planning effective and positive service-learning experiences for students and community partners.

*Impact of service-learning on students’ negotiation and creative skills.*

The study’s findings demonstrated that students were not shut off by institutional- or organizational-related barriers. On the contrary, these complications stimulated students to exercise their negotiation skills and generate creative solutions to get over these barriers. For example, when an NGO staff refused to allow students to take photos during a joint event, students generated another idea for documenting the event, thereby maintaining friendly relationships with the organization and community. Similarly, students overcame the lack of transportation issue by carpooling when visiting the partnering organizations. These examples indicate that students’ involvement in community service work can enhance their negotiation skills and capacity to work across differences. While past research reported a wide range of gains for college student service-learners, negotiation and creative skills were rarely discussed. Thus, these promising findings invite future studies to examine the following question:

• How does participation in service-learning impact college students’ negotiation and creative skills, abilities to solve problems and reach compromising solutions, if at all?
Outcomes of these studies could be extremely useful in demonstrating the academic benefits of service-learning for students, thus strengthening the case for its institutionalization on college and university campuses.

Influence of students’ economic backgrounds.

Financial-related issues surfaced as potential barriers to students’ involvement in service-learning partnerships. As the study revealed, it is less likely that financial costs, such as commuting to partnering organizations and developing projects of a specific nature, would be a significant barrier to AUC students’ engagement in these partnerships given the privileged economic backgrounds of the vast majority of the student body at the University. However, such costs could constitute a serious impediment to students from economically struggling backgrounds, typically enrolled at public institutions. Future research in this area could examine several questions, including the following:

- How may students’ economic backgrounds accelerate or decelerate their participation in service-learning partnerships?
- How may the institution eliminate financial costs related to students’ involvement in service-learning partnerships?

Addressing financial-related issues is a first essential step to attracting diverse students, especially those form economically distressed backgrounds, to service-learning partnerships and other community engagement initiatives.

The value of reflection.

Intentional reflection has been repeatedly cited in the literature as essential for building the habit of interrogating one’s experiences in different ways (Eyler & Giles,
1999; O’Grady, 2000; Rhoads, 1997). Notably, students in this study connected the reflection component of CBL courses to their level of satisfaction with, and benefit from, these courses as well as their desire to take more of them. This finding is consistent with previous research in stressing the value of reflection in service-learning courses, but offers additional insights into the impacts of reflection on students’ learning and attitudes toward service-learning. Future research is needed to better illuminate the influence of reflection on the areas specified in this study. Potential research questions in this area include the following:

- What is the impact of reflection on students’ contentment with, gains from, and future decisions to enroll in CBL courses?
- Are there additional impacts of reflection on students other than the ones identified in past research and this study?

Outcomes of such studies could further underscore the value of reflection to student service-learners, thus motivating faculty members to incorporate it as an integral component of these courses.

*Students’ need for a sense of community.*

The typical discourse of university-community partnerships is built on the premise that the academy and the community represent two different cultures. Therefore, one of the primary goals of service-learning partnerships is to help establish relationships between those entities. However, one of the interesting findings of this study was students’ wishes for building a sense of community among themselves. This finding is important for two major reasons; first, it directs attention to the need for a reconsideration
of the taken-for-granted notion that university constituents are already well-connected, and thus all what is needed is to build connections with the community outside of the campus walls. Second, this finding calls attention to the need for efforts geared toward building relationships among the university community. Making these efforts is a first essential step before embarking on building partnerships with the communities outside of the campus premise; it can be reasonably argued that the academy cannot effectively build ties with outside communities when these ties are missing inside the institution. As such, this finding merits thorough attention. Future studies could explore ways to build a strong sense of community among the university partners. Examples of research questions in this area include the following:

- How may a sense of community be built at the university within and across different service-learning partners: students, faculty, and staff?
- How could faculty members generate a sense of community between service-learning students?
- How may service-learning offices/centers build strong ties within and across service-learning participants on campus, and between them and community partners?

Outcomes of such research would better enable the university to cultivate a sense of community within campus as well as with the outer communities.
Limitations

There are several limitations to the study. First, the sample was drawn from a single small private university. Except for the students who attend AUC on scholarships, the student population is demographically homogenous; students come from middle-class backgrounds with a high competency in English language. Future research should address this limitation by replicating this study at a range of other institutional types—public, four-year, two-year, and technical—with diverse students. A second limitation is the relatively small sample size (n = 79 for the qualitative data and 61 for the quantitative data). Nevertheless, the consistency of findings across the four groups of participants, as well as between the qualitative and quantitative components of the study increases confidence in its findings, thus contributing to its validity. Third, since the methodological intent of this study was to understand the collective vision of each group of participants as they constitute service-learning partners rather than to examine their individual views, no systematic data were gathered about participants’ personal traits or demographic characteristics. Therefore, the study could not account for how such features may have shaped participants’ perspectives. However, general information about participants’ demographic backgrounds, professional experiences, and their involvement with community service-learning was provided at the beginning of each data analysis section.

A fourth limitation was the quantitative component’s reliance on student self-reported data. Some research raised doubts concerning the validity of college students’ self-reported gains as indicators for longitudinal learning and growth (Bowman, 2010a,
2010b; Pascarella, 2001). To minimize this limitation, the survey included open-ended questions. Also, interviews were conducted with a subsequent sample of the students who completed the survey. Inviting students to address qualitative questions allowed them an opportunity to reflect deeply on their experiences. Further, other partners were asked to comment on students’ experiences from these partnerships. The consistency of the findings across these approaches contributes to the credibility of the research results. However, the use of longitudinal assessment of students’ outcomes of service-learning would add more confidence in the findings/results of the study.

Fifth, this study did not solicit the perspectives of the partnering organizations’ clients. While NGO professionals who were interviewed in the study reflected on how the beneficiaries of their organizations experience service-learning partnerships, future studies should seek the perspectives of community members directly to develop a more complete portrayal of how these collaborations impact the community. Sixth, while the age of the partnership was identified as an important factor in predicting its stage of development (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002) and explaining the types of relation among partners (Dorado & Giles, 2004), it was not possible to assess the impact of this factor on community partners’ perspectives or their respective organizations because all partnering organizations in this study started their CBL collaborations with AUC at the inception of the program. However, partners’ views were analyzed in light of the frequency of interactions their organizations have had with AUC.

Another limitation of the study is its timing; data were collected approximately two months after the January 25th Egyptian Revolution of 2011, and thus the political
situation may have clouded participants’ perceptions and perspectives of service-learning partnerships. Conducting such research during more politically stable times would promote our understanding of how these partnerships are typically experienced in less turmoil periods.

**Contributions**

**Expanding the knowledge base on service-learning partnerships.**

This study made a substantive contribution to the knowledge base on service-learning partnerships and community engagement in general. The study’s findings largely confirm many of the themes in the extant literature. These consistencies were discussed in detail in the fourth chapter. Among the notable ones are the barrier posed by the differences between the academic calendar and the nature of community-based organization’s work along with the critical need for assessing these collaborations, with keen attention to the community perspective and impact. In another show of consistency between this study and past research, the present study confirmed institutional factors as legitimate areas to facilitate these partnerships. Despite affirming prior research in many areas, some of the study’s findings constitute a new twist to the literature. For example, the study revealed community partners’ persistent wishes for transformative partnerships with AUC despite sizeable impediments at both the institutional and organizational levels.

