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ABSTRACT

CONSIDERING PROBLEMS OF SERVICE AND UTILIZING SOLUTIONS: DEVELOPMENT OF AN EDUCATIONAL TOOL TO ASSIST SERVERS

Heather Sanderson

It can be established that problems of community service exist. To address the possibility that a service program might unintentionally foster such problems, a study was conducted to determine the appropriate contents of an educational tool that could be used to assist program participants and other servers in avoiding problematic service. This project began within a particular service program, the Short-Term Internship Program (SIP); a period of fieldwork was undertaken with the overseeing community organization, during which information was gathered to understand parameters of the service program. Next, four categories of problematic service were devised and scholarly literature was analyzed to draw out and categorize problems of service and associated solutions. Because the fourth category contains problems of service that result from server attitude, and this educational tool was intended for servers, category four was analyzed further to find patterns. Eight problem themes were distinguished. The solutions found focused mainly on reflection or thinking about and questioning the service being done, therefore this became the major focus of the educational tool. Problem themes and solutions, along with parameters of the particular service program, and information about appropriate reflection, were employed to develop the educational tool.
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THE NECESSITY FOR A TOOL TO AVOID PROBLEMS OF SERVICE

Overview of the Project

Service matters to a significant portion of the people in the United States. In their well-known study on American life, Bellah and his colleagues note that people have a strong attraction to serving: “Practically all of those we talked to would agree…that two of the most basic components of a good life are success in one’s work and the joy that comes from serving one’s community” (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, & Tipton, 1985: 196).

This can be supported with current statistics. It is estimated that 63.4 million people sixteen and older provided service as volunteers between September 2008 and September 2009; that translates to 26.8 percent of the population (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, January 27, 2010).

While there are many reasons people engage in service, there is evidence that the desire to help or make something better is often involved. In one study, 69% of teenagers reported that their reason for volunteering was to benefit others; in a study of Illinois residents, 93% of participants surveyed reported volunteering because they wanted to improve their community; a third study found that 83% of volunteers over 60 gave their time because they wanted to help others (Musick & Wilson, 2008). It seems many people want to do something beneficial when they are serving. This is not necessarily surprising. In the general culture of the United States, service is assumed to be good; it is supported
by educational, political, and corporate sectors, and linked with caring and social values (Piliavin, Grube, & Callero, 2002).

People can accomplish very good things by engaging in service. However, in this rush to do good through service, the less-than-desirable aspects may be overlooked. For example, Illich (1968) speaks to students, who are traveling to Mexico to provide service, and admonishes them for not considering the negative effects of their work, saying, “You close your eyes because you want to go ahead and could not do so if you looked at some facts” (314). In short, there are negative aspects of service that are not always considered. Thus, there is a possibility that in just doing service, the actions may not be beneficial, or effective.

As will be seen below, the Short-Term Internship Program (SIP) in Northern California is an example of a program set up to offer young adults the opportunity to benefit others through service. Since the possibility of ineffective service does exist, it is reasonable to assert that at least some of the service undertaken in SIP could be ineffective.

There may be a variety of methods to ensure that the service is beneficial. This project attempts to address the need to encourage beneficial service, through the creation of an educational tool. The intent of the educational tool is to help the servers engage in beneficial service by making them aware of issues to consider in order to avoid problematic or inefficient service.

It is not expected, however, that the educational tool should simply summarize all the possible problems of service for the volunteers, in the hopes that they will avoid those
problems once known. Since the point of this tool is to help servers engage in beneficial, or efficient service, it is important to go beyond education about problems to engage servers with principles that prompt avoidance of those problems. Additionally, the educational tool is intended to be more than a mere job description or summary of how to do an assigned service project. While helping servers do their particular project well is of great importance, this project hopes to transcend that to give them evaluation techniques that would be useful for any service experience. Finally, the outcome of this project is not intended to be a training manual. Because of the variety of service projects available to participants of SIP (see below), providing all the necessary or specific training for each participant is beyond the scope of this project.

Therefore, the purpose of this project is to develop an educational tool that would encourage and support participants in avoiding problematic service and engaging in beneficial service during SIP or a similar service program.

The Potential for Problematic Service

Defining service

For the focus of this project, the service of interest is that which may be suggested by activities such as community service, volunteering, and service-learning. There are myriad definitions of this type of service and ideas about what it entails. In his book *Community Service: Encounter with Strangers*, Howard B. Radest (1993) quotes a technical definition used at The Fieldston School in New York City, "'Service' means a contribution to the welfare of others..." (45), but he also supplied the more visceral,
"[Community service] endorses the search for the lost connection, even while it is ambivalent about the virtues of those to whom it is addressed" (44). Morton and Saltmarsh (1997) assert that "The history of what we have come to call community service actually entails three different and continuing cultural responses to the individual and social dilemmas that emerged from the crisis of community at the turn of the last century" (137). The common thread of problem resolution in these ideas, contribution to welfare, search for connection, response to dilemmas, demonstrates that service necessarily entails performing positive acts. While this certainly does not constitute a definition, one would have difficulty arguing that performing purely negative acts could rightly be called service. Similarly, any brilliant solutions imagined cannot be called service if they are never put into action. These two elements are pervasive throughout the literature on service. For example: "Community service is broadly defined in the legislative language as activity to meet social educational, environmental, and public safety needs [sic]" (Falbo, 1998: 151).

Some debate surrounding the definition of service

Service has been described as a contested term, meaning its definition is tied to moral and political ideals and therefore changes over time according to cultural, social, economic and political forces (Pollack, 1999; Rice and Pollack, 2000). Pollack (1999) explains that service is understood by some as charity and the fulfilling of immediate needs, and by others as a way to change the structures causing deep social problems.

Service-learning literature includes discussion around whether service should focus on charity or change (for example, see Morton, 1995; Robinson, 2000; Gerics,
Some authors (such as Kendall, 1990) even explain that service is an inadequate and harmful word because of the more charity-like aspects it holds. Some authors attempt to distinguish service from charity. Wade (1997) believes the difference is important. She explains that charity often includes feelings of pity for those being served, is motivated by fear or guilt rather than a response to true need, and includes a distance between the server and served, which can be harmful to those served. Service, by Wade’s definition includes compassion instead of pity, community instead of distance, and rather than choosing what someone else needs, working with people to help them define and meet their own needs.

Despite some experts’ attempts to distinguish charity from service, much of what is still popularly considered service could often be called charity. For an extreme example of how far in the direction of charity an individual’s conception of service can be, Wade (2000) mentions a proposal for a service-learning grant by teachers who wanted to provide frosted graham crackers to students for their birthdays. More commonly, while the activities might be considered charity by some authors, many laypeople would likely consider a holiday toy drive or an afternoon at a soup kitchen to be service.

Additionally, similar activities may be categorized differently. In discussing the terms of “volunteering” and “activist,” Musick and Wilson (2008) explain, “…the same activity can be labeled as one or the other depending on political and economic interests” (517). A group that takes up a service project, to monitor water quality for example, may view it as volunteering while another group may conduct a similar service project and view it as activism. A quick internet search for examples of service projects finds groups
raising funds for charity organizations, working on voter registration drives, cleaning up litter, organizing community workshops, and more. Perhaps some of these would be considered as service focusing on charity, and some would be considered as service focusing on change, depending on the outlook of the person describing the activity.

Finally, there may be advocates on both sides of the service-as-charity versus service-as-change debate, and some claiming that both are important: immediate relief should not be delayed while long-term resolutions are sought (Penner, 2004). Certainly advocates on neither side can claim to own an approach that is entirely free of service problems or difficulties.

Thus, for the purposes of this project, service is not confined to either solely charity work or solely social change work. Discussion of charity and change is important and can be included in an analysis of problems and solutions, however this project will not be limited to studying only one or the other. Here, service can include activities that some individuals may consider charity and others that some would consider work for justice and social change. The important focus is how to help people engage in beneficial service and avoid inefficient or problematic service.

Service is popular in the United States

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, which defines a volunteer as someone who provides unpaid work for or with an organization, estimated that 65.4 million individuals in the United States age 16 and over, or 28.8 percent of the country’s population, volunteered between September 2004 and September 2005 (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, December 9, 2005). Between September 2008 and September
2009, 63.4 million people 16 and older, or 26.8 percent of the population, volunteered at least once, just slightly higher than the percent that volunteered the previous year, 26.4 percent (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, January 27, 2010). For younger Americans, the rate of service is even higher. A 2005 study estimated that 15.5 million teenagers, 55 percent of the teenage population in the United States, volunteered with a formal organization in 2004 (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2005). Thus, a significant portion of the population is involved in service.

In 2006 the Corporation for National and Community Service noted that since the corporation began, 400,000 people had given service in AmeriCorps, over one billion hours had been given by individuals in their Senior Corps program, and each year over a million students in high school participate in service programs through their Learn and Serve America program (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2006-a). Using the value of volunteer hours based on data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Campus Compact estimated that students from its 935 member colleges and universities contributed $4.45 billion worth of time to community service during the 2003-2004 school year (Campus Compact, n.d.). It is clear from such statistics, that service is popular.

**Service is supported and promoted**

There is significant support for and promotion of service in the United States. Currently, through the Corporation for National and Community Service, the federal government oversees multiple service programs including: AmeriCorps, which offers intensive service opportunities for citizens; Learn and Serve, focused on service
opportunities for students; and Senior Corps for older citizens (Corporation for National and Community Service, n.d.). Politicians from one end of the spectrum to the other have advocated volunteering (Musick & Wilson, 2008).

A great deal of money is directed towards service. The 2009 fiscal year budget of the Corporation for National and Community Service was $890 million; President Barack Obama requested that Congress increase the Corporation’s budget for fiscal year 2010 to $1.149 billion (Corporation for National and Community Service, May 7, 2009).

Some people can benefit financially because of service. As part of their careers, some individuals research service and even publish articles in peer-reviewed journals (for example, see Frumkin & Miller, 2008). Other individuals are employed in managing service opportunities for individuals and groups. For example, in hospitals an individual may be employed as a “Director of Volunteer Services” to coordinate volunteers; the salary range for this position has been estimated at $24,000 to over $68,000 (Field, 2007: 79). Sometimes, even the servers themselves are financially rewarded for their service. For example, stipends and education awards are both associated with AmeriCorps (Frumkin & Miller, 2008). In 2009, the educational award, which could be used to pay for higher education or repay student loans, amounted to $4,725 for a year of full-time service in AmeriCorps (AmeriCorps, n.d.).

Each of our recent presidents has promoted service. President George H. W. Bush emphasized service during his administration and signed the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (Stukas & Dunlap, 2002). President Bill Clinton also emphasized service and created the Corporation for National and Community Service when he signed
the National and Community Service Trust Act (Stukas & Dunlap, 2002). In early 2002 President George W. Bush urged each American to devote 4,000 hours of their lives to service (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2006-b). He set up the USA Freedom Corps to assist people in serving, and to “strengthen our culture of service” (White House, n.d.: ¶ 2).

In April 2009, President Barack Obama signed the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, which would include expanding AmeriCorps and increasing possibilities for Americans to engage in service (White House, April 21, 2009). In June 2009, President Obama started an initiative called United We Serve, which asked Americans to make service a part of their daily lives and offered resources for doing so (White House, June 17, 2009). He also proclaimed September 11th 2009 as Patriot Day and National Day of Service and Remembrance (White House, September 10, 2009).

Service is also emphasized through education. In schools nationwide, service-learning has been promoted from kindergarten through college (Clark, 2002; Kellog, 1999). The field even has a peer-reviewed journal, The Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, begun in 1994. There are also organizations that focus specifically on service in education. For example, Campus Compact is a group of over 950 college and university presidents from public, private, two- and four-year institutions, founded in 1985 and concerned with service and civic engagement in higher education (Campus Compact, 2006).

Not only is service promoted in government and schools, but also through religious organizations. For example, Catholic Network of Volunteer Service is an
organization of more than 200 members programs that links volunteers with full time
service or mission opportunities (Catholic Network of Volunteer Service, n.d.). The
Jewish Coalition for Service is an organization with over 50 member programs, which
strives to promote full-time volunteer service within the Jewish community (Jewish
Coalition for Service, 2006). SIP is another example of service promoted by a religious
group.
Insufficient acknowledgement of problems

In the midst of the promotion and popularity of service, how often are problems
of service considered? Perhaps not enough: It seems there is even reluctance to consider
the possibility that service can be problematic. Radest (1993) notes, quoting work done
by one of his students, “Even more surprising was the realization that…people felt there
was no need to question their community service; service was simply to be done and not
examined” (31). In such an atmosphere, attempts to acknowledge problems may not be
met positively. Radest (1993) explains:

Community service, then, is welcomed as action is welcomed. Indeed, just
because it is a relief from the burdens of passivity—for example, the passivity of
a schooling trapped in academicism, a politics trapped in expertise, and a vocation
trapped in administration—it becomes a “good” whose credentials are not
carefully reviewed. It is, in short, good to be doing good—just that, and nothing
more. To raise questions—beyond questions of improving our practice—is even
resented. (198)

Thus, not only is there reluctance to acknowledge that service might be
problematic, there may even be animosity towards those who try. Understanding the
reluctance to consider the problems of service, it is not surprising that peer-reviewed
literature focused on problems of service and associated solutions is difficult to find, as explained below.

Some people have noticed that there may be problems. For example, Cone and Harris (1996) note that “When educators and community representatives speak of a ‘do no harm’ policy for service-learning, they are acknowledging that service-learning may have negative consequences” (39). Still, it seems many times, problems go unacknowledged, and are sometimes even suppressed. Eyler and Giles (1999) provide a personal example. After relating the feelings privately expressed by a student who had found her service experience difficult, uninteresting, and pointless, the authors then quoted the inspiring narrative she gave during a student panel discussion of service-learning, and began to consider the pressure to relate service experiences as positive when surrounded by others who are enthusiastic:

   It left us impressed with the power of peer pressure and faculty expectations on how students present their service experience. It also made us wonder about the extent to which we, with our enthusiasm as true believing service-learning professionals, may block honest reflection by our students who do not want to hurt our feelings with any dissenting view of the process. (201)

More generally, in discussing the impacts of short-term service-learning on community organizations, Tryon and her colleagues note that “…much literature promotes the idea that all service-learning is good for everyone” (Tryon, Stoecker, Martin, Seblonka, Hilgendorf, & Ellis, 2008: 17, emphasis by the original authors). Finally, Basinger & Bartholomew (2006) state that, “The overall impression given by the service-learning literature is that the value of service to the community is more or less
assumed. As long as the program is well-designed, the value of the service is somehow assured” (15).

The need to consider problems and criticisms of service

After realizing that service is widely promoted, understanding that service might be harmful, and witnessing the reluctance to acknowledge problems of service, the need for deeper analysis becomes clear. It is important to seriously consider service, not simply engage in it. Exploring the realities, the questions, the words that aren’t said about service is necessary, especially when everyone believes it is inherently good (Radest, 1993).

It follows that one should not assume that any proposed method for engaging in service or preparing servers may in fact be appropriate, especially if it is not clear that those proposing the method have considered the problems that may arise. As Radest (1993) explains, there are a variety of models for service and people or groups are biased toward their model; additionally new people or groups are constantly trying to put forth their model of service. Merely analyzing recommendations for how to engage in service would not necessarily provide information for avoiding common pitfalls or ensuring that service is beneficial.