The study’s findings add nuances to the existing literature in several ways. First, they introduced new variables in understanding service-learning partnerships. For example, prior research highlighted partnership age as an influential factor in these
collaborations. This study identified frequency of interaction between university and community constituents as another important factor in assessing the impact of these partnerships on the parties involved and their level of satisfaction with the partnership. Also, concerns about student safety, limited native language skills, and unfamiliarity with the local culture were added to the list of barriers to partners’ engagement in service-learning collaborations. In a similar vein, change of campus location was added as a motivator for the institution and faculty to promote these collaborations. In regards to the barriers to reciprocal university-community relationships, the study extends past research by suggesting that perceptions of the superiority of the academy over the community are perpetuated, in part, by community members themselves, hence highlighting the need for a reconsideration of the socialization process in society. Additionally, the study identified students’ economic backgrounds as an important factor affecting their involvement in service-learning partnerships, as well as their class level—graduate versus undergraduate—as a potential factor that may impact these collaborations, especially the satisfaction level of community partners.

Second, the study’s findings offer an opportunity to reconsider previously identified factors. For example, while prior research highlighted rewards as an effective mechanism for motivating faculty use of service-learning, this study offered additional ideas for doing so, including team-teaching, reducing teaching load, and hiring professors of practice. Unlike traditional thinking about “community building” as an ideal that should be developed between the university and partnering community-based organizations, the study’s findings stimulate a new consideration of the term such that it
should be built first inside the academy. In addition to reinforcing prior research on the
critical role of faculty members in promoting service-learning partnerships, this study
suggested that faculty members can also play valuable roles in ensuring quality impact of
these partnerships to the partnering organizations.

Third, the study’s findings inspire new ways of thinking about previously
identified issues. For example, traditional thought about the role of culture in impacting
service-learning partnerships typically focuses on the differences between the academy
and the community, stressing the need for applying changes to higher education to
facilitate these collaborations. The study depicted this thought as well, but expanded our
understanding by showing how the local culture—including parental attitude toward
service-learning, common perceptions of youth in society, and the 25th Egyptian
Revolution—substantially affected these at AUC. Similarly, the study invites a
reconsideration of the term “diversity,” such that it encompasses diverse community
organizations and sources of funds in addition to racial diversity. Under the institutional
leadership factor, the study directs attention to the role of other bodies, such as the
university senate, alumni, students, and faculty members, in institutionalizing civic
initiatives on college and university campuses. In the same vein, the study identified a
new factor, traditional criteria of university ranking systems, in influencing higher
education senior administrators’ decisions to endorse community-based research.
Finally, while many voices call for integrating service-learning into the curriculum, the
study’s findings suggest that doing so may yield harmful impacts on the partnering
community-based organizations.
Comprehensive study.

A major contribution of this unique work accrues from its comprehensiveness. This study is comprehensive in both scope and methods. In terms of scope, it made two critical contributions. First, the study included different groups of service-learning partnerships. Unlike the vast majority of extant literature that focuses exclusively on one group of partners, this study incorporated the perspectives of four groups: community partners, administrators, faculty members, and students. The inclusion of these groups afforded opportunities to gain unique insights from different partners. Second, the study covered several broad areas. The qualitative component explored motivations for, relationships of, barriers to, and suggestions for improving, service-learning partnerships. The quantitative component assessed the impact of course experiences and students’ demographics on their scores on the Community Awareness and Interpersonal Effectiveness scales. Studying these expansive areas allowed for augmenting understanding of multiple facets of these partnerships. With regard to methods, the study employed a mixed methods design in which service-learning partnerships were studied both qualitatively and quantitatively. Following this methodology contributed to the rigor and comprehensiveness of the study. Taken together, the distinct features of this study led to developing a holistic model of understanding service-learning partnerships.

Bridging serious gaps in the literature.

Research in non-Western settings.

Giles (2010) identified a gap in the research on service-learning in global contexts. This study is an important step toward voiding this gap. One can find dozens
of studies on service-learning partnerships in Western contexts (e.g., Bushhouse, 2005; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Worrall, 2007), but investigating these partnerships in the East is rare. Actually, this research is unprecedented in Egypt. The CBL program director at AUC complimented this unique effort, stating:

> It is not an area that we have searched before and we value very much your results and we want to make use of them and benefit from your research and hopefully you make recommendations and we can use them in enhancing the partnerships. We have a lot more work to do.

The study fulfilled the director’s hopes by devoting an entire detailed section that offers recommendations for changes in policy and practice to ensure effective partnerships. In addition to making an effort to enhance service-learning practice at AUC, the study paved the way for future research on service-learning in non-Western settings and comparison studies in different cultural contexts. Hatcher and Bringle (2012) underscored the importance of such research noting, “Cross-cultural perspectives are invaluable to understanding and improving both research and practice in service-learning and community engagement” (p. xiii).

**Bringing underrepresented voices into light.**

Giving voice to underrepresented service-learning partners is among the significant contributions of this study. In addition to faculty members, the study included the perspectives of community partners, senior administrators, and students. A brief discussion on the importance of seeking the perspectives of the latter three groups is provided below.
Community partners.

Service-learning research on the community perspective is rare and recent (Worrall, 2007). Up until the present time, there is a dearth of research in this area with hardly any research on service-learning partnerships in Eastern contexts. By including the perspectives of Egyptian community professionals, this study redressed this noticeable neglect in the literature. The voices of these professionals provided helpful insights into the unique culture of civil society in Egypt and showed how culture may shape service-learning partnerships in higher education.

Senior administrators.

Despite repeated emphasis on the critical importance of institutional leadership to institutionalizing service-learning and community engagement in higher education (e.g., Vogel et al., 2010; Votruba, 2005), the voices of senior administrators are underrepresented in service-learning literature on the whole. This study incorporated the perspectives of senior administrators and program staff members. The inclusion of administrators generated new knowledge about the barriers to fostering service-learning on the university campus beyond the control of the institution’s leadership: the traditional criteria for university ranking systems. This new knowledge drew attention to the necessity of applying broad policy changes in higher education to promote its civic mission.

Students.

While the literature abounds with studies assessing the impact of service-learning on a wide range of student outcomes (e.g., Eyler & Giles, 1999; Karin & Nurse, 2004;
Lansverk, 2004; Mooney & Edwards, 2001; Myers-Lipton, 1996), no research has asked students what they think about service-learning partnerships. This study aimed to redress this serious gap by exploring students’ perceptions of service-learning partnerships at AUC. The findings of this dissertation counter the common perceptions of college adults as materialistic and self-centered. Students’ insights, along with their desires for affecting positive change in their communities, validate them as central partners to service-learning. It is the author’s hope that this study will lead to the emergence of a new body of literature that focuses on investigating students’ perspectives of service-learning partnerships, thus guiding the future planning of these collaborations with student wisdom. This study is a starting point toward that direction and many areas warrant future research to accumulate knowledge, thus building and refining this new body of literature.

Foreign groups

This study made distinct contributions to the literature by documenting the experiences of foreign individuals, including students, faculty, and staff members. The inclusion of these voices afforded an opportunity to consider new variables should service-learning involve international individuals. Specifically, the study revealed that competencies in the native language and familiarity with the local culture are two important factors that must be carefully considered for effective engagement of foreign individuals in service-learning partnerships. This is a timely contribution given a globalized world in which people are increasingly mobile is, as well as the current emphasis on study abroad and exchange programs. The study’s findings in this regard
provide practical guidance to local hosting institutions for building solid support systems for internationals groups, thus attracting more of them. These findings can also inform the preparation programs for this group in their home institutions before participating in service-learning in foreign contexts. Equally important, this contribution offers a new direction for research to explore the differences, if any, between the perceptions of domestic versus international individuals of service-learning partnerships. Such an exploration would allow for deeper understanding of how culture shapes university-community engagement.

**Breaking new ground.**

This study breaks new ground by calling attention to the organizational factors influencing service-learning partnerships. Although small, there exists a body of literature that illuminates understanding of the institutional factors that help integrate service-learning in institutions of higher education. No published study has addressed these same factors on the community-based organizations side. The findings of this study begin to address this gap by revealing some of the organizational factors that influence service-learning partnerships. As the study showed, these factors pertain to governance structure, management style, and culture of the partnering community-based organizations. Revealing these factors is an important contribution to the literature because it demonstrates that promoting service-learning partnerships is a joint responsibility for both higher education and the community. Therefore, bringing light into these factors could shift attention from an exclusive focus on the role of institutions of higher education in promoting service-learning to a consideration of a new question.
that pertains to what community-based organizations should do to facilitate these partnerships. This newfound recognition could also promote research on community-based organizations, thus redressing the noticeable neglect on the community aspect. Furthermore, it could promote reciprocal partnerships between the academy and the community as each realizes the other’s impact on service-learning collaborations.

**Providing a timely contribution and salient examples.**

Having been conducted only two months following the 25th January Egyptian Revolution of 2011 and during rapid changes occurring on the political situation in Egypt and several other Arab countries, this study provides a timely contribution to the knowledge on service-learning partnerships; it captures the effect of the political context prior, during, and post-revolution on these partnerships, therefore augmenting our understanding of how grand political changes may progress or paralyze these collaborations.

Moreover, the study provides salient examples in the voices of community partners, administrators, faculty members, and students. Among the most powerful examples are participants’ comments on the imbalanced power relationships between the university and the academy, as well as the role of community partners in educating AUC students. Furthermore, the study’s recommendations have the merit of being informed by both theory and practice; the use of theory and literature contributes to the solidness and credibility of the suggested solutions. Grounding the recommendations in participants’ voices increases their sense of ownership of these recommendations, which would enhance the likelihood of practicality and utility.
Developing a research agenda.

An important contribution of this study is that it generated new ideas and directions for future research. A detailed section, implications for future research, was designated for presenting provocative research questions that stimulate interest in future research on service-learning and community engagement. This section is organized around the four participating groups. Together, the directions provided for each group lay a foundation for future research in the field. In doing so, this study could potentially guide and influence the direction of future research on the scholarship of engagement in higher education.
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Appendix A

Quick Facts about AUC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate students</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>4,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of female students</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of male students</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Egyptian students</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students from other countries</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of student-run clubs and organizations</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of athletic programs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty to student ratio</td>
<td>1:12.3</td>
<td>1:11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty who hold PhDs</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Egyptian faculty</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of American faculty</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty from other countries</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes in library</td>
<td>403,722</td>
<td>414,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial and periodical subscriptions</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>39,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of degrees awarded</td>
<td>25,534</td>
<td>26,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Website of the American University in Cairo at

http://www.aucegypt.edu/aboutauc/QuickFacts/Pages/default.aspx
Appendix B

AUC’s Mission Statement

Source: The Website of the American University in Cairo at
http://www.aucegypt.edu/aboutauc/HistoryandMission/Pages/mission.aspx

The American University in Cairo (AUC) is a premier English-language institution of
higher learning. The university is committed to teaching and research of the highest
caliber, and offers exceptional liberal arts and professional education in a cross-cultural
environment. AUC builds a culture of leadership, lifelong learning, continuing education
and service among its graduates, and is dedicated to making significant contributions to
Egypt and the international community in diverse fields. Chartered and accredited in the
United States and Egypt, it is an independent, not-for-profit, equal-opportunity
institution. AUC upholds the principles of academic freedom and is dedicated to
excellence.
Appendix C

President Obama’s Message of Congratulation to AUC on Moving to a New Campus

"The opening of a new campus marks the beginning of a new era for one of the Middle East's great academic institutions, and a new era for the Egyptian-United States partnership that is symbolized by the history of this university. "For ninety years, Americans and Egyptians have studied and researched together, discovering a common purpose and shared values in their diverse heritage and aspirations. With a new campus, more young people will benefit from this unique educational experience. They will have access to world-class facilities and innovative teaching that will produce the science and understanding to improve all of our lives.

AUC was founded in 1919 by Americans dedicated to the ideal of an American liberal arts education in the Middle East. Since then, the university has enjoyed the support of private and public donors from the U.S., including the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), which provided a $100 million construction grant for the new campus, as well as partnering with the university and the Egyptian Ministry of International Cooperation in funding the Leadership for Education and Development program, a scholarship program that offers full scholarships to public school students from throughout the country.

"I am honored to affirm the commitment of the American people as your partner and friend in this endeavor. I do so with the belief that our work together is vital and necessary. As Americans and Egyptians representing many different backgrounds, philosophies and faiths, we can and should enjoy a productive and close relationship. We can and should work toward common goals and interests. Together, we can and should work for peace, better educational opportunities for our children, and more opportunities for all."
Appendix D

The Gerhart Center: Vision and Mission

**Vision**

Strengthen the culture and effectiveness of philanthropy in the Arab region.

**Mission**

Gerhart Center serves as the leading provider of knowledge and resources for strengthening philanthropic practice in the Arab region.

Source: The Website of the American University in Cairo at

http://www.aucegypt.edu/ResearchatAUC/rc/gerhartcenter/Pages/OurMission.aspx
Appendix E

Description of the CBL Program at AUC

About the program

The Community-Based Learning (CBL) program was established in Fall 2008 as part of the campus infrastructure to forward civic engagement. As an academic support unit, it is managed by both the John D. Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement and the Center for Learning and Teaching. The CBL program is aligned to the institutional mission which states that “AUC builds a culture of leadership, lifelong learning, continuing education and service among its graduates, and is dedicated to making significant contributions to Egypt and the international community in diverse fields.”

Mission

The CBL program empowers the AUC students, faculty and partners to create community-engaging learning environments across the disciplines, environments which facilitate student academic excellence, personal growth and civic engagement, and build sustainable community capital.

Vision

The CBL program envisions an engaged academic curriculum—one that acknowledges the value of and integrates community knowledge to strengthen student learning, while employing student competencies to address community-defined needs.

Values

The CBL program values learning environments that promote:

- Proactive citizenship
- Reciprocity of learning and service
- Respect for diversity and participatory practices
- Integrity in learning, research and civic engagement
- Critical reflection and ongoing self-development
- Innovation and creative problem-solving
- Knowledge-sharing and life-long learning
Goals

The CBL program aims to:

1. Develop the program, on an ongoing basis, building on the advisory council of students, faculty and community partners
2. Promote the values, theories, principles and methodologies of community-based learning to faculty, students and community partners
3. Evaluate the student experience and civic outcomes, and to use the results to enhance the program, the curriculum, and the community-campus partnerships
4. Reward faculty, students and community partners through a variety of grants, assistantships and awards
5. Document course experiences to build a knowledge base and identify model partnerships

Stakeholders

The CBL program serves the interests, and periodically seeks the opinion and recommendations, of:

- AUC students
- AUC faculty
- Community partners
- Beneficiaries of community partners
- CBL program staff
- AUC administrators

Source: The Website of the American University in Cairo at http://www.aucegypt.edu/ResearchatAUC/rc/gerhartcenter/Pages/OurMission.aspx
Appendix F

Survey Questionnaire

Dear AUC Student,

During your time at AUC, you have had a variety of experiences. We are interested in the opportunities you may have had to be involved with the community, either through coursework or extra-curricular activities. Examples of these opportunities may include participation in the Community-Based Learning (CBL) Program, one-time or multiple service projects, or volunteer service.