It is thus necessary to consider the ideas of authors discussing problems of service to avoid making this project yet another simple promotion of service. It is important to look more carefully at criticisms of service. One such criticism comes from McKnight (1977) and because of the detail he goes into, it is worth giving a thorough analysis.
Concerns posed by McKnight

In *Professionalized Service and Disabling Help*, John McKnight (1977: 233-242) discusses negative outcomes associated with professionalized service. Although he uses "professionalized service" to mean social service, his observations are applicable to service in general, including volunteer service, community service, service-learning, and so on, as will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

First however, it is worth addressing a few objections that might be brought up regarding the comparison of professionalized service with service in general (which, in some points in this section, will be referred to as non-professionalized service) and explaining why they are not significant reasons to discount the similarities. One immediate objection that might be brought up is that non-professionalized service is not generally viewed as containing financial motivations. A brief examination of some facets of non-professionalized service show that this assumption is incorrect. Certain volunteers often receive financial rewards, for example under the AmeriCorps program. Some service program directors receive at least some income for their work. There are individuals who are employed in academia studying service and volunteer programs, training participants or program directors, or participating in the creation of policy. Moreover, there are motivations that, while not immediately financial, ultimately affect the careers and incomes of those involved, including the publishing of peer-reviewed and non-academic literature, and using service activities as résumé material. Finally, there are federal grants, state grants, community funds, and private funds that are devoted to service programs and promoting service, and these moneys must be competed for even if
individuals doing service do not directly profit. These demonstrate that even if the service is done by a non-profit group, financial motivations are usually inescapable.

Another possibly objectionable item with respect to applying McKnight's observations to non-professionalized service is his reference to how professionalized service employs managers in an attempt to eliminate counter-productivity. While non-professionalized service may not specifically be hiring managers to optimize effectiveness, it is, nonetheless, a managed endeavor in most cases. For example, many volunteer opportunities are overseen by one or more individuals who coordinate the activities.

A third possible objection might be that non-professionalized service has not become specialized as McKnight notes professionalized service has. This objection can be countered with examples that show ways non-professionalized service is specialized. For instance, some service programs work only with certain groups of individuals: veterans, at-risk youth, or battered women. Other programs perform specific tasks such as organizing beach clean-ups, running tutoring programs, and so on.

Any remaining dissimilarities between professionalized and non-professionalized service will not be relevant to the points that are to be made here. Therefore, references to professionalized service in the following interpretation of McKnight's work have been stated in terms of service in general. Additionally, McKnight’s references to servicers and clients have been retained below, but they could easily be substituted with servers and recipients, terms often used for non-professionalized service.
Early in his paper, McKnight makes it clear that the negative outcomes result from unconscious decisions of well-intentioned people. The servicer does not intentionally hide the business (financial) aspects of service with the intent of deceiving anyone, but really believes that service is an expression of care. The problems he describes can therefore be assumed to evolve even without conscious malicious intent. He also notes that service is not automatically bad, since the servicers are being motivated by care, and since service does provide jobs (234-235).

Since so much financial motivation is involved with providing service, and since new people are constantly entering service, there is a strong impetus for the service system to perpetuate itself and expand as a business entity. In fact, McKnight points out that social service has become a significant business in every industrialized country. His ideas can be extended to non-professionalized service because it, too, is a significant undertaking worldwide. McKnight further argues that the business aspects of service such as markets and income get overlooked (see below). Viewing service purely in terms of its business aspects, McKnight argues "needs" projected onto the public serve the real need of the service economy to fund its servicers and facilitate the growth of their business (235).

One way this growth can be facilitated is when service exacerbates the problems it is intended to remedy. That is, if service inadvertently makes a problem worse, it has effectively generated more opportunities for service. It is the possibility that this is indeed happening that McKnight ponders; he indicates that people are beginning to ask why services consume so much while the problems they tackle seem to be getting worse. In
fact, some service critics ask if service is producing the very opposite of what it is intended to create. A major problem with service facilitating its own growth in this way is that service systems will come to be seen as hurting more than they help (235-236).

Another way for service systems to create their own growth is to generate new problems that also require service. McKnight asserts that service systems sometimes manufacture needs in order to secure ever more "clients" for the purpose of expanding the service as a business (235). One way this can be done is by promoting standards that ensure people are seen as lacking ever more. Thus, with the passage of time, increasing numbers of situations that were previously considered innocuous become regarded as serious problems needing correction with the help of service. This means that real needs might be going unaddressed while servicers treat made-up problems. An additional way to create growth is to sub-divide service into multiple specialized parts that are supposedly needed to treat different aspects of the same problem (237-239).

McKnight notes that particular elements must exist in society if these methods for growth are to work, and the service system nurtures these elements. First, the problems treated have to be taken seriously because otherwise no one giving or receiving service would participate. This means that these problems may be exaggerated in scope or intensity. McKnight points out that the service system tends to inflate needs in terms of their undesirability; specifically, professionalized service systems tend to view simple needs as deficiencies. Therefore on a larger scale, since service economies depend upon deficiencies, a society with such a strong basis in service needs people to find faults in
each other so that individuals can be employed to service those faults. This also means
that service tends to focus on what clients lack rather than what they have (237).

Another necessary element is that citizens must respect the authority of servicers
to set the standards described above. Moreover, servicers increasingly decide not only the
remedy, but what is wrong in the first place. That is to say, problems that are not real or
that cannot be dealt with aptly must be made to seem as if they are being solved, so this
requires servicers to also have the authority to dictate not only the remedy but whether it
has been successful. McKnight lays out a series of assumptions built into the service
system's treatment of clients that illustrates this more clearly: One assumption is that only
the servicer has the solution to the client's deficiency. Another assumption is that
servicers should get to encode problems and solutions into terminology that the clients
cannot understand. An unfortunate outcome associated with this is that since the public
does not understand the remedies, the client must believe the servicer knows their need
and its remedy and that he himself knows neither. A final assumption is that the servicers
are the only ones who can decide whether the treatment has been successful. In essence,
servicers decide their own effectiveness, while clients are assumed to be too deficient to
know this. These assumptions are so ubiquitous in the service system that if a servicer
fails to adhere to them, he may suffer a negative response from the rest of the service
community such that his service career suffers (238-241).

Such a set of trends as thus far described left unchecked might lead to a society
entirely vulnerable to exploitation by servicers and similar unquestioned authority
figures. McKnight notes that some service managers have begun to create needs and
market them to clients. Knowing this, he continues, one might predict that with the ability to create need for service, and the apparent inability of society to make political value judgments about service, managed service might come to entirely control nations' economic policies (236). McKnight is of course talking about professionalized service when he says this, but the large economic effects of non-professionalized service would mean that it too would be a part of this possibility. McKnight later suggests that people who are used to being told what they need by authorities may surrender their power as citizens to anti-democratic leaders (239).

McKnight's study paints a picture of the trend of increasing service and its negative effects: Since the service system requires people to have needs, the system is focused on understanding how to treat more and more problems that in the past were not thought of as problems; therefore, it pushes people into wanting to have their deficiencies determined. Furthermore, because the system says they must be treated piecemeal, an individual broken into parts is thus rendered incapable of acting on their own as a unit to help themselves. Servicers’ insistence upon encoding problems and solutions using terminology incomprehensible to clients assures that evaluation and treatment of clients remains entirely in the hands of the servicers. Citizens cannot define or solve their problems. This creates a society of people who can't even understand whether or not they have a problem or how to remedy it. Consequently, not only citizens, but entire communities are rendered unable to help themselves. When people cannot act as citizens they are relegated instead to being clients awaiting diagnosis and treatment. The ultimate tragic result of this on the part of citizens is when they no longer attempt to figure out
their own needs or remedies, or even question whether servicers are truly helping them (238-241). Although McKnight does not explicitly provide the following scene, his descriptions evoke the image of a person knocking at your door, telling you that you have a problem you are entirely unaware of, and that you must take their word for it, accept their treatment, allow them to declare whether or not it has worked, and pay them for it.

This disturbing set of outcomes begs the question of how it can be allowed to happen. McKnight has an answer for this. Certain aspects of service are hidden behind what he terms "the mask of love" (McKnight, 1977: 234). As McKnight points out, when pressed far enough, servicers tend to answer that they perform the services they do because they love people. Service is thus equated with the universal virtue of love, which is upheld as an unquestionable ideal; therefore service is rendered similarly unquestionable. This means that the political and economic issues of service become hidden behind the obscurantist symbols of care and love. As a result, the business aspects of service such as markets and income are overlooked. The reality is that the service system has a hidden need to fund its servicers and facilitate the growth of their business, which requires the manufacturing and marketing of ever more citizen deficiencies requiring service (234-235).

McKnight declares unequivocally that professionalized service will always have disabling effects, such as the exaggeration of minor needs into deficiencies and the altering of standards so that people are perceived to have ever more problems. He proposes that these can only be weighed against benefits if service is viewed as a self-interested economic system that has the capacity to manipulate politics for profit.
McKnight is not certain these disabling effects can even be minimized, but he suggests that if they cannot, they should at least be well understood (242).

An important lesson that can be taken from McKnight is that simply assuming service will be beneficial because the servers are motivated by love and care is not sufficient to guarantee that negative outcomes will be avoided. A next step is therefore to evaluate what has been done to criticize service objectively so that problems of service don't go unrecognized.

Such an analysis of criticisms of service may prove beneficial in understanding principles that could be undertaken to avoid problematic service. This, in turn, would assist in understanding what should be included in an educational tool to encourage beneficial service and avoid problematic service.
FIELDWORK WITH THE SHORT-TERM INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

Gathering Information

While the significant portion of the educational tool was determined by analyzing literature presenting criticisms of service (see below), it was also necessary to understand how parameters of SIP would constrain the tool. Thus, between May 2005 and May 2006, background information on SIP was gathered through personal communication with SIP staff and associated individuals, and review of published and unpublished materials related to SIP.

Personal communication and review of literature occurred beginning in May 2005, with significant work in late 2005 and early 2006. Because the author became employed with SIP in August of 2005, personal communication included formal and informal discussions about the program, discussions during the creation of materials for SIP, and discussions in preparation for arrival of SIP participants. Significant individuals who were part of these discussions included SIP staff and related staff at the Episcopal Diocese of Northern California, a staff member at the National Episcopal Church, and directors of the agencies where program participants would serve.

Published and unpublished literatures associated with SIP were reviewed for background information. Published literature included promotional materials such as information from the national and California SIP websites, and articles in the Episcopal
Diocese of Northern California's newspaper. Unpublished materials included internal items created for the program, such as flyers and brochures.

Notes were taken either directly during discussions, or were noted from memory as soon as possible after discussions. Notes were kept in a field notebook. Copies of published and unpublished materials were also kept in this notebook. Significant quotes and observations from discussions and materials were noted. Pertinent information was drawn out and synthesized.

Information that was obtained from individuals associated with SIP in the method described above, or was common knowledge discussed with staff, often found in promotional SIP materials or discussed with the public, is not formally cited in the text below. Quotes from personal communications and published materials are cited.

Overview of The Short-Term Internship Program

The Short-Term Internship Program (SIP) is an eight-week service program in Northern California for young adults, supported by the Episcopal Diocese of Northern California and the National Episcopal Church. The program in Northern California is one of six SIP sites across the United States, each with a different focus, but all supported by the National Episcopal Church. SIP participants in Northern California commit to engaging in a full 40 hours of community service each week during their experience. Participants of the program also live together in an intentional community, have designated time for theological reflection on their experience, and participate in a church
community. Within this context of service and community, participants explore what they are called to do in life.

**Creation of the Short-Term Internship Program**

Discussions between the author and SIP staff revealed that SIP was created out of the desire and ability to provide young adults with service opportunities, which are shorter than the year-long service opportunities already sponsored through the Episcopal Church. The National Episcopal Church supports eight year-long service programs. In recent years staff with the National Church were concerned because some interested individuals had not been able to commit to the programs for an entire year. Additionally, the year-long programs require significant experience that some individuals do not have. Consequently, there was discussion about developing a shorter-term service program. This came into being after a governing body of the church called for the creation of opportunities for young adults within the church and then designated funds to realize such opportunities.

The Episcopal Church in the USA has tri-annual national meetings called General Convention, where representatives meet to focus on the church’s business and activities (*The Executive Offices of The General Convention*, n.d.). The General Convention of 2003 passed resolution A065 encouraging leadership programs for young adults (*General Convention of the Episcopal Church*, 2003:4). Discussions with affiliated SIP individuals also revealed that General Convention 2003 also committed one million dollars to be distributed over 3 years between the three areas of *young adults, higher education,* and *youth*. The Young Adult and Higher Education staff at the offices of the National
Episcopal Church decided to use their portion of these funds to start up a service program, SIP (L. Fodor, personal communication, January 11, 2006).

In December 2004, through efforts of the Youth and Young Adult Administrator for the Episcopal Diocese of Northern California, the diocese agreed to support SIP participants to work with nonprofit and social-service agencies in the Sacramento area. The first participant in Northern California arrived in February of 2006.

Focus on service

Service is the emphasis for SIP in Northern California. The program there was created to connect Jubilee Ministry Centers with young adults who desire to serve others and want to determine their vocational goals. The main creator of the program in Northern California saw a need and wanted to address it through service opportunities. As she explained, “we have a number of Jubilee Centers and we wanted to support those Jubilee Centers because they have such a hard time finding volunteers.” (C. Sieracki, personal communication January 9, 2006).

SIP staff in Northern California felt that young adults are at a stage in their life when they are able and willing to engage in service. “Young adults are a prime population to serve. They have the time and are documented to have the interest” (A. Dierlam, personal communication, December 7, 2005). The individual who was key in the startup of SIP in Northern California explained that young adults have fewer obligations and don’t know what they want to do. She said: “I felt this [SIP] was a way for us to provide that opportunity [finding oneself and God by serving] for others at a time when they were searching” (C. Sieracki, personal communication, January 9, 2006).
The staff saw this as a service opportunity, and one that could potentially benefit both the young adult participants and the organizations they serve.

SIP promotional materials such as the official SIP brochure, the National Episcopal Church’s SIP website and the Northern California SIP website all target young adults who are interested in service. Promotional materials request that applicants should have some service experience. The SIP application includes a reference form which asks references for their knowledge of the applicant’s “service in the church and community” and her “suitability for…volunteer service” (Short-Term Internship Program, n.d.: 4). Many of the promotional materials ask: “Would you like to make a difference by giving service to people in need?” (Short-Term Domestic Internship Program (SIP), n.d.: ¶ 1).

There should be no doubt that service is the focus of this program.

A brief explanation should be given about the name Short-Term Internship Program and the fact that participants in the Northern California program are often referred to as “interns.” An internship is often thought of as an experience in which an individual engages in service in order to learn about a field, as Furco (1996) explains. Furco notes that service is not the primary focus of an internship and that “in internship programs, the students are the primary intended beneficiary [sic] and the focus of the service activity is on student learning” (4). While learning could be a goal for any individual involved with SIP, and while it is hoped that participants in SIP in Northern California will benefit from the experience, their learning is not the primary purpose of the program. As illustrated in the above quotes, and continually noted by SIP staff, the service is primary: “The focus in this program is service and how that ties in with God’s
call” (A. Dierlam, personal communication, March 29, 2006). Thus, although the word “internship” is used, this should not distract the reader from understanding that in Northern California, SIP is a service program.