Please note that this is NOT a test. There are No right or wrong answers. Your responses are anonymous. Please do NOT write your name on any part of the questionnaire. Your opinion is important to us as we work to improve CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations. Please be open and honest in your answer. It would help us most if you do not skip any questions. Thank You!

Section I

This section includes questions about your community service experiences in Community-Based Learning (CBL) course(s) at AUC.

1. How many CBL courses have you taken?
   1. 0 course
   2. 1-2 courses
   3. 3-4 courses
   4. 5 or more courses

2. Was your participation in your CBL course(s):
   1. Required for all courses?
   2. Optional for all courses?
   3. Required for the first course and optional for the others?
   4. I took only one CBL course and it was required.
   5. I took only one CBL course and it was optional.
   6. Other, please specify ………..

3. Approximately, how many hours, on average, have you worked at your community-based organization(s) per week for your CBL course(s)?
   1. 1- 5 hours
   2. 5-10 hours
   3. 10-15 hours
   4. 15-20 hours
   5. ≥ 20 hours
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4. In which discipline(s)/department(s) did you take your CBL course(s)?

Section II

Below are some statements about your experiences with CBL courses. Please use the following scale to indicate your degree of agreement with each statement. Circle the number that best describes you.

1- Strongly disagree  
2- Somewhat Disagree  
3- Neither Disagree nor Agree  
4- Somewhat Agree  
5- Strongly Agree

Through my experience in the CBL Program, I have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5- Learned about the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Developed friendships with other students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Become more aware of the community of which I am a part.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Practiced my ability to lead and make decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Changed the way I think about the community in which I worked.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Worked with other students in a leadership role.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11- Reflected on the concepts I learned in the CBL course.

12- Had opportunities to take a leadership role.

13- Learned to see social problems in a new way.

14- Had beneficial interactions with other students.

15- Gained a deeper understanding of things I learned about in my CBL course.

16- Learned how to work with others effectively.

17- Learned to apply concepts from my CBL course(s) to real situations.

18- Changed the way I think about societal problems.

19- Developed my leadership skills.

Through my experience in the CBL Program, I have:
Section II

This section includes questions about your community service experiences at AUC other than the one(s) you have had in CBL courses.

22. Please estimate the number of courses other than CBL courses that you have taken at AUC that have included community involvement, such as volunteer service, one time service projects, or other service activities.

1. 0 courses
2. 1-2 courses
3. 3-4 courses
4. 5 or more courses

23. Please indicate how often you have participated in community involvement as part of your student experience at AUC outside the classroom (e.g., through a campus organization, a student club, on your own)

1. None/never
2. Once each academic year
3. Once or twice each academic semester
4. About once a month
5. Nearly every week

24. Summarizing all of your activities, both inside and outside the classroom, how often have you been involved in the community as part of your experiences at AUC.

1. Never
2. Seldom (1-2 times per semester)
3. Sometimes (1 time a month)
4. Often (2-3 times a month)
5. Always (Each week)
Section IV

This section asks a few general questions about you so that we can accurately describe the sample. Please mark the choice that applies to you.

25. Gender
   1. Female
   2. Male

26. Citizenship Status
   1. Dual citizen (Egyptian and another citizenship)
   2. Egyptian citizen
   4. Other, please specify ………..

27. Race/Ethnicity
   a. African-American
   b. Arab
   c. Caucasian/European
   d. Hispanic-American
   e. Middle-Eastern
   f. Native-American
   g. Other, please specify ………..

28. Class Level
   a. Undergraduate First Year
   b. Undergraduate Second Year
   c. Undergraduate Third Year
   d. Undergraduate Fourth Year
   e. Graduate
   f. Other, please specify ………..

29. Enrollment Status
   a. Full-time in a degree program
   b. Part-time in a degree program
   c. Certificate program
   d. Non-degree program
   e. Other, please specify ………..

30. Grade Point Average (GPA)
   a. 1.0-1.5
   b. 1.5-2.0
   c. 2.0-2.5
   d. 2.5-3.0
31. What best describes your religious/spiritual orientation?
   a. Very religious
   b. Religious
   c. Spiritual but not religious
   d. None
   e. Other, please specify ..........

32. What is your major area of study?...........

33. What is your age? ...........

Section V

Your opinion and feedback matter to us. This section provides you with an additional opportunity to express in detail your views about CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations.

34. Please describe and/or provide examples of the activities you have done in your CBL course(s) (e.g., providing tutoring or mentoring services to children, organizing campaigns, participating in cleaning or painting activities, etc.) If you need more space, please feel free to write on the back of the paper.

35. Why did you enroll in CBL courses?

36. What are your suggestions for improving CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations?

37. Would you like to share additional comments, suggestions, concerns, or things you like or dislike about CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations?
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Section VI

This section includes questions about your community service experiences that are not connected to AUC.

38. If you have had any past or current experiences with community involvement outside AUC, please tell us about them, and your primary motivation for engaging in these experiences. For example, you may have some of these experiences during elementary, preparatory, or secondary school. Also, you may be currently involved in community activities that are not connected to AUC.

Pre-college Experience(s)

Experience(s) during College

Thank you for completing this survey.
Appendix G

Student Individual Interview Protocol

Date: Venue:

Interviewee: Interviewer: Neivin Shalabi

1. How are you?
2. What motivates you to enroll in CBL courses?
3. How have your participation in CBL partnerships impacted you? Please elaborate with examples.
4. Please describe your most meaningful/challenging/puzzling experience in CBL partnerships.
5. Were your goals and those of your organization aligned or at odds in CBL partnerships? Please elaborate with examples.
6. Have you noticed any change occurred in your organization because of CBL partnerships? If yes, how would you describe this change? Does an example come to mind?
7. Have you noticed any change occurred in AUC because of CBL partnerships? If yes, how would you describe this change? Does an example come to mind?
8. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact AUC? Please elaborate with examples.
9. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact faculty members? Please elaborate with examples.
10. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact community-based organizations? Please elaborate with examples.
11. In your perspective, are the benefits associated with CBL partnerships balanced for all involved partners, or do you think that one partner benefits significantly more than the others? Please elaborate with examples.
12. In your perspective, are the costs, if any, associated with CBL partnerships balanced for all involved partners, or do you think that one partner experiences significantly a higher cost than the others? Please elaborate with examples.
13. In your opinion, do the benefits of CBL partnerships outweigh the costs?
14. In your perspective, what are the difficulties, if any, to developing CBL partnerships?
15. What are your suggestions for improving CBL partnerships? Please elaborate with examples.
16. Is there anything I have not asked about CBL partnerships that you would like to share or any issues that you have talked about that you would like to revisit?

Thank you. I appreciate your time and input.
Appendix H

Faculty Individual Interview Protocol

Date: 
Venue: 

Interviewer: Neivin Shalabi

Interviewee:

1. How are you?
2. What motivates you to teach CBL courses?
3. How have your participation in CBL partnerships impacted you? Please elaborate with examples.
4. Please describe your most meaningful/challenging/puzzling experience in CBL partnerships.
5. Were your goals and those of your organization(s) aligned or at odds in CBL partnerships? Please elaborate with examples.
6. Have you noticed any change occurred in your organization(s) because of CBL partnerships? If yes, how would you describe this change? Does an example come to mind?
7. Have you noticed any change occurred in AUC because of CBL partnerships? If yes, how would you describe this change? Does an example come to mind?
8. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact students? Please elaborate with examples.
9. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact AUC? Please elaborate with examples.
10. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact community-based organizations? Please elaborate with examples.
11. In your perspective, are the benefits associated with CBL partnerships balanced for all involved partners, or do you think that one partner benefits significantly more than the others? Please elaborate with examples.
12. In your perspective, are the costs, if any, associated with CBL partnerships balanced for all involved partners, or do you think that one partner experiences significantly a higher cost than the others? Please elaborate with examples.
13. In your opinion, do the benefits of CBL partnerships outweigh the costs?
14. In your perspective, what are the challenges, if any, to developing CBL partnerships?
15. What are your suggestions for improving CBL partnerships? Please elaborate with examples.
16. Is there anything I have not asked about CBL partnerships that you would like to share or any issues that you have talked about that you would like to revisit?