The hope for beneficial service

In discussing the importance of service in the context of SIP, one staff member commented, "Service is something you do because God tells us to, and Jesus is an example of that” (A. Dierlam, personal communication, February 8, 2006). This statement is indicative of the fact that, in this program, service is emphasized as a very good undertaking. Additionally, promotional announcements about SIP have asked, “Want to make a difference in the world?” referring to the service projects young adults can participate in (Service Internships for 8 Weeks, July/August 2005: M7). Some other quotes from SIP staff about service in relation to SIP include the following: "To be a Christian you have to commit to love others and to serve others....You find yourself and you find God by serving others" (C. Sieracki, personal communication, January 9, 2006); "We are all asked to serve as followers of Christ....In this context [SIP], service is doing something because God tells us that we need to be serving those in need” (A. Dierlam, personal communication, February 8, 2006). There is an understanding that Christians are called to engage in service because they are Christians. SIP reinforces the idea that engaging in service is what God asks of Christian followers. For those of the faith, this would likely add up to viewing service as a good endeavor, because it is related to something very important, one's relationship with God. Faith and service are highly intertwined in SIP. Clearly, in this program, it is hoped that service will be beneficial.
Effectiveness of service has not been emphasized

It is not clear, from a review of published and unpublished SIP materials or discussions with SIP staff and associated individuals, that there is any emphasis on or attention drawn to the fact that ineffective service may exist. To their credit, the SIP staff in Northern California has given much focus to creating the program, resolving logistical issues, and running the program. Focus has not been placed, however, on considering the effectiveness of the service or possible problems of service. The participants’ considerations of service were envisioned as weekly theological reflections. This was intended as time to explore how service fits in with the Christian faith, how Christians are called to serve, and for each participant, how this service experience ties in with their own faith. Reflections were not focused on considering effectiveness or problems of service.

A variety of service opportunities for interns in Northern California

In Northern California, SIP was not structured so that interns would engage in a group service project or even the same type of service. Five church-based organizations or non-profit agencies⁴ within the Sacramento area agreed to participate in the Northern California program and be matched with interns. Thus, the places interns could serve varied and included: an afterschool program at a multicultural church, an emergency shelter for women and children, an agricultural based suburb of Sacramento working with local Hispanic ministries, a church-sponsored weekly meal program, an emergency food closet, and a rural community working with a nurse on health issues.⁵ Within some of these placements, there were also a variety of options for projects with
which to become involved. One site created specialized positions for 3 different interns, while some other sites had a variety of projects with which one intern could be involved. Finally, the supervisors of some sites were very flexible about what an intern would do within their organization. Interns were expected to work with their site supervisor to define the individual projects that they would be undertaking during their eight weeks in the program. The intern's own interests were an important part of deciding this, as was working within the parameters of the church or agency's needs.

**Expectations and time constraints for interns**

During their eight weeks with SIP, interns were expected to engage in full time community service at one or a combination of the churches or agencies involved with the program. Full-time is taken to mean forty hours per week (C. Sieracki, personal communication, January 11, 2006). Interns would also participate in weekly activities with the community of interns with whom they were housed. They would attend worship on Sundays at the church which provided their housing, and become involved in some activities at that church. Interns would meet weekly with their supervisor at the church or agency where they were serving, for support and guidance. They would have individual weekly meetings with a spiritual mentor for spiritual direction and help in discerning their vocational goals and calling. They would also participate together in weekly theological reflection sessions.

**Not an academic service program**

SIP in Northern California was not created to include an academic component. Young adults in the program are not expected to participate in a class, do not enroll in
this program for course credit, are not given homework, are not expected to apply theory
learned to the service they are providing, and are not required to complete in depth
readings or write essays. The program is not tied to any formal education. Participants’
time is clearly taken up in non-academic endeavors, as described above.

Program parameters affect the educational tool

The described parameters of SIP affect the educational tool in a variety of ways. First, there is a general expectation that the service performed will be beneficial, but not an expectation that this requires consideration of whether there are problems associated with service or whether the service actually is beneficial. This is not surprising, considering service seems to be regarded in a similar manner by many others in the United States. However, it does show that there is a failure to consider possible problems. Meeting this need through the educational tool would be appropriate.

Second, the variety of opportunities available to participants supports the idea that a training manual, job description, or summary of how to complete a particular project is not an appropriate focus for the educational tool. Third, the abundance of religious and theological activities already occurring shows that the educational tool does not need to include similar types of activities. Fourth, time constraints of SIP participants mean that additional activities cannot require an excessive amount of time. Fifth, since SIP is not an academic program, a focus strictly on service-learning is not necessary or appropriate.

It should be noted that while these parameters affect the educational tool, they do not constrain it so much that it is only useful for SIP. It is hoped that although originally designed to be applicable to SIP, this tool could be used with any similar service
program. Such adaptability is especially important as conditions continue to change; support for SIP has dwindled since this project began and SIP is not currently being promoted.
ANALYZING LITERATURE WITHIN A CATEGORICAL FRAMEWORK

Developing a Framework of Four Categories

In determining the contents of the educational tool, literature needed to be analyzed to identify criticisms of service and perspectives of scholars in the field, who, having service-related experience, may have developed solutions for ensuring that service is effective and avoiding problems. A framework was developed for the analysis, and because of the derivation of this framework, some extra explanation and examples are included here.

As explained above, service is seldom ineffective by intention, and positive ideas never put into action would not be described as service. However, well-meaning servers can end up performing ineffective service when, unintentionally doing negative acts, their approach to a problem compounds it or augments another problem to an even greater degree than its positive contribution as a side effect. In either case, the overall effect of that approach is negative. From this, one can define three classifications of ineffective service: service that attempts to remedy a problem, but in fact compounds it; service that consumes time and resources without effectively addressing the problem; and service that may or may not be treating a problem, but that creates other problems outweighing any possible benefits of that approach. The third classification can then be subdivided into negative effects due to the program design, and negative effects due to the attitudes, perspectives, or behaviors of the servers as they carry out their service. Thus, there are
four final categories of problems. Examples follow to demonstrate problems in each of these four categories.

A useful example of the first category, self-defeating service, comes from Jonathan Kozol's (1988) *Rachel and Her Children*. Kozol describes the admitted 1980's policy of New York City towards homelessness and homeless services. The theory employed was that temporary housing should be made as unattainable, inconvenient, and uncomfortable as possible under the assumption that this would discourage homeless people from remaining homeless. This principle of “deterrence” (Kozol, 1988: 196) was found to be counter-productive by a committee of the New York City Council, which observed that the homeless programs with the worst conditions usually had the longest average length of stay in temporary shelters. Clearly, if the intent of “deterrence” was to get homeless people into permanent housing as quickly as possible, the service approach they had adopted was having exactly the opposite effect.

The second category, unproductive service, includes service that is not specifically self-defeating or that exacerbates other problems, but that uses resources to produce no significant effect. An AmeriCorps impact assessment (Aguirre International, 1999) illustrates such a scenario. In evaluating the effectiveness at improving public school class grades by assigning AmeriCorps members to assist in classrooms, none of the programs studied demonstrated any measurable outcomes. Individual tutoring was found to be a more effective approach to the problem. Even without a better means of improving individual grades, classroom assistance, at least in the form studied, is
arguably unproductive considering that other activities with demonstrable impact are a better use of volunteer resources.

The third category, service with negative side effects, is exemplified in an anecdote in Michael Maren's (1997) *The Road to Hell*. He describes an idea he once had of driving around the deserts of northern Kenya with a portable drilling rig, providing wells for the wandering nomads. He is forced to abandon his dream when he is told by a more experienced individual that others who had attempted his "service" found that the nomads tended to become dependent on the new wells, exhausting the surrounding land with their herds and ultimately rendering themselves without a means of livelihood. It seems he could indeed remedy their need for water, but only at the cost of a much greater dilemma that would require resolution. (It should be noted that in this example, the person who had the idea could be both a server and a service designer, but the problem is ultimately one of design.)

The fourth category can best be labeled counter-productive attitude. A reasonable attempt to meet a need can sometimes be undermined by the misguided attitude with which the service is performed. In their article, *Service-Learning: A Disservice to People with Disabilities?*, Gent and Gurecka (2001) discuss a study in which some of the students, participating in a service project working with classmates who had disabilities, developed such an attitude of discomfort that they became bitter toward those with whom they were working and the service assignment in general. In this case, the attitudes of particular servers caused negative side effects.
Selecting Literature to Analyze

Since service is widely promoted, the literature to be analyzed and categorized had to be selected with care; it was requisite that the authors of the literature were critical of service along with their explanation of how to engage in service. This became the method for filtering out literature that might give a skewed perspective of the benefits of service.

The original central theme for literature selection was service-related items cross referenced with critical problem discussion. A systematic attempt to find literature was made via HSU Library databases and the HSU library catalog using terms such as "service," "serve," "community service," "community-service," "service community," "service-learning," "voluntary*," "volunteer*," "voluntarism," "voluntar*", "charity," and "help*," cross referenced with words such as "problem," "limitation," "critique," and "negative impact," "problem*," "critic*," "disadvantage," "limit," "pitfall," "paternalism," "exploitation," "against," "anti," "bad," "negative," "impact" and "effect". This list is provided in such detail to illuminate the difficulty in locating appropriate literature and the efforts made to overcome it. An attempt was made to expand the selection through bibliography cross-referencing and extensive searches of general literature on service. This, too, yielded large quantities of service literature, but few useful items.

Literature that simply discussed complexities and problems of doing service, but offered no solutions to addressing these problems was not useful because the intended final product of this effort was an educational tool employing solutions for volunteers.
While there are numerous articles and books asserting that service should be performed in one way or another, and each has a few issues of focus and opinions regarding the best ways to resolve them, there do not seem to be very many concise solution-oriented discussions about problems associated with doing service. For instance, one common issue discussed is whether service should focus on charity or change. While there are advocates on both sides, certainly neither can claim to own an approach that is entirely free of service problems or difficulties. These problems are nearly universal to all approaches to service, and need to be identified and resolved, and so it is necessary that an article or book consider service critically in order to achieve this.

Thus, the criteria for literature to be analyzed was that it was critical of service or mentioned some problems with engaging in service, and that some proposed solution to avoiding such problems could be drawn from it.

There proved to be too few relevant items dedicated to this intersection to form a complete picture, so an attempt was made to expand the pool of articles using general service-learning-related items. Care had to be taken: Because much of the peer-reviewed literature in service-learning concerns academic service-learning, many articles focus on ways to increase learning or reform education. Since these are not important problems for a non-academic service program, literature providing solutions to problems associated with student learning or education reform were not relevant and could not be used. The service-learning literature had to be applicable to service in general, and not focus on education to an unreasonable extent. Some literature was found by reading abstracts of the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, from 1995 to Spring 2008. With
these supplements, enough literature was available to proceed with the analysis, even though service-learning literature now dominated the selection.  

Selecting Solutions

Articles and texts were processed to extract relevant solutions and the associated problems that they were intended to alleviate. Solutions were accepted or rejected based on their applicability to a non-academic service program which may not have the potential for as intensive an educational component as academic service-learning can possess.

Academic service-learning frequently involves intense amounts of classroom learning time, which may include extensive reading, writing papers, and time spent in lecture and discussion. Such activities are not possible in a non-academic service program. Attempting to direct time and effort to increasing the servers’ understanding of and ability to analyze social issues, which may occur with significant classroom structure, could take time from the actual service and undermine the efficacy of the service activities which a non-academic service program such as SIP was designed to provide. To assume that it would be possible to achieve the same level of change implies either that the classroom portions of service learning are irrelevant, or that virtually no time need be invested in educational portions of volunteer activity in order to bring about change. Neither of these is realistic. Solutions that were too academic were therefore not utilized.

Frequently, a service-learning author provides solutions to a problem or a group of closely-related issues confronted by those designing service-learning programs, and
these solutions contain some elements that can be applied to general or non-academic service programs and some that cannot. Since some solutions are outside the purview of the general service program designer, solutions that were applicable were utilized, and the others have been omitted. Occasionally, this has meant taking only certain solutions from multiple in a single article.

Of course, even the applicable solutions sometimes required the replacement of service-learning terms with general service terms, such as simply exchanging "program designer" for "teacher," "server" or "volunteer" for "student," and "service" for "service-learning." In both service environments, the desired outcome, the successful remediation of a societal problem or fulfillment of a need, is the same, and thus it is valid to make these interchanges. In addition, occasionally, it was seen as necessary to generalize a solution employed with respect to a specific group that frequently receives discrimination. The intent was to be able to apply it to any group that receives discrimination.

Often, the solutions offered in service-learning articles were only partially applicable to a general service environment. However, the solutions could be made entirely applicable through slight modifications. For instance, appropriate volunteer attitude and approach are most definitely necessary for effective service; good program design can be undermined by poor implementation of service on the part of the volunteers. It is therefore necessary to prepare these individuals, to avoid damaging the connection and trust between all persons interacting in the service environment.

However, when a service-learning author speaks of academic activities intended to help
transform the students, it would prove very difficult to attempt these extensive solutions in the literal form they were presented from within a non-academic service program without compromising time needed for the performance of service activities. If, instead, some of these transformational ideas can be presented in terms of non-classroom activities, they have the potential to prove a great benefit to the server and the service recipients as well, and should thus be included as solutions in that condensed form. Therefore, this type of modification was employed when valid.

Categorizing Solutions

Selected solutions were organized into the four categories of ineffective service as described above, based on the problem they were designed to resolve. To recapitulate, the categories were: 1. self-defeating service (service that attempts to remedy a problem, but in fact compounds it); 2. unproductive service (service that consumes time and resources without effectively addressing the true need); 3. service with negative side effects (service that may or may not be treating a need, but that creates other problems outweighing any possible benefits of that approach); 4. counter-productive attitude (service that is undermined by negative side effects that result from the misguided attitudes with which the service is performed).

It should be noted at this point that solutions deemed applicable to category 4 problems might easily be seen as category 1, 2, or 3 problems were it not for the fact that the difficulty is stemming from volunteer implementation faults. That is, were the problem not coming from volunteer attitudes, it would not belong to category 4, and this
was therefore the principal indicator for placing solutions into categories by the problem they are supposed to alleviate. Next, assuming that the problem did not fit category 4, it was determined whether the problem was making worse the situation that was supposedly being resolved (category 1). Again, one might say that this is a form of negative consequences, which is category 3, however, this is a very specific form of negative consequence: the worsening of the very situation purportedly being helped. If a problem then did not belong to category 1, it was next determined whether some other side effect was occurring. This would be category 3. Finally, failing all of the above criteria, any remaining ineffective service must fall into category 2, unproductive service. This is to be expected since a "problem" that meets none of the above and is in fact productive would not truly be a problem at all. Some solutions addressed problems of multiple categories. A hypothetical instance of this would be long-term failure of a service program to address the true needs of a situation. In some cases, this might lead the community to lose interest in helping the situation or even produce animosity toward service programs intended for that purpose. This is a negative side effect produced by design (category 3) because it could make it difficult for better programs to find funding or support. In other cases, the long-term failure might go generally unnoticed, but the service is still ineffective (category 2). Thus, such a problem might be labeled both category 2 and 3.