Thank you. I appreciate your time and input.
Appendix I

Administrator Individual Interview Protocol

Date:                                              Venue:

Interviewee:                                              Interviewer: Neivin Shalabi

1. How are you?
2. What motivates AUC to offer CBL courses?
3. How have CBL partnerships impacted AUC? Please elaborate with examples.
4. Were AUC’s goals and those of community-based organizations aligned or at odds in CBL partnerships? Please elaborate with examples.
5. Please describe your most meaningful/challenging/puzzling experience in CBL partnerships.
6. Have you noticed any change occurred in community-based organizations because of CBL partnerships? If yes, how would you describe this change? Does an example come to mind?
7. Have you noticed any change occurred in AUC because of CBL partnerships? If yes, how would you describe this change? Does an example come to mind?
8. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact students? Please elaborate with examples.
9. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact faculty members? Please elaborate with examples.
10. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact community-based organizations? Please elaborate with examples.
11. In your perspective, are the benefits associated with CBL partnerships balanced for all involved partners, or do you think that one partner benefits significantly more than the others? Please elaborate with examples.
12. In your perspective, are the costs, if any, associated with CBL partnerships balanced for all involved partners, or do you think that one partner experiences significantly a higher cost than the others? Please elaborate with examples.
13. In your opinion, do the benefits of CBL partnerships outweigh the costs?
14. In your perspective, what are the challenges, if any, to developing CBL partnerships?
15. What are your suggestions for improving CBL partnerships? Please elaborate with examples.
16. Is there anything I have not asked about CBL partnerships that you would like to share, or any issues that you have talked about that you would like to revisit?

Thank you. I appreciate your time and input.
Appendix J

Community Partner Individual Interview Protocol

Date: 
Venue: 
Interviewee: 
Interviewer: Neivin Shalabi

1. How are you?
2. What motivates your organization to partner with AUC in CBL courses?
3. How have your participation in CBL partnerships impacted you? Please elaborate with examples.
4. Were AUC’s goals and those of your organization aligned or at odds in CBL partnerships? Please elaborate with examples.
5. Please describe your most meaningful/challenging/puzzling experience in CBL partnerships.
6. Have you noticed any change occurred in your organization because of CBL partnerships? If yes, how would you describe this change? Does an example come to mind?
7. Have you noticed any change occurred in AUC because of CBL partnerships? If yes, how would you describe this change? Does an example come to mind?
8. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact AUC? Please elaborate with examples.
9. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact faculty members? Please elaborate with examples.
10. In your opinion, how do CBL partnerships impact community-based organizations? Please elaborate with examples.
11. In your perspective, are the benefits associated with CBL partnerships balanced for all involved partners, or do you think that one partner benefits significantly more than the others? Please elaborate with examples.
12. In your perspective, are the costs, if any, associated with CBL partnerships balanced for all involved partners, or do you think that one partner experiences significantly a higher cost than the others? Please elaborate with examples.
13. In your opinion, do the benefits of CBL partnerships outweigh the costs?
14. In your perspective, what are the challenges, if any, to developing CBL partnerships?
15. What are your suggestions for improving CBL partnerships? Please elaborate with examples.
16. Is there anything I have not asked about CBL partnerships that you would like to share or any issues that you have talked about that you would like to revisit?

Thank you. I appreciate your time and input.
Appendix K

The Researcher’s C.V.

NEIVIN M. SHALABI

1905 S. York St., Apt # 304 Denver, CO 80210
E-mail: nshalabi@du.edu
Portfolio http://portfolio.du.edu/nshalabi
Cell Phone: (001)720-208-8407

PROFILE

- Ph.D. in Higher Education with a concentration in Diversity in the Higher Learning and a cognate in not-for-profit organizations management
- Bilingual: Arabic and English with intermediate efficiency in French
- Qualitative and quantitative research methods experiences
- Twelve years of teaching experiences in pre- and postsecondary institutions
- Research interests focus on international service-learning and university-community partnerships
- Key strengths include excellent academic standing, writing, interpersonal, and leadership skills

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy

  - Higher Education, Concentration in Diversity in the Higher Learning
  - Dissertation Title: Multiple Perspectives on Academic Service-Learning Partnerships at the American University in Cairo: A Mixed Method Study. Co-chairs Drs. Nick Cutforth and Frank Tuitt
  - GPA: 3.98

Master of Arts

  - Higher Education, Concentration in Leadership and Organizational Change
  - Thesis Title: Integrating Service-Learning into Undergraduate Students’ Curricula: Recommendations for Best Practices
  - GPA: 4.00
EDUCATION (Cont.)

Professional Diploma
- El-Mansoura University, College of Education, DA, Egypt
- Pedagogy of Teaching English as a Foreign Language, 2005

Bachelor of Arts
- Tanta University, College of Arts, TA, Egypt
- English Literature, 1998

Bachelor of Education
- El-Mansoura University, College of Education, DA, Egypt
- Pedagogy of Teaching English as a Foreign Language, 1996

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

PUBLICATIONS

PEER-REVIEWED RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL & INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES


PEER-REVIEWED PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL & INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES (CONT.)


INVITED GUEST SPEAKER SESSIONS


PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

- The National Outreach Scholarship Conference. North Carolina State University, U.S.A., October 4-6th, 2010
- IUPUI Research Academy. Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, Indiana, U.S.A., May 14-16, 2009
- The 14th Women's Conference, "Her Story, Our Story." University of Denver, U.S.A., March 6th, 2009
GRANTS

- The American Educational Research Association (AERA) Division J’ Post-secondary Education Graduate Student Travel Grant Fund. Selected to receive a travel award in the amount of $300.00 for the 2012 AERA annual conference in Vancouver, Canada

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

I- POSTSECONDARY


Graduate Teaching Assistant

- HED 4216 History of American Higher Education Spring 2012
  - Led class discussions
  - Facilitated small group activities
  - Developed and delivered presentations on academic freedom, campus activism, and
  - Assisted students with conceptualization of individual assignments and projects
- HED 4216 Higher Education Research Processes Winter 2012
  - Developed readings for the course
  - Facilitated class discussions
  - Gave presentations on theoretical frameworks and literature reviews
  - Reviewed students’ papers and provided feedback


Graduate Teaching Assistant (Cont.)