Analysis of Literature Containing Problems and Solutions

Thirteen works were found that fit the constraints detailed above. This number is largely a result of the reality that the issue of problems of service has only been picked up
relatively recently. Despite the lack of available literature, problems and associated solutions falling into each of the four categories were identified. There are some categories for which a greater number of problems and solutions were found; however, for each category at least two studies were found offering problems and solutions.

**Category one**

Category one includes service that attempts to remedy a problem, but in fact compounds it. Two studies were found to contain problems and solutions that could be identified as category one.

Erickson and O’Connor (2000: 59-70), understanding that service-learning is sometimes used as a way to decrease prejudice, employ contact theory to evaluate whether service-learning can actually be used as an antiprejudice tool. Contact theory is used to understand how contact between diverse groups might lead to improved understanding. The authors conclude that reducing prejudice is extremely difficult and service-learning projects, even though they attempt to decrease prejudice, might actually increase prejudice.

Gent and Gurecka (2001: 36-43) outline basic problems associated with service with the disabled. Mainly, service projects are often created based on stereotypes and have a tendency to reinforce them. For instance, as the authors explain, the prevalent assumption that the disabled have a lower quality of life leads to the creation of service projects where the disabled are given gifts or parties to make their lives better, but this only promotes the assumption that people with disabilities need their lives to be made better. Though Gent and Gurecka do not specifically say so, it seems clear that service
projects attempt to treat problems that do not exist, and as often create or compound others.

Based on Cook’s work, Erickson and O’Connor propose that fulfilling a minimum of five conditions may make prejudice reduction more likely. The five necessary conditions are: “pursuit of common goals, equal status contact, contact that contradicts stereotypes, long-term contact, and social norms favoring contact” (Erickson and O’Connor, 2000: 68).

Contact that contradicts stereotypes means that the interactions between those involved cannot conform to the culture's existing stereotypes, otherwise, the result would likely be reinforcement of those stereotypes. The authors note that some service-learning opportunities are consciously set up in atmospheres where non-stereotypic interaction is likely; however, most projects are not and may lead to confirmation of stereotypes.

In a similar vein, Gent and Gurecka propose a solution intended to counter disablism, a set of differentiating or discriminating behaviors and attitudes toward those with real or imagined disabilities. They point out that it often seems acceptable to do something for people seen as disabled that no one would do for other people, but this can reinforce stereotypes that hold disabled people as helpless or needy. Moreover, assuming disabled people have a poor quality of life or are in need of pity marginalizes them rather than diminishing the real injustices of discrimination and exclusion they endure. Service that is motivated by stereotypes may make servers feel good in the short run, but is self-defeating because it devalues the very people it is intended to benefit.
As a solution, Gent and Gurecka assert that program designers should be trained in disabilities issues to help their volunteers see people with disabilities as individuals and not victims. This means showing volunteers that people with disabilities generally feel satisfied with their lives. Program designers should also understand that people with disabilities often desire promotion of attitudes to defend their civil rights rather than the kind of special treatment often given via service programs, which they may see as counterproductive.

The other four conditions needed to reduce prejudice discussed by Erickson and O’Connor are not paralleled in Gent and Gurecka’s work, and are taken up here.

Erickson and O’Connor explain that pursuit of common goals means the people involved in the service activity should share common goals for the activity; students should have goals in common with those they are serving and with their fellow students. This may be difficult because ability to share common goals may depend on: whether the learner is able to develop empathy for the person she is serving rather than simply engage in the service to complete the assignment; and whether the student not only focuses on her individual goals during the project, but actually shares collective goals with the other students.

Equal status contact means that those involved with the activity should have the same status during their interaction. Erickson and O’Connor note that it is hard to determine whether service-learning provides this, since multiple service-learning pedagogies exist. The authors mention that the program would need true collaboration with the service recipients in order to achieve equal status contact.
Long-term contact means that the interaction must last for an extended period of time, however, in terms of service-learning, it is hard to determine how long the time should be. Erickson and O’Connor suggest that practitioners of service-learning consider creating multi-semester or multi-year opportunities for antiprejudice learning.

Social norms favoring contact means that the server’s community and culture must encourage examination of stereotypes and favor contact with the members of the service recipients’ group. This could be very difficult in service-learning contexts because practitioners cannot create social norms, and service-learning itself may not be favored in the community.

**Category two**

Category two includes unproductive service, or service that consumes time and resources without effectively addressing the true need. Four works were found to contain problems and solutions that could be identified as category two.

Kahne and Westheimer (1996: 593-599) compare and contrast the charity- and change-orientations of service-learning. Essentially, they identify charity-orientation as a potential pitfall in service due to the ineffectualities associated with it. First they assert that many service-learning projects are charity-oriented and those participating in them often fail to achieve a caring relationship based on understanding. Additionally, service-learning may be used as a substitute for government action, thereby maintaining the status quo. This can take the form of superficial efforts spent on easing burdens without addressing the structural problems responsible for them.
Rosenberger (2000: 59-70) mentions that teaching a service learning course made her question whether there weren't harmful aspects in service learning. A significant problem she sees is that those with power and privilege determine the problems and their solutions for those who are less privileged, thus the thoughts that often accompany the service aspect of service learning, such as "doing good," (24) perpetuate a hierarchy of power. She questions whether service learning maintains the status quo and sustains the need for more service, or leads to justice. She proposes that a “Freirean approach” (24) can help one imagine how to create service learning practices which move beyond the status quo towards justice and equality.

There are multiple similarities between Rosenberger and Kahne and Westheimer. Both suggest an overall critical approach to engaging in service as opposed to the traditional manner; however, Rosenberger specifically and extensively references the work of Paulo Freire.

Rosenberger asserts that service activities must be designed around what Freire calls "praxis as cultural action for freedom” (Rosenberger, 2000: 30). This means more than the traditional combination of reflection and action; the ultimate goal of this praxis must be the transformation of society to eliminate the imbalances creating social problems, instead of merely taking care of immediate needs. This directly corresponds to the problem that Kahne and Westheimer notice, mentioned above, that service may maintain the status quo by responding to superficial burdens rather than addressing their underlying problems.
Rosenberger goes on to explain that the dynamic nature of reality must be considered in determining what activities service should undertake. Again, based on Freire's ideas, Rosenberger believes reality should be perceived as a process, which all people, together, should transform. She sees the need for willingness to honestly appraise the social structures responsible for dehumanization of people and the tendency to engage in a false generosity that maintains the status quo and the perpetual need for service.

Clark (2002: 288-297) is also concerned with considering social problems. She states that the need for systemic change should not be overlooked when avoiding service motivated by a sense of crisis. Performing service with a sense of ordinariness is her category three solution to service motivated by crisis; however, she cautions that this sense of ordinariness may lead servers to overpersonalize service, and thus overlook the patterns of commonality among recipients. These patterns are indicative of large-scale problems in society which must be addressed. Overpersonalized service that does not address the root societal problem leads to unproductive service.

Rosenberger’s process of looking at problems and engaging together to create change is similar to Kahne and Westheimer’s view, though they specifically focus on political activity and democracy. They believe that service-learning, as associated with good citizenship, requires critical participation in the design and development of society and its institutions, not just altruism, which is promoted as a characteristic of good citizens under the charity orientation of service-learning. They explain that those who favor the change orientation believe service should include political activities and the development of skills needed to participate in them. They note, however, that despite the
work of scholars who focus on change rather than charity, many service projects don't promote participation in democracy and some volunteers tend to treat service as a sufficient contribution to societal development without participating in political activity. This is because the political goal motivating charity-oriented service is civic duty (whereas political action is optional), which leads to promoting altruism and discouraging individualism. The political goal motivating change-oriented service is social reconstruction, which requires learning how to analyze policies and participate in democracy.

Rosenberger argues the need to work together, explaining that those involved in service should consider and confront issues of privilege and power and thus avoid characteristics of Freire's "dominant elite" (Rosenberger, 2000: 33), who engage in false generosity by thinking for and without people but not with people. She explains that it is necessary to think with people, listen, give up power and control, and work together. This is similar to a problem Kahne and Westheimer notice, mentioned above, related to understanding; however, where Rosenberger emphasizes power and privilege, Kahne and Westheimer focus on caring.

They explain that charity-oriented service often involves making decisions for the recipients, which forgoes the opportunity to interact with and learn from those being served; this may be because the moral goal motivating the charity-orientation is simply giving, whereas the moral goal motivating the change-orientation is caring, and the difference is that caring means coming to understand and identify with the other and join in their struggle (Kahne and Westheimer, 1996).
Attempting to be fair, Kahne and Westheimer note that there can still be an opportunity to increase understanding and caring between the servers and the recipients during charity-oriented service, but it is more difficult. Rosenberger, however, does not assert that traditional service learning may lead to her goals. She proposes that because power may remain hidden with the usual service learning understanding of mutuality and reciprocity where everyone is involved and benefits, it is necessary to move beyond such understandings. Power and privilege must be examined and discussed in service learning. Additionally, those with a privileged position in the relationship need to be willing to give up their power, listen, and learn from others so the less-privileged can lead and make changes for themselves.

The idea of caring, proposed by Kahne and Westheimer, is also related to another solution that can be drawn from Rosenberger: a service program must employ dialogue. Rosenberger believes dialogue, in Freire's sense, is a way to achieve mutual relationships and allow community members to define needs. This is similar to Kahne and Westheimer’s idea that in change-oriented service, one understands, identifies with, and joins with others in their struggle. Rosenberger explains that dialogue is based on love, humility and faith in people. Love, the starting point for dialogue, is a non-manipulative commitment to others. Humility is needed in order to listen to, learn from and work with others without arrogance. Faith in people is the belief that people have the ability to realize what they need and determine solutions for achieving the fulfillment of their needs. Service participants have to be able to engage in dialogue with community members, specifically those being served. Rosenberger explains that many service
projects are set up with social agencies. In these cases, however, the served don't usually define their needs or determine how they will be fulfilled; the agency does. This often leads service participants to feel they are helping to maintain the status quo rather than bring about changes. Rosenberger stresses that although difficult, those creating service projects need to create situations where dialogue occurs with those served so they can define their own needs.

Also important to Rosenberger is that service programs must empower and promote growth of the critical consciousness of all involved, for whom she recommends the use of the term *stakeholders*. Rosenberger employs Freire's idea of conscientization, a person's growing awareness of her place in reality and her ability to create change. Similarly, Kahne and Westheimer argue that the form of experience promoted by change-oriented service goes beyond merely adding to the knowledge of the server and actually changes the understanding the server has of social issues. This is because the intellectual goal motivating charity-oriented service is additive experience while that for change-oriented service is transformative experience.

For critical consciousness, Rosenberger asserts that those involved in service (who often have privilege) must think critically about their privilege and how this position may cause oppression. This means more than understanding the root causes of problems and may involve questioning values, giving up comfortable positions, and facing "personal contradictions" (Rosenberger, 2000: 36). Applied to service, conscientization empowers all involved to understand their position and see themselves as able to change the world. Alternatively, Kahne and Westheimer promote a specific
form of reflection to achieve transformative experience. Without reflection they say, a service experience cannot be assured of achieving either transformative or additive goals for its volunteers. They note that many authors suggest reflection, but put too little emphasis on critical analysis, which would help students avoid adhering to and rationalizing false and simplistic beliefs. Critical analysis via reflection can lead to personal transformation and help students to reconsider personal assumptions when the reflection includes consideration of arguments supporting opposing viewpoints. The use of such reflection is in some ways similar to another of Rosenberger’s solutions: problem posing education.

Rosenberger believes "problem posing education" (Rosenberger, 2000: 38) in the Freirean tradition is useful to increase consciousness of service learners and equalize power in relationships. Problem posing education is a way to explore what Freire called "generative themes" (Rosenberger, 2000: 38): things that keep individuals from truly seeing reality. Such education should unmask and question assumptions and may be achieved through drama or asking questions such as "What is wrong with this picture?" (Rosenberger, 2000: 39). She says that although difficult, it is crucial to investigate those things that are familiar. Students need to be offered questions that help them see things they had not seen before.

A final thought by Rosenberger is that service-program designers must create non-hierarchical service relationships. This idea includes the interactions between those traditionally thought of as providing the service and those being served. Rosenberger also stresses that for a “critical” (Rosenberger, 2000: 30) experience, programs must afford
service participants the opportunity to choose the area of their service involvement. She intimates that choice is important because it aids students in thinking about power dynamics, how needs are defined, and the impact of the project, and also gives them ownership. Extrapolating from the principles of the rest of her article, choice is also crucial because when students are not allowed to choose what they do, a hierarchical relationship is created.

Many of the authors who focus on problems and solutions in this category are concerned with societal problems or maintenance of the status quo, as seen above. Tryon, Stoecker, Martin, Seblonka, Hilgendorf, and Ellis (2008: 16-26) instead focus on problems and solutions for individual organizations. Additionally, unlike the other, more theoretical works described in this category, the ideas Tryon et al. propose are based on empirical work.

They analyze short-term service-learning based on their study on the concerns of small- to medium-sized community organizations which have been involved in service-learning projects. Following their data, they discuss design-based problems of short-term service and suggest solutions to alleviate some of these problems, which generally fall into category two due to their impact on a service project’s effectiveness and use of resources. It may be worth noting that for their study, "short-term" is defined as a commitment that was at maximum a semester long and usually included only a few hours of service per week, while "service-learning" refers to any situation in which students received academic credit for assisting community organizations (Tryon et al., 2008:17).
The problems of short-term service that the authors outline range from problems that impinge upon the development of servers to those that threaten the ability of the program itself to perform its intended purpose. First, if service is seen as mandatory, it can inspire feelings of resentment on the part of the server, which can result in poor performance or even situations in which servers take advantage of the service organization, such as intentionally not seeing commitments through if they exceed the minimum requirements to receive some benefit. Second, short-term or one-time projects can take up more resources, such as time and energy, than they are worth. These projects tend to get dropped when old servers leave and new ones come in. Third, even when the project is worth continuing, an organization might have to put more time into training and supervising short-term servers than the organization will receive in terms of service from the individual. Fourth, for certain projects, such as direct service with youth, short-term servers cannot properly fulfill the necessary conditions to provide a stable and consistent environment that will be beneficial to the recipients. Fifth, in situations where the service project is intended to provide a meaningful experience for the servers, short-term service may not allow enough time to effectively meet this goal. Sixth, breaks taken by servers during the service interval can deprive the organization of able bodies while the need for service continues. This can be compounded when the project is short-term, where any interruption to the application of steady effort is especially problematic.

The solutions gleaned from Tryon et al. are not panaceas. The authors explain that they might be helpful in some cases, but no claims were made that these will cure all problems associated with short-term service: First, a server with a longer time
commitment or a more experienced volunteer might be placed in charge of overseeing the coordination of other servers so that less community organization staff time is consumed in training short-term servers for temporary projects. Second, projects could be designed to be longer, or project leaders could arrange to provide a consistent number of short-term servers so the supply of volunteers stays sufficient to complete the project. Third, an outside agency could be used to match organizations that already have clearly defined projects, with servers that have corresponding interests or abilities, so that time is not wasted planning a project after volunteers have arrived. Fourth, some organizations may have various reasons for wanting to give short-term servers an opportunity to serve, for example, when servers reap some kind of benefit specific to their situation; such organizations should consider resisting the temptation to do this if it may be detrimental to the organization and its productivity.