- RMS 4952 Research Ethics Fall 2011
  - Identified readings on ethics in international settings
  - Co-developed syllabus
  - Gave a presentation on ethics in international settings

The Center for World Languages and Cultures (CWLC), CO, U.S.A. 2011

Language Partner [Student Job]

- Assisted students in learning the Arabic writing system
- Engaged in one-on-one conversations in Arabic with beginning- intermediate- and advanced-level learners
- Facilitated language conversation groups, language learning games, and other communicative activities
- Designed curricular and extracurricular activities

**The Community College of Denver, CO, U.S.A. 2010**

*Intern Instructor*
- Developed curriculum for the College 101: The Student Experience
- Co-taught one university subject
- Prepared and implemented lesson plans
- Designed and prepared in- and out-class activities
- Prepared, administered, and graded quizzes, laboratory assignments, and reports
- Advised students on course and academic matters

**The American University in Cairo (AUC) 2004-2006**

*Part-Time Instructor and Instructor Trainer*
- Taught courses on English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English for Specific Purposes (ESP), Methods of Teaching EFL, and Professional Development
- Advised students on coursework and academic-related issues
- Updated customized courses on ESP
- Participated in recruiting new instructors as an application evaluator and an interviewer
- Designed and implemented training workshops with the goal of enhancing the performance of the teaching staff

**II- PRE-SECONDARY**

**Mokhtar Abdel-Aal High School, DA, Egypt 2004-2006**

*High School Teacher of English*
- Taught courses on EFL
- Advised students on academic-related issues

**Mokhtar Abdel-Aal High School, DA, Egypt 2004-2006 (Cont.)**
- *High School Teacher of English (Cont.)*
- Established relationships between the school and a few local and foreign schools which resulted in improving students’ co-operative and language skills
- Participated in the *Model United Nations* Program aiming at enhancing students’ communication and negotiation skills
El-Redania Technical School, DA, Egypt 2003-2006

High School Teacher of English
- Taught vocational courses (Industry & Electronics)
- Advised students on academic-related issues
- Simplified textbooks and technical terms which resulted in increasing the percentage of students’ success in English 3.0% above the percentage of the previous years
- Nominated the best teacher in El-Dakahlia Governorate by El-Dakahlia Educational Zone

Monshat El-Salam Middle School, DA, Egypt 1999-2003

Middle School Teacher of English
- Taught courses on EFL
- Created positive attitudes toward learning English by employing engaging pedagogy
- Engaged students in community service activities

Dyast Middle School, DA, Egypt 1997-1999

Middle School Teacher of English
- Taught courses on EFL
- Advised students on academic-related issues
- Initiated partnerships between the school and the surrounding community which resulted in raising students’ awareness of some environmental issues, such as air pollution and water purification
- Started an English club at the school which resulted in encouraging students to use English in real-life situations

ADMINISTRATIVE WORK EXPERIENCE

Westminster Law Library, Denver CO, U.S.A 2009-Present

Circulation Associate [Student Job]
- Managed front desk operations
- Served as the primary source of information of the library and building on the weekends by answering phone calls on a multi-line telephone system, and greeting and assisting visitors
- Mentored new staff members
- Proctored mid-term and final-year exams to ensure the security and integrity of the exam process
SERVICE EXPERIENCE

I- PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

- **Reviewer:** Manuscripts presented to the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, 2012-present
- **Inaugural Editorial Fellow:** The International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE), U.S.A., 2011-present
  - Worked alongside a group of doctoral students and senior scholars to develop the proceedings of the conference
  - Received a letter of appreciation from the IARSLCE
  - Participated in recruiting the fellows of 2012-2014
- **Reviewer:** Manuscripts presented to the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE) Annual Conference, U.S.A., 2011-present
- **Reviewer:** Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, Indiana, U.S.A. 2010-present
- **Reviewer:** Manuscripts presented to the Community-University Partnerships: Bringing Global Perspectives to Local Action. Waterloo, Region, Ontario, Canada May 10-14, 2011
- **Member:** Steering Committee of the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement: Graduate Student Network. 2010-present
- **Session Convener:** The 11th National Outreach Scholarship Conference. North Carolina State University, October 4-6th, 2010
- **Volunteer:** The Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education Conference, Denver, CO, October 10-12, 2010
- **Translator:** The Office of Internationalization, University of Denver, 2007

II- VOLUNTEER/COMMUNITY SERVICE

- **Volunteer:** Lasting Impact Project
  - Raised awareness of the adverse effects of alcohol for pregnant women
- **Area Leader:** Project Homeless Connect # 6, University of Denver, April, 2009
- **Volunteer:** Habitat for Humanity Denver Metro Area, 2008-2009
- **Volunteer:** Fisher Early Learning Center Night Owls, 2008-2009
  - Provided care for children with special needs allowing their parents to enjoy a night of respite
- **Volunteer:** Project Homeless Connect 4, University of Denver, April, 2007
- **Volunteer:** Message, a not-for-profit social service agency, September, 2005-present
  - Co-chaired the Street Children Committee
  - Participated in fundraising activities
  - Cultivated partnerships between Message and some clubs and business persons
Inclusive Excellence/Multicultural Leadership Roles

- **Facilitator of the Greek Leadership Retreat:** Campus Activities Division, University of Denver for facilitating, 2012
- **Facilitator of Voices of Discovery Intergroup Dialogues:** Center for Multicultural Excellence, University of Denver, 2009
  - Developed curriculum for a five-week program
  - Deliberately adjusted curriculum based on the group dynamics and participants’ responses to diversity dialogues
  - Facilitated intergroup dialogue sessions two hours each week for five weeks on issues pertaining to race, gender, identity, social class, and religion
  - Established relationships with fifteen graduate and undergraduate students
- **Coach:** Community of Excellence Scholars, University of Denver, 2008
  - Mentored a female freshman from a Hispanic background for one academic year
- **International Graduate Student Ambassador:** Office of Internationalization, University of Denver, 2007-2009:
  - Served as a student ambassador for DU to diplomatic, international, business, political, and educational communities in Denver
- **Participant: Diversity and Unity Retreat,** The Center for Multicultural Excellence, University of Denver, 2010-2011
  - Participated in the weekend retreat with over 200 undergraduate students
  - Facilitated small group discussions about diversity issues

Gender Violence Education and Support Services Experience

- **Sexual Assault Hotline Advocate:** Student Life, University of Denver, 2008-present
  - Served on call duty
  - Filed incident report forms

Student Orientation Experience

- **Facilitator,** Life outside the Classroom: First Year Student Orientation. Discoveries Week Program. University of Denver, 2011-2012
  - Led discussions on gender violence education and support services, diversity-, emotional-, and alcohol-related issues
  - Educated students on how to access resources on campus
  - Assisted with the evaluation of the orientation
- **Orientation Leader:** Office of Internationalization, University of Denver, 2007-2008
  - Facilitated discussions on smoothing international students’ transition to life in the U.S.
STUDENT ORIENTATION EXPERIENCE (CONT.)

- Led a session on community building
- Engaged with international students in conversations during sessions, meals, and activities
- Led campus tours to familiarize international students with the campus community
- Assisted with the logistics of the orientation

LEADERSHIP ROLES/STUDENT ORGANIZATION EXPERIENCE

- **President:** Morgridge College of Education Student Association (COESA). University of Denver, 2009-2010
  - Led the planning, marketing, implementation, and evaluation of the Association’s activities
  - Increased the visibility of the Association in the University community by giving presentations about the Association’s mission and activities
  - Recognized outstanding students and faculty members through holding appreciation ceremonies
  - Redesigned and administered the Apple Award for Leaders in Education, allowing custodial staff members to be eligible recipients for this award
  - Monitored the nomination and selection processes of the Summit Award for distinguished students
  - Recruited students to fill in open positions on the board of the Association
  - Managed the Association’s budget and ensured the compliance of the expenses of the Association with the University’s Propriety of Expense Policy
  - Reshaped COESA scholarship application such that it became anonymous, and administered the application review process
  - Developed a contest for the Association’s logo
  - Assisted with creating safe spaces for students, faculty, and staff to reflect on their collegiate experiences by providing financial and logistic support to the Anthology Project
  - Established contacts and co-ordinated efforts with SODEXO Food Services to provide refreshments for students while taking their comprehensive exams
  - Represented the Association to the Graduate Student Association Council (GSAC)
  - Launched a fundraising for Haiti’s Earthquake: COESA Emergency $1.00 Appeal
  - Identified and donated the money raised for a not-for-profit organization, Save the Children
  - Represented the Association on the College committees and shared updates with the Association
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LEADERSHIP ROLES/STUDENT ORGANIZATION EXPERIENCE (CONT.)

- Served on the **College of the Whole Committee:**
  - Acted as a liaison between the student body and other constituents of the College
  - Brought attention to students’ concerns and helped resolve some of them

- Served on the **Alumni Relations Committee:**
  - Helped in the articulation of the mission statement of the Committee
  - Assisted with planning and executing a series of Signature Events featuring speakers from the College alumni

- **Vice-President:** Morgridge College of Education Student Association (COESA). University of Denver, 2008-2009
  - Built a sense of community between students, and faculty, administrators, and alumni through planning and implementing social events, such as Winter Festival, Welcome Back Carnival, College of Education Week, and End of the Year Party

- **Vice-President:** Morgridge College of Education Student Association (COESA). University of Denver, 2008-2009
  - Served on the **Inclusive Excellence Committee:**
    - Assisted with articulation of the mission statement of the Committee
    - Provided feedback for developing a survey, Perceptions of Inclusive Excellence and Diversity Survey, assessing faculty members’ perceptions of diversity-related issues
  - Served on the **Learning and Teaching Committee:**
    - Engaged in dialogues with faculty members to develop course evaluation focused on learner-centered classroom practice, and faculty peer evaluation process
    - Assisted in developing the winter Adjunct Orientation about international students

- **Vice-President:** International Team, Office of Internationalization, University of Denver, 2008-2009
  - Planned and implemented social events
  - Monitored the budget of the Team

SOFTWARE EXPERIENCE

- MAXQUDA [Qualitative data analysis]
- SPSS [Quantitative data analysis]
- Survey Monkey and Qualtrics [Online survey]
- Skype [Online meetings]
COMPETITIVE TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

- Certificate of successful completion awarded by the Computer Center at Mansoura University for successful completion with an excellent degree of information technology, El-Dakahlia, Egypt, 2003
- Certificate of successful completion of Video-Based Communicative Skills and Methodology Program. The Integrated English Language Program in collaboration with the Egyptian Central Directorate of Training, Egypt, 2003
- Certificate of successful completion of the Standard-based Communicative Reflective Methodology Course. The Integrated English Language Program in collaboration with the Egyptian Ministry of Education, Egypt, 2002
- Certificate of successful completion of the Certificate of Overseas Teachers of English (COTE). The American University in Cairo, Egypt, 2002
- Certificate of completion awarded by El-Dakahlia Center of Technological Development for successful completion of using multimedia centers, Egypt, 2002
- Certificate of successful completion of Student Achievement Development Training Course. The Egyptian Central Directorate of In-Service Training, Egypt, 2001
- Certificate of successful completion of Teacher Training Initiative-EFL The Department of Applied Linguistics & ESL of Georgia State University, U.S.A., 2000
- Certificate of successful completion of an excellent design of an achievement test. The Department of Applied Linguistics & ESL of Georgia State University U.S.A, 2000

MERIT-BASED AWARDS

- The International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE). Selected to receive the Graduate Student Scholarship in the amount of $1000.00, 2010, 2011, Indianapolis, and Chicago, U.S.A.
- Graduate Studies Doctoral Fellowship for Inclusive Excellence, University of Denver, U.S.A., 2010-2011
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- Dean’s Education Scholar, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver, CO, U.S.A., 2008-2009
- Graduate Dean’s Scholarship, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver, U.S.A., 2008-2010
- George and Mamie Miller Scholarship, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver, U.S.A., 2009-2010
- Ford Foundation Scholarship, 2006-2008

HONORS & AWARDS

- Certificate of recognition awarded by the Campus Activities Division, University of Denver for facilitating the Greek Leadership Retreat, 2012
- Certificate of recognition awarded by the Higher Education Student Association, University of Denver for Commitment to Civic Engagement, 2010
- Certificate of recognition awarded by the Higher Education Student Association, University of Denver for Embodying The Spirit of Education, 2009
- Identified as a “Top Academic Scholar” by the University of Denver, 2008
- Certificate of recognition awarded by Egypt TESOL for active participation in the Sixth and Seventh Egypt TESOL Convection, 2005, 2006
- Certificate of recognition awarded by the Egyptian Ministry of Education in collaboration with the International Education and Resource Network (IEARN) Project for participating in Youth Can 2006 Conference.
- Certificate of recognition awarded by the Egyptian Ministry of Education in collaboration with the International Education and Resource Network (IEARN) Project for hosting and assisting the Exchange Students from MLC, U.S.A. learn about the Egyptian culture, way of life, and high schools, 2005

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIPS

- The American Educational Research Association (AERA), 2010-present
- The International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE), 2010-present
- Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), 2010-present
- Golden Key International Honor Society, 2008-present
- The Institute of International Education (IIE), 2000-present
- Egypt TESOL, 2005-2007
STUDENT ASSOCIATIONS MEMBERSHIPS

- Muslim Student Association (MSA), University of Denver, 2007-2012
- Higher Education Student Association (HESA), University of Denver, 2007-2012
- College of Education Student Association (COESA), University of Denver, 2007-2012
- Graduate Student Association Council (GSAC), University of Denver, 2007-2012
- International Student Association (ISO), University of Denver, 2007-2012
- International Team (I-Team), University of Denver, 2007-2010
- International Graduate Student Ambassadors (IGSA), University of Denver, 2007-2009

PROFESSIONAL REFERENCES

- Nick Cutforth, Ph.D.
  Professor, Research Methods and Statistics
  Morgridge College of Education
  University of Denver
  E-mail: ncutfort@du.edu

- Kathy Green, Ph.D.
  Professor, Research Methods and Statistics
  Morgridge College of Education
  University of Denver
  E-mail: kgreen@du.edu

- Frank Tuitt, Ed.D.
  Associate Professor, Higher Education
  Associate Provost for Inclusive Excellence
  Morgridge College of Education
  University of Denver
  E-mail: ftuitt@du.edu
Appendix L

Follow-up Letter

Neivin Shalabi
2369 S Gaylord St., APT # 206
Denver, CO 80210

November 9th, 2010

Dr. Barbara Ibrahim
Director, The John D. Gerhart Center for Philanthropy & Civic Engagement
The American University in Cairo

Dear Dr. Barbara Ibrahim,

This is a follow-up letter on the conversation we had during the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement conference which took place on October 28-30th, 2010 in Indianapolis. The aim of this letter is threefold. First, I would like to thank you for your willingness to allow me to conduct the empirical study of my dissertation at the American University in Cairo (AUC). Second, I would like to provide you with some more information about my dissertation research which focuses on service-learning university-community partnerships. Specifically, my research explores the rationale for and impacts of these partnerships on all the parties involved. It also investigates the models for, and organizational factors that help facilitate such collaborations.

Third, I would like to apply for the Fellows Program at AUC. Enrollment in such a program is critically important for several reasons. For instance, my dissertation is grounded in the ideals of participatory action/community-based research. In this type of research, community partners participate in defining the problem(s) and generating the research question(s). Also, the results of this research are typically used to improve current practices. As such, becoming a fellow researcher at AUC will enable me to establish direct relationships with the parties involved in AUC-community-based organizations partnerships for service-learning. I can then ensure that my study responds to the unique needs of these partners, and thus increasing the likelihood that the findings will be practical and useful to all the constituents involved in these collaborations.