Category three

The third category contains service with negative side effects. Seven works were found to contain problems and solutions that could be identified as category three. Jones (2002: 10-15) writes about a problem she sees in service-learning, when students have difficulty integrating all the aspects of their experience. Werner, Voce, Gaufin Openshaw, and Simons (2002: 557-579) discuss principles related to avoiding service made ineffective due to poor approaches which exacerbate difficulties of power, privilege, authority and culture. In his book Community Service: Encounter with Strangers, Radest (1993) critically examines the potential dangers that arise when community service is motivated by a response to a perceived crisis. Maybach (1996: 224-
236) develops an alternative model of service-learning because she is concerned with oppression that can occur unintentionally through the current service-learning paradigm. Gent and Gurecka (2001: 36-43) discuss some basic problems associated with service with individuals who are disabled. Clark (2002: 288-297) and Schultz (1992: 9,18-19) are both concerned with power dynamics in service-learning.

Multiple authors question the goodness of service. Schultz (1992) notes that service should not simply be assumed to be inherently good. Radest (1993) risks the statement early on that “Some service is worthy of approval and some is not” (2). One of his concerns is that the goodness of community service often goes unquestioned. Werner, et al. (2002) mention that although many people automatically espouse the goodness of service-learning, others are noticing problems associated with doing service.

According to Radest, a major reason service is unquestioned is that most community service is motivated as a response to perceived crisis. He discusses the potential dangers in this at length. For instance, once a crisis passes, there is a tendency to glorify it and distort the memory of it, or if it doesn't end, the ability to react to it or even perceive it is soon lost. Radest also notes that a state of constant crisis response would have undesirable side effects such as restriction of freedom and absolutist philosophy. In a less extreme, but more common example, Radest explains that crisis is a point of view that is used by the powerful for their own benefit instead of the common good. He notes that community service is sometimes used to meet political agendas that give the impression of compassion and concern without really working toward any positive ends.
Radest presents a strong criticism of the crisis approach in his final chapter: If the motive for community service is perceived to be a crisis, community service is inadequate to resolve it even in the long-term because the effort required is unsustainable. Thus its purpose becomes distorted into such notions as preoccupation for the do-gooders, citizenship training for youth, pseudo-jobs to employ the poor, or useful punishments for the guilty. The denial of this he explains as the tendency for Americans to believe that any person can rise in society without regard to class, and so there is resistance to admitting that community service does not ever truly get rid of social problems entirely, that there is always another person in need of help to escape the results of social inequality.

As an alternative, Radest proposes that community service should be seen as an ordinary and common action instead of a crisis response, but he also recognizes that crises have become so much a part of everyday life that "ordinariness" seems a kind of idealism (Radest, 1993: 177). Despite this, he asserts that community service must be performed under conditions of ordinariness, which means that those involved will need to continually ask what would be the ideal state for this society and seek to achieve that state. This contrasts with the crisis mode in which the positive benefits of community service become low priority and the associated mindset celebrates the servers while treating the recipients as inferiors. Community service as a response to crisis, he says, separates the server and recipient by the very idea of giving aid from the haves to the have-nots, while community service under conditions of ordinariness seeks to undo the artificial separations that have created inequality through reciprocation of understanding.
and sharing. Radest notes that people tend to require that those to whom they are giving are at a lower standard of living than themselves, indicating that they don't truly care to elevate the recipients of their charity to their own level. While the crisis-response approach leads to the perception of community service as a job that needs to be done with good deeds as a goal, the ordinariness approach avoids the inequality this creates by seeing community service as a vocation that has productivity shared between doer and done-to as a goal, and where all activities have a clear purpose.

In dealing with power dynamics, Clark (2002) also focuses on crisis and ordinariness. She recommends to simultaneously avoid service motivated by a sense of crisis, while making certain the need for systemic change is not overlooked. There is a tendency for program designers to convey a sense of crisis to the servers, which can have the unfortunate side effect of overwhelming them. Thus, referring to Radest, Clark recommends performing service with a sense of ordinariness, however, she sees the need to seek a balance between creating this sense of ordinariness and overpersonalizing service. When servers overpersonalize service they may overlook common patterns among recipients, which indicate large-scale societal problems that must be addressed, she says.

Some authors discuss the problem of need projection in service. Maybach (1996) notes that individual recipients frequently have their needs projected onto them by a service agency. Additionally certain groups are singled out as needy and as being perpetual recipients. The stigma and marginalization this causes is a form of oppression. She also explains that use of terms such as “service provider” and “service recipient”
(Maybach, 1996: 231) creates a dichotomy between the service provider and the recipient, places the latter as subordinate, and reinforces the view of the recipient as needy, to themselves and in society. This problem perpetuates their marginalization. Additionally, service projects may fail to address root causes of need due to need projection. If service does not work to address the root causes of recipients' needs, it is oppressive, Maybach argues.

Similarly, Gent and Gurecka (2001) observe that quite often, service involving disabled people means service to them, rather than with them. This may be the result of two common misconceptions: that disabled people are broken and in need of repair, and that they are childlike and therefore too incompetent to make their own decisions. The former fits strongly with the assumption that disabled people are pitiable victims and have a poor quality of life. The latter results in few disabled people getting to serve in important positions in service programs and agencies, because many service providers assume that they can help the disabled in a way that the disabled cannot help themselves. The authors explain that both of these position disabled people as inferiors to other people because they imply that disabled people need to be repaired and cannot repair themselves, being instead dependent on service providers who have abilities they lack.

Connecting need projection with power dynamics, Clark (2002) notes that in service situations where need and help are the focus, there is a risk that the server gains more power and privilege while the recipient loses them. This may occur partly due to the tendency of the server to project neediness onto the recipient and view herself as having the ability to resolve those projected needs. Clark discusses the way individuals’ view of
their social position dictates their perspective in interacting with others. For instance, in a service situation, the server may position the recipient as needy, even when the recipient resists such a positioning. The resulting perspective conflict alienates the recipient. In order to avoid this alienation, Clark speaks to the effectiveness of server and recipient working together toward a solution, and, as explained above, promotes service with a sense of ordinariness rather than service motivated by a sense of crisis. This solution is intended to resolve the dilemma of the aforementioned need projection because need projection, an important aspect of the power dynamics of service, can result from the unfamiliarity between server and recipient that grows out of crisis-oriented service.

Also concerned with power dynamics, Schultz (1992) reflects on Adolph Guggenbuhl-Craig's observation that helping relationships can strip the recipient's feelings of power, goodness, and vitality and transfer them onto the server, creating a dependency that can be difficult to escape and that can only be prevented when the server relinquishes the opportunity to thrive on the other's vulnerable position. Schultz claims that such power dynamics demonstrate one way in which service can perpetuate injustice. He recommends three solutions to deal with power issues, one of which shares some similarity with Clark’s recommendation that the need for systemic change is not overlooked; Schultz argues that reflection needs to involve analysis of the societal factors creating the need for service. This means that reflection must go beyond merely considering feelings or understanding service organizations because servers need to consider the structural components of social ills and not perpetuate the current social order without questioning it. The intent is that the servers be able to apply knowledge to
civic issues employing moral consideration of the way society is organized. This helps prevent a form of societal power dynamics in which those with needs are unjustly blamed for problems beyond their control. Schultz points out that when service is understood as charity, it demeans the dignity of those whose needs result at least partly from corrupt political and economic structures. This implies that failure to recognize such corrupt structures falsely imbues the recipients with incompetence through the process recognized by Guggenbuhl-Craig as described above.

Equality within service is important to many of these authors, perhaps most obviously for Radest (1993) who believes that the real purpose of community service should be to eliminate the inequality between server and recipient. Gent and Gurecka (2001) explain that the goal of service projects should always include making it possible for all parties to participate equally; equality requires the involvement of disabled people as partners in planning and implementing service. Werner, et al. (2002) assert that service should benefit both the servers and those served. No one involved should be exploited; each should have something to give and something to receive. Additionally, Werner, et al. suggest that service should empower both groups.

Maybach (1996) also proposes solutions that seem to promote equality. For example, those traditionally called “service recipients” need the opportunity to serve, not just be served (Maybach, 1996: 228). Maybach asserts that allowing recipients to serve empowers them by destroying the stigma surrounding traditional views of them, and by letting them experience a different role in society. Additionally, as explained above, recipients become subordinate when there is a dichotomy between recipients and servers.
Thus she says terminology needs to be updated: specifically, the term “partners in service” should replace “service provider” and “service recipient” (Maybach, 1996: 231). Third, both partners need to be considered when goals are set, outcomes are examined, research is undertaken, and public recognition is given. To achieve the empowerment of all parties involved, concern for and impact of both parties must be given equal weight.

Schultz (1992) connects equality to interaction or communication, in a second solution to problematic power dynamics within service. Servers, he says, should be encouraged to interact with those being served and try to understand similarities between themselves and the recipients. The intended outcome is that servers will learn to trust the recipients to define their own needs and help shape the service, and ultimately help the recipients find the resources to help themselves. The applicability of this to equalizing the power differential is clear, especially when the servers and recipients actually meet and talk, because they begin to understand the commonalities between them and grow closer.

Gent and Gurecka (2001) also see a connection between equality and communication. Specifically, equal participation in service projects must include direct communication between those traditionally seen as recipients and servers, rather than communicating via an agency. The authors note that this may initially require reaching out to those who may feel marginalized and afraid they will be seen as needy or as having nothing to contribute.

Maybach (1996) supports communication and interaction in service as well. She says interactive reflection is needed to facilitate understanding between service partners. Maybach suggests that interactive journaling may lead to cross-cultural understanding
and clarification of each partner’s interpretation of the experience. This is intended to alleviate the problem of misunderstanding that can occur between service providers and service recipients. She also argues that in order to address the root cause of need rather than just symptoms of need, the recipients of service must be listened to and responded to. Service providers may project needs onto recipients and falsely assume that their service is beneficial to recipients without knowing whether recipients view it as beneficial or empowering. Thus, including recipients’ voices should occur during design, engagement in, and evaluation of the service program.

Both Schultz (1992) and Werner, et al. (2002) advocate helping service recipients help themselves. Schultz touches on this in connection with interaction between servers and recipients, as explained above. Werner, et al. (2002) integrate the idea into their suggestion that service should empower both groups. They explain that it is important for the people offering help to allow those they are helping to determine what they want, and rather than simply giving them what they want, to work with them to nurture the ability to accomplish it themselves. Werner, et al. also explain crucial elements of nurturing this ability. They claim that two main components of empowerment are control and competency. People need to be allowed to have control over their situation because a lack of control can be stressful or cause people to give up. Conversely, having control gives people a sense of well-being. People also need to feel that they are competent and able to solve problems in order to stay motivated and continue a task. Furthermore, the authors explain, both components, control and competency, must be present for a situation to be
empowering; if individuals are given control without the ability to succeed, it may result in more anxiety than if they lacked control entirely.

Though she takes a different perspective and focuses on needs of the server, Jones (2002) also discusses competency. She notices that sometimes students assume volunteering will be easy, are soon overwhelmed by the experience, and become disconnected from the service. In order that service program designers will not require students to have or immediately gain skills or become competent in areas where they are unprepared, and so that students are not overwhelmed by the service experience, Jones says designers must account for students’ developmental readiness for their service experience. Designers must not presume all students come from the same background, but understand their backgrounds and make expectations accordingly.

A few authors recommend consideration of what could be thought of as big ideas. Radest (1993) notes that insufficient careful thought about the motives and methods of community service leads to negative side effects. Thus, he advocates that all involved (including program designers, servers, even recipients) think carefully about the goals and actions of community service. Similarly, Maybach (1996) argues that those involved in creating service programs should be clear about their service ethic. The service ethic refers to the values people associate with service, the focus or intent of their service, and the issue of who is benefiting. The problem is that without having a clear service ethic, one may be serving just to feel good, or perpetuating oppression by trying to change the perception of the oppression rather than the oppression itself. Therefore, individuals must understand their biases and agendas in encouraging service and the effects that these can
have. Maybach asserts that understanding the causes and results of caring is vital to clarifying one’s service ethic. She then says, “With this knowledge and insight, one’s agenda behind the service experience may become clear, helping to prepare the individual to engage in discussion, reflection, and praxis based on an in-depth understanding of what it means to care” (Maybach, 1996: 227). Considering the activities Maybach refers to in this quote and her choice of non-role specific pronouns, it is reasonable to conclude that she believes that the server would also benefit from clarifying their own service ethic.

For Schultz (1992), the big idea to consider is citizenship. As a third solution to problematic power dynamics in service, he argues that discussion of the meaning of citizenship must be ongoing. Schultz asserts that the servers must be reminded that they are a part of the process of creating and recreating the institutions that make our world what it is. He speaks of citizenship as including the act of making decisions for the common good rather than perpetuating injustice. The connection seems clear that to act for individual rather than common good creates a power differential.

Two works, those of Werner, et al. (2002) and Radest (1993) also offer ideas a bit unique in category three. Unlike others in this category, Werner, et al. specifically note that service should be contextual; it should not conflict with or be disconnected from the ideas and activities of the group receiving service, the group performing the service, or the community in which they are interacting. Additionally, they say the service project should endure. That is, the service should give some real and lasting effect on the people involved or the community.
Unlike others in category three, Radest (1993) explains that a prevalent form of resistance to diversity is the assumption that the uncomfortable differences between people should be downplayed and remain undisputed while the homogenizing idea that all people are really the same underneath should be emphasized, and Radest claims such resistance in community service makes it ineffective. The practice of otherness, which is the encounter and embrace of difference, is vital in a world where diversity has become commonplace, and is indispensable in community service. Radest contends that in modern society, identity and community are more a matter of personal choices than of birth, and otherness exists in the variety and possibilities presented by these choices. Otherness is a feature that occurs in everyone one encounters, including oneself. Otherness is also found in the characteristics in common among collective groups of people, as seen from the outside, and the perception of this, Radest believes, is often a part of defining one's own identity, though the perception will be unique to the individual. He explains that otherness is generally not truly taught in school because of the controversy that surrounds differences, but the increasing presence of diversity in this society demands that otherness be practiced. Radest also warns that community service should not be shaped around loyalties such as patriotism which may compromise the acceptance between doer and done-to, which is essential to practicing otherness.

For Radest, otherness, to embrace the differences one may encounter with honesty and openness, is one of three components of effective community service performed under ordinariness. (Two more components, mutuality to balance the relationship between doer and done-to, and solidarity to affirm the commitment to mutuality with
whomever one may encounter, specifically deal with category four problems that arise from the crisis response, and are discussed below.)

Category four

Category four contains service that is undermined by negative side effects that result from the misguided attitudes with which the service is performed. Five works were found to contain problems and solutions that could be identified as category four. Of special interest is the fact that all of these works mentioned reflection or careful thinking about and questioning service, as a solution.

Three of these, Jones (2002: 10-15), Weah, Simmons, and Hall (2000: 673-675), and Gent and Gurecka (2001: 36-43), are based on issues of service-learning, but the ideas contained within can be adapted for service in general. Each of these addresses stereotypes, though this is not their only focus.

Jones (2002) notices is that some students are insincere as they perform their service, thinking highly of themselves for the work they are engaging in and holding on to the stereotypes and assumptions they brought to the experience. She explains that community members and those served perceive this attitude in the students and develop a lack of trust in the servers. For clarification, it should be noted that these problems are caused by the actions and attitudes that the students hold, not necessarily by the program or designers; students may be insincere and arrogant, clinging to stereotypes and assumptions as they perform their service, despite designers' efforts to create a good program.
Jones also offers a solution to avoid the possibility that some students will engage in service insincerely and maintain the assumptions and negative stereotypes with which they start out. Service programs must be designed to include elements that contribute to the personal development of the students. Specifically, she says the design should involve direct service. The explanation Jones provides of her own students engaged in direct service reveals that this element is meant to help students undergo a transformation, as they come to see themselves as partners with those they are serving, rather than merely providers of service. In addition to direct service, Jones calls for high quality placement and intentionally designed reflection. By intentionally designed reflection she means reflection that is chosen specifically for the transformative effect it evokes relating to the service being done. Jones also recommends the opportunity to personalize social issues, meaning that students connect their service experience with their own lives to understand and internalize the situations of those with whom they work.

Weah, et al. (2000) are also concerned with stereotypes and assumptions. One useful solution proposed for dealing with servers’ stereotypes and assumptions is given as a reflection activity. Servers are asked to compose a narrative case study on the perspectives and experience of a person from a very different background than their own. Overall, Weah, et al. largely echo Maybach’s (1996) sentiments, drawing on her suggestions in order to include multicultural perspectives in service-learning. One of their emphases, akin to Maybach’s assertion that recipients also be servers, is that servers must work with people rather than just for people. This is similar to Jones’ (2002) reason for direct service, mentioned above. Not only do Weah, et. al advocate that servers
understand different perspectives, but they promote it among others involved in service; the article contains examples of service programs employed by various cultures to benefit their communities. Just as it advocates servers understanding others, this article suggests that service program designers look to a variety of sources for ideas in solving community problems, especially approaches taken by other cultures.

In addressing stereotypes and other problems, Gent and Gurecka (2001) discuss program designers’ failure to recognize the importance of effective reflection in helping servers proceed with the right attitude during service. They say that without reflection, many people without disabilities are so ill at ease around those with disabilities that they can develop attitudes that lead to devaluation, distancing, and reinforcement of stereotypes. Their solution, originally based in service-learning, can be translated for general service: Program designers should acquire training to provide servers with reflections that help them examine their own perspectives and values, focusing on virtues we all hold in esteem. Reflections should look at problems’ root causes, and this may be facilitated by creating a dialog between those traditionally seen as servers and those traditionally seen as recipients. The authors suggest that involving people with disabilities is an important part of the solution; rather than treating disabled people as victims in need of charity, reflection in which both parties are involved may help break down the barriers of understanding and expression between them.

Again, the ideas in the three works described above are all based on service-learning, but can be adapted to general service. Additionally, each of these studies presented at least one specific suggestion for reflection. Alternatively, the other studies in
this category are not based on service-learning, and, rather than specific suggestions, present general approaches to service from which solutions can be drawn. Radest (1993) is concerned with the development of community service, and Illich (1968: 314-320), unlike any of the other authors, is concerned with international service, addressing a particular service program that stands as an example of widespread problems.

Radest advocates against service motivated out of a sense of crisis. The problems he attributes to the crisis-response approach include a distorted view of societal reality, ulterior motives for performing service (including questionable political agendas), unrealistic goals and the resultant inability to meet them, and inequality between servers and recipients. He instead promotes service as performed under ordinariness (see above).

Illich, in a speech entitled To Hell With Good Intentions, addresses a group of U.S. college student volunteers in an attempt to dissuade them from traveling to "help" Mexican villagers during the summer (Illich, 1968: 320). He asserts that their efforts are damaging and that their motives are self-serving because they act based on troubled consciences to make themselves feel better. He argues that the disruption they create is not worth any insights they may gain from the experience.

Radest and Illich both discuss aspects of the relationship between individual servers and recipients. Illich, however, emphasizes the failure of servers to communicate with those they serve, while Radest is concerned with the superficiality and separation that occurs when servers pretend they do not have needs as the recipients do. These scholars therefore suggest very different solutions to the relational problems they see.
Illich asserts that middle-class volunteers in Latin America cannot truly meet with those they ostensibly serve because they cannot communicate with them, but only with those who are of a similar mindset. Illich explains that this stems from the fact that most Latin Americans do not reach the sixth grade, and almost none of them attend college. The middle-class Latin Americans with whom U.S. volunteers can communicate are a tiny minority that still bears little resemblance to the substantially more educated and privileged U.S. middle class. He points out that if these same volunteers went on a similar mission to the poor in the U.S., they would realize their own powerlessness and irrelevance. The poor would see the volunteers’ guilt-motivated acts for what they were and reject their help. Unfortunately, the U.S. volunteers Illich addresses, apparently do not even understand that their work in Mexican villages is insignificant because the culture of the Mexican poor is so different from their own, thus offering them very few individuals with whom to communicate. He therefore proposes that if one wishes to help others, one should work in one’s own country so that communication is possible with those being served in order to understand their ideas and know if the service is failing.

Radest (1993) observes that a kind of alienation between server and recipient happens when those who serve pretend that they themselves are never in need and are therefore more powerful than those they serve. While he provides no rigid definition, Radest approaches mutuality as a way of relating to others through the admission that, no matter their condition, everyone has needs that can be responded to and also has strength to respond to other people’s needs. Radest sees this as a reinforcement of the usefulness of community service because, while relationships will be mutual, strengths and needs
will be different so people can support each other, and hence the service will continue to be beneficial. He believes that the development of mutuality would allow superficial relationships to become more personal because reciprocity of understanding can occur in which people can interact with others unlike themselves and, if only for a short time, these others become real for them. However, mutuality involves keeping one's own identity while being able to understand the other person's identity. Without this, Radest believes there is a danger of something similar to what is now called group-think occurring in the relationship.

Radest goes on to assert that the act of maintaining mutuality is not possible with all people as a collective because the ability to feel care for individuals is a personal process that cannot be generalized. He claims that mutuality occurs only when individuals meet, but solidarity allows eventual mutuality with the unknown stranger because solidarity is the readiness to have a reciprocal understanding with those whom one has not yet met. Solidarity is thus a maintaining of the attitude of readiness through envisioning relationships with people not yet encountered, in which both people will be needed and have needs. Radest also explains that solidarity connotes the willingness to become comfortable with the differences of others so that reciprocation of need will be allowed.

Radest and Illich both promote careful thought about service. Radest makes repeated appeals to careful thinking about the goals and actions of community service: "There is much that we do not know about it [community service] and much that is less than honest in our arguments about it" (Radest, 1993: 15). "We are so busy doing good
things that we do not stop to ask about their goodness and we are so oppressed by the number of good things yet undone that we do not take the time to ask" (Radest, 1993: 92). Without sufficiently careful consideration, he warns, community service can lead to bad ends, especially during a crisis approach, because it does not afford the majority of the servers and recipients the right to question the intents, methods, and effectiveness of the actions being taken, which is virtual authoritarianism. He also specifically urges that the actual process of doing community service, as an undertaking of ordinariness to eliminate inequalities, must not be confused with peripheral activities such as fundraising, symbolic discussions and theorizing, or the performance of actions just to be doing something without truly evaluating their purpose and effectiveness.

Illich asserts that volunteers should have a clear methodology and purpose; that is, they should question how their actions will alleviate the problem and why it needs to be alleviated (Illich, 1968: 320). The specific problem he points out is that there is a tendency for middle-class Americans to promote their way of life when they volunteer. Moreover, the need Americans see for service frequently stems from damage the U.S. causes, and the service often merely attempts to convert the recipients into imitators of the American middle-class lifestyle. Illich argues that this is a side effect of the way the U.S. fights to convince others that the middle-class way of life is ideal, just as it fights to protect foreign consumers and commercial alliances. Thus, U.S. volunteers in other countries often help to maintain this status quo. He also mentions that many volunteers to Latin America receive no training, and worse, Mexicans receive no preparation for dealing with the volunteers and the disturbances they can cause.
Illich also declares that volunteers should not pretend that something they want to do is necessarily a good act. He explains the potential delusion of assuming that simply desiring to do something makes it good, helpful, or noble. Furthermore, this illusion can be compounded by supportive words from others captured by the same illusion. For instance, those Illich might label as middle-class Mexican converts to the American ideal, sometimes are motivated by troubled consciences as are the U.S. volunteers, and thus assure these volunteers that they are doing good work. He notes that such individuals want to feel better about themselves and so do their work at least partly out of self-interest. Throughout the speech, Illich describes the damaging effects in Mexican villages of some U.S. college students’ actions, which are motivated by good intentions. He thus strongly asserts that good intentions are not enough, hence the title of his speech.

More than any of the other authors, Illich emphasizes not engaging in, and even giving up, ineffective service. First, he says volunteers shouldn't perform a deed simply because they have the power to do so. He asserts that many of the motives U.S. volunteers find for doing service are bound up in American ideology; many Americans believe they must assist those they think are less well off. The wealth possessed by many U.S. citizens enables them to travel to another country to try to help the poor in a form that could be compared with a vacation. Illich entreats the U.S. volunteer to renounce the idea that one should engage in an action simply because one can. He explains Americans must understand that their values would not work for some other cultures, and thus not impose them on others just because they have the power.
Illich also clearly states that one should give up service that is not working. In speaking of the specific kinds of damage U.S. volunteers have done in Mexican villages, he relates how some volunteers promote the allure of middle-class life to people who will at best achieve nothing better than turmoil trying to pursue it. He also explains that the volunteers causing this turmoil seldom stay to experience it. Next, he speaks to the fact that some argue that individuals can mature through realizing the damage they have done as volunteers; he contends that the detriments of learning in this destructive manner outweigh the benefits. Leaving no reason for the volunteers he is addressing to work in Latin America for the summer, Illich asks that the effort be abandoned. At the beginning of his speech, he points out that some of the volunteers are willing to evaluate their program, but not enough to discontinue it. They want to spend their summer in Mexico and call their efforts there "help" (Illich, 1968: 320). The implication here is that just because one calls an activity service, does not necessarily mean the activity is worth continuing.

Radest and Illich both place responsibility on servers themselves, not just service program designers. Radest asserts that negative side effects result from insufficiently careful thought about the motives and methods of community service, but he goes on to state that this task falls to everyone involved with service, including the servers themselves. Though Illich speaks to the group at times as if they are the individuals in charge of the volunteer organization he is addressing, his plea is aimed at the individual volunteers. Thus, even the more program-oriented solutions he suggests are still intended to be heard and internalized by the volunteers themselves. The volunteers are, ultimately,
the force for change of any service program because, without them, service programs do not function. Illich asks the individual volunteers to question the methods, purpose, and effectiveness of their programs, as well as their personal motivations and effectiveness. In essence, he is proposing a set of guidelines for volunteers’ attitudes and philosophies while doing service. He insists that without these guidelines, volunteers’ actions can be destructive to others. More than any other arguments reviewed from this field, Illich's speech puts the responsibility for refusing to partake in ineffective service squarely on the shoulders of those who do the work.

Concluding thoughts

It is clear from the analysis above that service has the potential to create or compound a number of problems. These include but are not limited to problems such as marginalization of certain people, wasting of resources, failure to address large problems, creation of power imbalances, and reinforcement of incorrect assumptions. There may, however, be actions that could reduce such problems. For example, understanding of the other was mentioned in all four categories, as was examination or careful thinking and consideration.

The problems and solutions explained above are unlikely to encompass all those that could apply to service; there are surely others that could be imagined. This analysis is a start, however, considering the newness of this area of inquiry and the resulting difficulty in finding literature that discusses problems of service and proposes solutions. Continued study of the possible problems of service and their solutions is important. It is
also necessary to encourage those involved to examine their service and employ relevant solutions, in order to avoid the problems described above.

Focusing on Category Four

To create the educational tool that would help individuals examine service, the problems and solutions, now categorized and understood, needed to be further analyzed to condense ideas and find patterns. This was because the servers’ time in SIP was limited. Since it would not be fair to the servers for the educational tool to employ solutions for problems that aren’t within the power of the servers to resolve, it was decided that the focus of the tool must be the fourth category. Understanding the problems and solutions of service classified as category 1, 2, and 3, is important, so those remain in the text of this project; however, analyzing and implementing all this information is beyond the scope of this project. Therefore, it is most appropriate that only the fourth category be analyzed further.

In order to analyze problems and solutions in the fourth category, first, problems that authors attempted to resolve were analyzed to look for commonality and redundancy. Additional problems were extrapolated based on the pattern, and a single set of ultimate problems was formulated. Next solutions were analyzed to identify commonalities and eliminate redundancies.

Analyzing problems

As discussed above, there are five studies containing solutions to category-four problems: Jones (2002); Weah, Simmons, and Hall (2000); Gent and Gurecka (2001);
Illich (1968); and Radest (1993). The category four problems for which these authors propose solutions, can be summarized succinctly by the following list: performing service insincerely, stereotyping recipients, experiencing discomfort with differences, engaging in alienation and distancing from recipients, devaluing recipients, promoting server's own culture, assuming that other cultures need to be "improved," overestimating server's own power to change large problems, being motivated by guilt, holding the naive belief that a desire to help assures good service, failing to consider or observe long-term outcomes for recipients, having a distorted view of societal realities, conducting service for political agendas, setting unrealistic goals, reinforcing inequality between servers and recipients, performing service carelessly due to crisis-mode perspective, having other ulterior purposes for service, assuming that it is possible to care for generalized groups as one cares for individuals, having patriotism and loyalty as motivations, and viewing fund-raising or theorizing as if they were actual service projects.

It is worth noting once more that while some of these problems may seem more appropriately aimed at a program designer than a server, Radest and Illich, for instance, assert that servers have a responsibility to evaluate the service in which they are considering involving themselves, and Illich goes on to say that they should refuse to participate if it is problematic.

In order to examine the list for possible omissions, it became clear that it would help if a service project could be seen as subdivided into distinct stages. As with many other activities, the likely stages could be motivation (inspiration for performing the
activity), analysis (acquiring understanding about what must be done), procedure (actually performing the service), and evaluation (assessing the results of the activity).

The problems associated with motivation include performing service insincerely, assuming that other cultures need to be "improved," being motivated by guilt, patriotism, or loyalty, and conducting service for political agendas or other ulterior motives.

The analysis-related problems are stereotyping recipients, experiencing discomfort with differences, devaluing recipients, overestimating server's own power to change large problems, holding the naive belief that a desire to help assures good service, having a distorted view of societal realities, setting unrealistic goals, and assuming that it is possible to care for generalized groups as one cares for individuals.

The problems related to procedure are engaging in alienation and distancing from recipients, promoting server's own culture, reinforcing inequality between servers and recipients, performing service carelessly due to crisis-mode perspective, and viewing fund-raising or theorizing as if they were actual service projects.