It is worth noting that my dissertation research is guided by the collective wisdom of three eminent scholars: Dr. Nick Cutforth, Professor of Research Methods and Statistics, Dr. Frank Tuitt, Professor of Higher Education, and Dr. Kathy Green, Professor of Quantitative Research Methods. These scholars and I are affiliated with the Morgridge College of Education at the University of Denver.
Given the limited research on the scholarship of engagement in non-U.S. contexts, I would like to stress that conducting my dissertation research at AUC is an important step toward achieving one of my goals—promoting research on engaged scholarship in international settings, especially in my country, Egypt. I thus hope that my dissertation study will advance university-community engagement at AUC and other institutions of higher education worldwide, as well as increase the knowledge base on such collaborations in international settings.

Attached to this letter, please find my curriculum vitae. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me via e-mail nshalabi@du.edu or at my cell phone (720)208-8407.

Thank you for your attention and kind consideration to my request. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Neivin Shalabi

Neivin Shalabi
Ph.D. student, Higher Education Program
University of Denver
E-mail: nshalabi@du.edu
Portfolio: http://portfolio.du.edu/nshalabi
Appendix M

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval Letter

University of Denver

Sylk Sotto-Santiago, MBA
Manager, Regulatory Research Compliance

Tel: 303-871-4052

Certification of Human Subjects Approval

May 26, 2011
To,
Nelvin Shalabi

Subject Human Subject Review

TITLE: University-Community Partnerships for Service-Learning
IRB#: 2011-1703

Dear Shalabi,

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects has reviewed the above named project. The project has been approved for the procedures and subjects described in the protocol at the 04/06/2011 meeting. This approval is effective for twelve months. We will be sending you a continuation application reminder for this project. This form must be submitted to the Office of Sponsored Programs if the project is to be continued. This information must be updated on a yearly basis, upon continuation of your IRB approval for as long as the research continues.

NOTE: Please add the following information to any consent forms, surveys, questionnaires, invitation letters, etc you will use in your research as follows: This survey (consent, study, etc.) was approved by the University of Denver's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research on 04/06/2011. This information must be updated on a yearly basis, upon continuation of your IRB approval for as long as the research continues. This information will be added by the Research Compliance Office if it does not already appear in the form(s) upon continuation approval.

The Institutional Review Board appreciates your cooperation in protecting subjects and ensuring that each subject gives a meaningful consent to participate in research projects. If you have any questions regarding your obligations under the Assurance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

Susan Sadler, PhD
Chair, Institutional Review Board
for the Protection of Human Subjects

Approval Period: 04/06/2011 through 04/05/2012
Review Type: EXPEDITED - NEW
Funding: SPO:
Investigational New Drug:
Investigational Device:
Assurance Number: 00004520, 00004520a
Appendix N

Informed Consent Form: (Individual Interview)

University-Community Partnerships for Service-Learning

You are invited to participate in a research study that will examine partnerships between the American University in Cairo (AUC) and community-based organizations in the Community-based Learning (CBL) Program. In addition, this study is being conducted to fulfill the requirements of a Ph.D. degree. The study is conducted by Neivin Shalabi. Results will be used to improve CBL partnerships and to complete the requirements of a Ph.D. degree. Neivin Shalabi can be reached via phone at (001)720-208-8407, or via e-mail at nshalabi@du.edu. This project is supervised by the dissertation Chair, Dr. Franklin Tuitt, Higher Education Program, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, U.S.A. Dr. Tuitt can be reached via phone at (001)303-871-4573, or via e-mail at ftuitt@du.edu.

Participation in this study should take about 90 minutes of your time. Participation will involve responding to 15 questions about your perceptions of the motivations, impacts of CBL partnerships on involved participants, and ways to improve these partnerships. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. The risks associated with this project are minimal. If, however, you experience discomfort, you may discontinue the interview at any time. We respect your right to choose not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

The potential benefits of being involved in this study include the opportunity to improve both CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations, and collaborations between universities and communities at large. You may also enjoy the opportunity to share your experiences with CBL partnerships. You will, however, receive no compensation for participation in this study. Potential risks of being involved in this study include the possibility that discussing your experiences with CBL partnerships may be upsetting. If this occurs, the researcher will discontinue the interview and arrange for supportive care from staff at AUC.

Your responses will be identified by code number only and will be kept separate from information that could identify you. This is done to protect the confidentiality of your responses. The interview will be transcribed by an individual who is not from AUC and who does not have access to your name. Only the researcher will have access to your individual data and any reports generated as a result of this study will use only group averages and paraphrased wording. However, should any information contained in this study be the subject of a court order or lawful subpoena, the University of Denver might not be able to avoid compliance with the order or subpoena. Although no questions in this interview address it, we are required by law to tell you that if information is revealed...
concerning suicide, homicide, or child abuse and neglect, it is required by law that this be reported to the proper authorities.

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the interview, please contact Susan Sadler, Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at (001)303-871-3454, or Sylk Sotto-Santiago, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at (001)303-871-4052, or write to the University of Denver, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208-2121, U.S.A.

You may keep this page for your records.

Please sign the next page if you understand and agree to the above. If you do not understand any part of the above statement, please ask the researcher any questions you have.

I have read and understood the foregoing descriptions of the study called, University-Community Partnerships for Service-Learning. I have asked for and received a satisfactory explanation of any language that I did not fully understand. I agree to participate in this study, and I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any time. I have received a copy of this consent form.

Signature _____________________ Date _________________

___ I agree to be audiotaped.

___ I do not agree to be audiotaped.

Signature _____________________ Date _________________

The purpose of audiotaping the interview is to better enable the researcher to capture your perspective accurately.

__________ I would like a summary of the results of this study to be mailed to me at the following postal or e-mail address:
Appendix O

Project Information Sheet

You are invited to participate in a study that will examine partnerships between the American University in Cairo (AUC) and community-based organizations in the Community-based Learning (CBL) Program. Additionally, this study is being conducted by Neivin Shalabi to fulfill the requirements of her Ph.D. degree. The results will be used to improve CBL partnerships. Neivin Shalabi can be reached via phone at (001)720-208-8407, or via e-mail at nshalabi@du.edu. This study is supervised by Professor Franklin Tuitt at the Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, U.S.A. Professor Tuitt can be reached via phone at (001)303-871-4573, or via email at ftuitt@du.edu.

Participation in this study should take about 25 minutes of your time. Participation will involve responding to 38 questions about your experiences with CBL course(s) and your suggestions for improving CBL partnerships. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. The risks associated with this project are minimal. If, however, you experience discomfort, you may discontinue the survey at any time. We respect your right to choose not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

The potential benefits of being involved in this study include the opportunity to improve CBL partnerships between AUC and community-based organizations, as well as collaborations between universities and communities at large. You may also enjoy the opportunity to share your experiences with CBL partnerships. You will, however, receive no compensation for participation in this study.

Your responses will be anonymous. That means that no one will be able to connect your identity with the information you give. Please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. Your return of the questionnaire will signify your consent to participate in this study.

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during this study, please contact Dr. Susan Sadler, Chair of the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at (001)303-871-3454, or Sylk Sotto-Santiago, Office of Sponsored Programs at ssottosa@du.edu or at (001)303-871-4052, or write to the University of Denver, Office of Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208-2121, U.S.A.

You may keep this page for your records.