The problem associated with the evaluation aspect is failing to consider or observe long-term outcomes for recipients.

After much consideration, it became clear that many of these problems seemed to consist of extreme aspects of certain neutral ideas. The next organization of the problems thus consisted of consolidating and reframing them in these terms so that the list was condensed.
The motivational problems list becomes: under-commitment to service, undervaluing other lifestyles, overemphasizing one's own responsibility for problems, and underestimating the damage associated with having ulterior motives.

The analytical problems are: underemphasizing individual differences within groups, underestimating other's abilities, overestimating one's own abilities, underestimating problem severity, and overestimating people's capacity to care abstractly.

The procedural problems are: underemphasizing similarities between server and recipients, overvaluing one's own lifestyle, undervaluing other's abilities or overvaluing one's own, overestimating problem severity, and overestimating the ability of peripheral activities to create change.

The evaluational problem is: overestimating the ability of certain activities to create lasting or significant change.

To clarify the notion of viewing these problems as extreme perspectives on otherwise neutral ideas, consider that having an opinion of one's own abilities is neutral whereas overestimating one's abilities is problematic. Bearing this in mind, it stands to reason that other problems on the opposite extreme end could be extrapolated and considered, to decide if they, too, are problematic.

Here are the opposite extreme positions listed in the same order as their corresponding extremes above, except redundancies have been eliminated: over-commitment to service, overvaluing others' lifestyles, underemphasizing one's own responsibility for problems, overestimating the damage associated with having less than perfect motives, overemphasizing individual differences within groups, overestimating
others' abilities or underestimating one's own, under- or over-estimating problem severity (both extremes of this problem were already listed above), underestimating people's capacity to care abstractly, overemphasizing similarities between servers and recipients, undervaluing one's own lifestyle, underestimating the ability of peripheral activities to create change, and underestimating the ability of certain activities to create lasting or significant change.

It's fairly easy to see the problematic nature in many of these: Overcommitment to service can lead to burn-out. Being overly-diligent in seeking ideal motives, total empathy for others, or perfectly effective service would prevent servers from attempting anything at all. Some peripheral activities are certainly necessary to keep service functioning. And so on.

Perhaps it is more difficult to accept the problematic nature of servers undervaluing their own culture or overvaluing that of others, ignoring the differences between them as individuals/groups and recipients as individuals/groups, or ignoring the common characteristics within groups. Radest (1993) addresses exactly these issues in discussing the principle he calls "otherness" (185), pointing out how important it is to the development and health of a person's identity to be free to recognize that members of groups do have certain common characteristics and that those groups do differ from one's own group. Though the problem he addresses in discussing this falls more into category three, he warns of the danger of cosmopolitan idealism preventing people from honestly recognizing the differences that create diversity, due to the drive to eliminate prejudice.
Once again, there is a neutral point between denying our similarities with others and denying our differences.

Finally, taking the neutral ideas from this list and grouping them according to similarity, a simple list of eight themes for consideration results: commitment and capacity to care, valuing of lifestyles, ulterior motives and responsibility for problems, individual and group differences and similarities, individual abilities, problem severity, impact of peripheral activities, and lasting effectiveness of service. These are the problem themes to be incorporated into the educational tool.

**Analyzing solutions**

The solutions proposed by the above authors can also be considered. The solutions gleaned from Jones (2002) included high-quality placement, direct service to bring transformation and help servers see themselves as partners with recipients, intentionally designed reflection chosen for its transformative effect, and personalizing social issues so servers connect service with their lives. Note that there are two solutions offered from Jones that are not applicable to the servers: high-quality placement and direct service fall under the control of the program designer.

Weah, Simmons, and Hall’s (2000) work includes a solution of a specific type of reflection activity where servers compose a narrative case study on the experience and perspective of someone very different from themselves.

Gent and Gurecka's (2001) solutions are reflection that help servers examine their perspectives and values while focusing on our shared virtues like honesty and respect for
others. They also recommend that reflections look at root causes of problems by creating dialog between servers and recipients.

Illich’s (1968) work provides the following solutions: Have a clear methodology and purpose, meaning question how your actions will alleviate the problem and why it needs to be alleviated. Don't do something simply because you can. Work in your own country so communication is possible with those being served to understand their ideas and know if service is failing. Do not pretend something you want to do is necessarily a good act. You should give up service that is not working.

Radest (1993) suggests that service must be performed while holding to the following principles: Mutuality, which means relating to others on a personal level and seeing the relationship as reciprocal where both people have needs and strengths which are different so they can help each other. Solidarity, which refers to being open to the possibility of mutuality with people not yet met, and includes willingness to become comfortable with differences of others so reciprocation of need can happen. Careful thinking about the goals and actions of community service: this includes being honest about the goodness of service and arguments about it, questioning intents, methods, and effectiveness of actions being taken, and not confusing service with other activities like fundraising or actions undertaken simply to be doing something without evaluating its purpose and effectiveness.

First, all of these authors place emphasis on reflection or thinking about and questioning the service being done. Thus, this solution is critical and merits the most attention and emphasis.
Second, while Illich and Radest have general ways of approaching service, the other authors have a few specific ideas about reflection. These specific ideas were extracted and included: reflection with an emphasis on transformation; having servers connect service with their own lives; reflection wherein a narrative case study is composed; reflection that looks at root-causes.

Finally, the remaining solutions presented by the authors share certain common themes: Reflection, careful thinking, and questioning as mentioned above; servers working or communicating with the recipients; being honest or not pretending about the goodness of service; consider not doing certain activities that are not truly service or are not working.

These four general solutions, along with the four specific ideas about reflection listed above, are the solutions to be employed in the educational tool. Since the solutions emphasize reflection, that is the focus of the next section.
UNDERSTANDING REFLECTION

Because the main emphasis of solutions in category four centered on reflection, careful consideration, and questioning, another body of literature was examined to understand useful ways to reflect. The possible ideas were subject to the constraints of this project, so only some ideas were chosen. For example, a number of authors use group discussions as reflections, which would not be possible in this case. Ideas that were possibly useful were described. As ideas for helping and supporting individuals during reflection were contained in the literature on reflection, such ideas were also noted.

What is Reflection?

There are multiple definitions for reflection, from the very general, which may be found in a dictionary, to those that are rather complex, to those that are used in a specific field. For example, Dunlap (1998) has defined critical reflection "as regularly considering and documenting, either orally or in writing, one's thoughts, experiences, and emotions with respect to a specific activity" (59). In speaking of reflection in service-learning, Eyler (2002) cites Hatcher and Bringle to define reflection as "the intentional consideration of experience in light of particular learning objectives" (518). However, because of the solutions found for this project, a more specific definition may be useful, one that includes careful thinking and questioning.

Reflection is defined by some as a process that allows people to assess their ideas or assumptions. Several authors reference John Dewey when discussing reflection (for
example, Mezirow 1990; Cone & Harris 1996; Deans 1999; Eyler 2002; Cranton 2006). A number cite his 1933 explanation of reflection (Eyler 2002; Mezirow 1990; Cranton 2006). Here, Dewey (1933) says that what he terms reflective thought is, "Active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends" (9). It is worth quoting Dewey further from the same paragraph which goes on to state that reflective thought "includes a conscious and voluntary effort to establish belief upon a firm basis of evidence and rationality" (Dewey, 1933: 9). The many references to Dewey support the position that his definition should be considered most suitable and he makes it clear that reflective thinking is to be grounded in rationality and factual evidence.

Eyler (2002) notes that reflection, while pointed to as an extremely important aspect of service-learning, isn’t given enough attention in actual experiences, and when done, it is often not done well; it is superficial, focusing on feelings rather than asking servers to question assumptions. In her view, Dewey’s idea of reflection is often unachieved.

It follows that careful consideration of reflection would be beneficial. As reflection has been important in the field of service-learning, ideas from authors in this field may be useful. Additionally, reflection has been a part of transformative education and solutions gleaned from Jones (2002) include reflection that is transformative, as explained above, thus ideas from authors of transformative education may be useful. Another field in which to look is critical thinking, as authors writing about reflection mention critical thinking or reasoning (for example, Cone & Harris 1996; Dunlap 1998;
Eyler 2002; Mezirow 2003). Additionally, the definition of reflection above, by Dewey, has commonalities with what may be thought of today as critical thinking.

Possible Techniques to Reflect on Assumptions

Brookfield (2005) explains that assumptions are beliefs that each of us holds about such basic things as how the world works and how we should behave. These assumptions, he says, are often unrecognized and unquestioned. In Brookfield’s view, identifying and analyzing assumptions is the main focus of critical thinking. Elder and Paul (2002) explain that assumptions are things that are taken for granted. Because there is not time to question everything, people make assumptions constantly in order to deal with the world. These assumptions may be justified if we have good reasons for them, or unjustified if we do not, they explain. Mezirow (2003) also emphasizes reasons and notes that “Beliefs are justified when they are based on good reasons.” (58). Reflection, for Mezirow, involves assessing assumptions and requires reasoning (Mezirow, 1990; Mezirow, 1997; Mezirow, 2003).

Mezirow (2003) discusses critical reflection and notes that in critical reflection, people must look at their reasons, how they arrived at those reasons, the logic of those reasons, and whether or not they are justified. Critical reflection could happen in many different situations, such as through self-reflection on one’s own beliefs, listening to someone’s point of view, reading, or solving a problem (Mezirow, 1997). Critical reflection can be undertaken alone or with a group (Mezirow, 2003).
Eyler (2002) finds that it is important to provide servers with intentional structured reflection, because without it, they will often not reflect. She encourages reflection before, during and after service. In reflecting before service, Eyler explains that for many people, assumptions may not be recognized and new information may be assimilated into old ways of thinking. Therefore, she advises the exploration of one’s own assumptions before service begins. This can be done by noting expectations in the form of composing a letter to oneself, writing a journal entry, and creating a goal statement. These assumptions could then be tested during the service. Another possibility is doing a “preflection” (525) with a community partner or members of the community, before service begins, in order to plan the service, create a contract, or assess needs.

During service, Eyler (2002) explains, reflection should be continuous so individuals are pressed to push past their comfortable thinking and assumptions. For reflecting as an individual she suggests a structured journal, meaning individuals are given weekly sets of questions to reflect on in the journal. If it is possible, individuals may also reflect with community partners during service; this may include having the server participate in the community organization’s regularly scheduled meetings, or it may mean making arrangements to discuss progress and problems with community partners.

Reflection at the end of service may be satisfying and allow servers to better understand what has occurred. Eyler’s suggestions for individual reflection at the end of service include creating final projects like art, or written papers on what was learned.
Reflections may also include challenging individuals to think about next steps or create action plans. Servers may also create presentations for community partners (Eyler, 2002).

As part of a service-learning model they propose, Cone and Harris (1996) explain how they use reflection in an ongoing service-learning program. Their reflection consists of individual written reflections as well as oral group reflection on both academic and personal issues. Individual reflections occur each week and are initiated by weekly questions. One set of questions focuses on theory and concepts brought up in intellectual reading and asks servers to tie their service experiences to these theories and concepts. These reflections ask the server to use her own observations to argue for or against a theory or ask the server to define concepts. The second set of questions assists the server in thinking about her own response to her service experience; each week these focus on a different theme or help the server look at service from a different perspective. The eight foci of this second type of questions are: the service setting, the people the server works with, the activities being undertaken, reaction by recipients, the impact of the service, details of a particular experience, impressions being changed or confirmed, and what was learned. Questions ask the server to tie these themes to their own feelings, reactions, impressions, and so on (Cone and Harris, 1996).

In working with college students in multicultural service-learning projects, Dunlap (1998) includes written journals as a way of reflecting and gives students ten journal questions to help start their journal writing.

Cranton (2006), who writes about transformative learning, offers a number of ideas for reflection. She draws on Mezirow’s content, process, and premise types of
reflection and offers a framework for asking the associated types of questions. She explains that questions for content reflection help individuals become aware of assumptions by asking questions such as: what do you know about this, how do you feel about this, or what do other people say about this? Process reflection questions focus on how an individual gained a certain perspective by asking questions such as: how did you arrive at your vision of yourself this way or how did the media or community influence your views on this? Cranton explains that questions for premise reflections help people examine their assumptions and the basis of their views; they ask things such as: why is X important, why do you associate X with Y, or why does it matter what your family believes about Z?

Cranton (2006) also suggests consciousness-raising experiences as a type of reflection. These experiences consist of anything that raises a person’s awareness or allows them to see something from a different perspective. Cranton includes role play, simulations, autobiographies, debates, case studies, and games in this type of reflection. Reflection through experiential learning is also noted. Cranton mentions Dewey’s 1933 explanation of reflection as being very similar to the critical reflection promoted in transformative learning.

Additionally, Cranton explains journals as a type of reflection and notes that if journals are to foster critical self-reflection, there must be a focus on “the articulation of assumptions, thoughts, and feelings about issues and the consideration of alternatives” (Cranton, 2006: 147).
Critical incidents are another form of reflection Cranton describes. In this case, individuals are asked to remember and describe an incident, explaining details such as who was involved and why the person felt it was positive or negative. The individuals then question the incident. Some of Cranton’s useful suggestions for questioning include: offering a critical incident that servers can question, encouraging servers to practice questioning an incident, and incorporating questions that help servers plan actions based on the incident.

While Cranton (2006) offers many ways to help learners consider their assumptions and question their values, she also points out that it is important for educators to: remember the influence they may have on learners; allow learners to see them questioning their own values; and respect the values learners have. She also notes that assumptions do not necessarily need to be changed after they are considered. In essence, Cranton is saying that educators should not expect learners to reach the same conclusions the educator has. The important part is questioning and considering, not making sure everyone arrives at the same answer or ends up with the same values.

Brookfield’s (2005) work is useful in considering how to help servers identify and assess their assumptions through reflection. Brookfield (2005) is concerned that students often have a difficult time investigating their own assumptions. One aspect that Brookfield notes is that students have a hard time recognizing their assumptions. To deal with this, he suggests using a “critical incident approach” (55), which asks students to think about a concrete moment or situation in their lives in order to reveal their assumptions associated with the incident, rather than asking them to abstractly think
about their own assumptions. A second aspect he notes is that, since critical thinking about oneself is so difficult (he compares it to running a 100 meter sprint, which takes training), people need to work up to critically thinking about their own assumptions. To deal with this, he suggests starting from a distance and moving to what is personal; he offers a series of activities that begin with students analyzing another person’s behavior to reveal possible assumptions the other person holds, and slowly working the students up to analyzing their own problems.

Elder and Paul’s (2002) article is also useful in considering how to help servers assess their own assumptions. Elder and Paul focus on critical thinking and, in order to help students notice and question their own assumptions, provide the following idea. Individuals may be asked to look for the inferences an author has made in an article, and then to determine what assumptions may have led to those inferences.

The authors explain that inferences are conclusions people come to based on things they believe to be true, while assumptions are things “we take for granted or presuppose” (Elder and Paul, 2002: 34). People may make different inferences based on the same observations, because they hold different assumptions. Elder and Paul give an example of a situation where two people see a man lying in a gutter. Person one infers “That man’s a bum” because of their assumption that “Only bums lie in gutters”; however, person two infers “That man is in need of help” because of their assumption that “Anyone lying in the gutter is in need of help” (Elder and Paul, 2002: 34).

They explain that with such practice identifying inferences and assumptions, individuals can begin to see that when the assumptions are not justified, the inferences
are illogical. There are many inferences that might be made in a situation and some may be more logical than others. With this practice, they are more able to question their own assumption (Elder and Paul, 2002).

Supporting Reflection and Acknowledging Difficulties

In his book about service, Coles (1993) discusses the despair that servers feel and notes that, in young adult volunteers, this feeling is often brought up when reflecting. Reflection can be quite difficult and this must be taken into account when creating reflection activities. Some of the literature discussed above includes suggestions to support individuals who are reflecting.

Cranton (2006) notes that under certain circumstances, reflection may be traumatic for an individual. She suggests care when using premise questions about personal views. She also suggests a number of other ideas to help people involved in transformative learning, which is often emotional or disruptive. Some of those ideas may be applicable and useful in this context. For example, she notes that taking up activities that encourage quiet may be helpful for some, such as joining a meditation or yoga group. Cranton also explains that when an individual’s thinking changes, external actions may result and these people should be supported as they consider actions. She offers a method of planning which includes: envisioning goals; considering the future; realizing constraints; thinking about alternatives and consequences; determining how to make the change; requesting feedback from others who may notice or be affected by the change (Cranton, 2006: 172-173).
Dunlap (1998), in discussing multicultural service experiences, suggests that to help individuals become comfortable with critical reflection, they be given the student comments shared in her article, as it will help these individuals share their own views. She also suggests that individuals should be told “it is okay to notice, think about, and discuss issues of difference” (64). Additionally, she suggests that individuals involved in thinking critically about their service be given resources to help them process, including a selection of possibly relevant literature.

Cone & Harris (1996) mention that even college students may not have the critical thinking skills that allow them to examine their own views or abstract social concepts. These authors use what they call “mediated learning” (39) so that reflection will help servers develop these skills; an assistant reads the journals and challenges the server’s statements with questions that will help her clarify her understanding. An example of such a question is, “…are there other explanations for…” (40).

Frustrating situations may also affect servers, as Cone & Harris (1996) point out. They explain that many servers, because of the way they see themselves as helping the community, will continue with a task despite the anxiety it may produce. They note that reflection allows servers to vent about these situations.

Some authors also discuss dealing with different learning styles when working with servers. Cone & Harris (1996) assert that as instructors are planning service experiences, they should remember that many different learning styles, backgrounds, and so on. exist among servers. However, they also emphasize that since servers may be so different, each one cannot be accommodated individually.
Dunlap (1998) and Cranton (2006) both mention responding to individuals’ concerns, offering support, or providing individuals with resources, including referrals to other people who can help. Cranton (2006) also offers suggestions to help people who are unsure how to start journaling, such as: create a routine, experiment with writing in the format of a letter, or focus on specific themes when writing.
EXPLANATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL TOOL

The list of problem themes and associated solutions was analyzed with the reflection and support ideas to determine which would match well. Finally, based on what was learned about problems, solutions, and reflection, the educational tool was composed.

General Explanation

As noted above, the focus of this tool is reflection to help servers carefully consider service to avoid problems of service and engage in beneficial service. Much of the tool is therefore composed of reflection activities. Additionally, introduction and support sections are included in the tool to aid servers in reflecting.

Each of the eight weekly reflections incorporates one of the problem themes and one or more of the solutions explained above. Reflections also utilize the suggestions of authors who write about reflection or consideration of assumptions. Finally, reflections include ideas to support the servers as they reflect, most of which were suggested by the authors writing on reflection. A few others are thoughts or practices this author has found useful while reflecting.

For a number of reasons, the educational tool could not be extremely lengthy. It was thought that servers might not even attempt the reflections if they felt a large amount of extra reading or work was required. Additionally, it was recognized that this kind of reflection, if done sincerely with true consideration of assumptions, could be quite
difficult and time consuming for some people. Finally, servers in SIP had limited time. Therefore, each reflection is kept compact so as to reduce apprehension to or dismissal of the activities and information offered, and to ensure that servers are not overwhelmed.

This tool is intended to be easily adaptable to other service programs similar to SIP, therefore, the tool does not include specific references to SIP or information about SIP. SIP participants would receive this information as a regular part of the program.

Taking Eyler’s (2002) recommendation in mind, the educational tool is constructed so that reflection is continuous and structured. Noting ideas by Cone & Harris (1996), Cranton (2006), and Dunlap (1998), a journal format for reflecting was seen as appropriate, especially since servers would be engaged in reflections individually rather than in a group. As with reflection designed by Cone & Harris (1996) and Dunlap (1998), each of the reflections in the educational tool includes a series of intentionally chosen questions which can be responded to in a journal format. Additionally, some reflections also include written or non-written activities to which the questions refer.

Since it may be difficult for servers to question their own assumptions, as Brookfield (2005) noted, the general format of the reflection is structured to ease servers into looking at their own assumptions, by focusing on other people’s assumptions during the first reflections, and later offering opportunities for servers to consider their own assumptions. The earlier reflections are less personal while later reflections are more personal.

Some reflections include questions meant to help servers clarify their understanding, think deeper, or examine a thought. This is due in part to Cone and
Harris’s (1996) observation that individuals may not have the critical thinking skills to examine their own views. While Cone and Harris have an assistant ask questions to help servers clarify understanding, that was not an option in this situation, so questions were instead built into the reflections.

**Introduction Section**

The introduction section is included to explain, to the servers, the purpose and suggested use of the educational tool. Some portions of this section are also included to ease servers’ possible apprehensions around completing the contained reflections.

It is very important that servers are not expected to think a certain way after reflecting. This idea is emphasized by Cranton (2006), but can also be logically argued. If the intent is for servers to consider their assumptions and think critically, it is counterproductive to attempt to push them into one way of thinking or another. Doing so would not model critical thinking about assumptions and knowledge. Thus, servers are explicitly told they do not need to think a certain way to be sure they do not feel pressured to do so.

Cranton’s (2006) idea of supporting people who are unsure about how to start journaling, by suggesting that they create a routine, is used. Additional ideas are added to expand this suggestion. The supportive ideas are introduced in this section to be sure that servers who might have trouble know where to turn.
Reflection Section

The reflection section follows the introduction and contains the reflection activities. In the text below, each reflection is described using the following format: First, the utilized problem theme is explained. (Recall that the problem theme is a continuum with a neutral idea somewhere at the center and problems on either extreme end). Next, any solutions besides reflection and questioning (the solution that is the basis for all the activities) are listed. This is followed by an explanation of the other ideas and suggestions that were incorporated into the reflection. The description ends with the support idea that is offered.

Reflection 1

The first reflection includes the problem theme of *commitment and capacity to care*. The neutral idea on the continuum is having a reasonable level of commitment to and care and concern for the people served, being able to care for those one serves as fellow human beings, and being open to caring about people you have not yet met. The problem on one extreme is that the server is apathetic towards the people served, disconnected and performing the service insincerely. The server may keep a distance from those served, devalue them, approach them with stereotypes, or not care about what happens to them. The problem on the other extreme is that the server may be artificial, saying they care for everyone. Alternatively they may actually try to care for everyone and torture themselves emotionally because they feel they do not care enough.
This reflection, being the first, has servers investigating others’ assumptions, rather than their own. Elder and Paul’s (2002) idea of considering other people’s inferences and assumptions, is partially used. However, emphasis is not placed on inferences because of time limits and because the goal is to identify assumptions so their validity can be questioned. The narratives from which servers identify assumptions, are inspired by concerns mentioned by Jones (2002), Gent and Gurecka (2001), and Radest (1993). Care was taken in composing these perspectives to be sure that none was an obvious straw man argument, because the purpose here was not to make one argument clearly right or wrong, but to have the servers think. Within the activity, servers are reminded that there is not a correct answer.

The support idea was included to remind servers that these reflections are personal, in the hopes that they would be more open to thinking about their true ideas, rather than being guarded out of fear that others would judge them.

Reflection 2

The second reflection includes the problem theme of *impact of peripheral activities*. The neutral idea on the continuum is service that can include direct service and peripheral activities. The problem on one extreme is service that only includes peripheral activities (such as theorizing or fundraising). The problem on the other extreme is service that only includes direct work, no peripheral activities.

This reflection includes additional solutions of *being honest or not pretending about the goodness of service*, as well as *consider not doing activities that are not truly service or are not working*. 
This reflection uses examples of a service activity that is not the server’s, however it does ask the servers questions about their thoughts on the examples, making it slightly more personal than the first reflection, though hopefully not too personal that it will be difficult at this early stage.

The support idea included in this reflection reminds servers that it is ok to consider whether something is not working, in case they feel they are betraying their program or other people if they question their service. The basic idea is taken from Illich (1968) who asks servers to question whether their service is working.

**Reflection 3**

The third reflection includes the problem theme of *ulterior motives and responsibility for problems*. The neutral idea on the continuum is engagement in a service activity because it includes a problem or issue the server has some responsibility for and ability to address; service is not engaged in solely for ulterior motives such as political pressure, financial gain, or other agendas. The problem on one extreme is that service is done because a server believes they have a responsibility to fix everything. They overestimate their own responsibility for the problem being addressed. This could possibly result from guilt. The problem on the other extreme is that service is done mainly because the server will reap an advantage, not because of any feeling of responsibility in the problem being addressed.

An additional solution incorporated into this reflection is *being honest or not pretending about the goodness of service.*
It is possible that this reflection is slightly more personal than the previous two, as servers might be reminded of their own motives for serving; however, an attempt has been made to mainly focus on general questions, so servers are not overwhelmed.

Support ideas were based on Cranton’s (2006) suggestion that quiet activities may be helpful when individuals are involved in self-reflection, as well as Dunlap’s (1998) and Cranton’s (2006) suggestions to refer individuals to other people who can help.

**Reflection 4**

The fourth reflection includes the problem theme of *valuing of lifestyles*. The neutral idea on the continuum is that the server values both their own lifestyle and those of the served. The problem on one extreme is that the server holds the opinion that only others’ lifestyles are of value, their own does not have value. The problem on the opposite extreme is that the server holds the opinion that only their own lifestyle is of value, others’ do not have value. The server may promote their own lifestyle or assume others’ need to be improved.

The additional specific solution is that drawn from Jones (2002) and paraphrased above as *servers connect service with their own lives*.

The idea to center this reflection around a role play came from Cranton (2006). This reflection places more emphasis on the server’s own assumptions, directly asking them questions about the assumptions they made. However, it is still slightly general, rather than personal, as they are not asked to question something that actually took place in their service, or conduct a portion of a reflection activity with someone involved in their service program.
Since this is the first reflection where servers are really asked specifically about their assumptions, the support piece reminds servers that it is ok to have assumptions, in an effort to ensure that they do not feel bad for doing something so natural to humans. This is based in Elder and Paul (2002).

**Reflection 5**

The fifth reflection includes the problem theme of *individual abilities*. The neutral idea on the continuum is holding the idea that, in service, both parties have needs and abilities. The problem on one extreme is the assumption that servers have nothing to contribute; servers are not needed while recipients have all the abilities and do not need any assistance. The problem on the other extreme is the assumption that recipients have nothing to contribute; recipients are not needed while servers have all the abilities and do not need any assistance.

The additional solutions contained in this reflection include: *working or communicating with recipients, being honest or not pretending about the goodness of service and servers connect service with their own lives.*

The use of a *critical incident* to structure this reflection is based on explanations from Cranton (2006) and Brookfield (2005). The actual critical incident included is a real incident from this author’s service (thus, no copyright has been violated). This reflection is more personal than the earliest reflections. Servers are here asked to question something that actually occurred during their service. They have the opportunity to consider assumptions they made regarding a specific situation they were involved in.
Support offered at the end of this reflection is inspired by Radest’s (1993) assertion that everyone has needs to which others can respond. Since the servers’ work focuses on assisting others, it is assumed that some of them might benefit from the reminder that they also have needs.

Reflection 6

The sixth reflection includes the problem theme of lasting effectiveness of service. The neutral idea on the continuum is that a server considers whether the service activity has long-term effects, while also realizing that short-term effects can be important. The problem on one extreme is that a server considers, or holds important, only what happens in the long-term, putting efforts toward nothing other than long-term solutions and even making goals that are so long-lasting that they cannot be reasonably achieved. The problem on the other extreme is that a server does not consider the long-term effects of their service, and may assume whatever efforts they put forth are working well and will make a lasting difference.

Solutions that are a part of this reflection include working or communicating with recipients, being honest or not pretending about the goodness of service, and the specific solution drawn from Gent and Gurecka (2001), paraphrased above as reflections look at root causes of problems by creating dialog between servers and recipients.

This activity is also based partly on Eyler’s (2002) idea that servers can reflect with community partners, as well as Illich’s (1968) emphasis that servers communicate with the people served to know if the service is working. This reflection is more personal and does ask the server to question their own assumptions, as it includes opportunities for
servers to look carefully at the effects of their service and what they think about those
effects.

One of the support ideas was included with the recognition that servers might
despair if they conclude their service is ineffective. While it is important to acknowledge
ineffective service, it is not the intent that servers would continually focus on what they
are doing wrong. Thus servers are encouraged to also think of things they might be doing
well. Additionally, this reflection includes a reminder, which could be logically deduced
from the basic premise of questioning assumptions that is emphasized in all these
reflection: All knowledge can be considered critically. Guevara (2004) is given credit in
this reflection as he notes that no knowledge needs to be taken for granted, even “local
knowledge” (133). Other people’s knowledge, as well as our own, can be considered
critically.

Reflection 7

The seventh reflection includes the problem theme of individual and group
differences and similarities. The neutral idea on the continuum is the server
simultaneously recognizing that there are both similarities and differences between
oneself and the recipient and between the recipient and an associated group (for example,
people of similar age, ethnicity, gender, and so on.) The problem on one extreme is that a
server thinks they are not like a recipient in any way and the recipient is no different from
anyone in an associated group. The problem on the other extreme is that a server thinks
they are just like a recipient and the recipient has no similarities with anyone of any
group.
Additional solutions incorporated into this reflection include *working or communicating with recipients*, as well as the specific solution drawn from Weah, Simmons, and Hall (2000), and paraphrased above as *servers compose a narrative case study on the experience and perspective of someone very different from themselves*.

This reflection is rather personal as it focuses on the server’s own assumptions and also gives them the opportunity to communicate with someone they serve. The note about personal identity is inspired by Radest (1993).

The support ideas are based on Dunlap (1998).

**Reflection 8**

The eighth reflection includes the theme of *problem severity*. The neutral idea on the continuum is taking the appropriate urgency for the problem the service attempts to address. The problem on one extreme is that the severity is underestimated; not enough urgency or attention is given to a problem and there may be an assumption that any small effort will be sufficient because the problem is not important. The problem on the other extreme is that the severity is overestimated; the problem is seen as a crisis, so people may be desperate in addressing it, or they may be paralyzed from acting.

The additional solutions incorporated in this reflection include: *being honest or not pretending about the goodness of service and consider not doing activities that are not truly service or are not working*.

The questions in this reflection are based loosely on Cranton’s (2006) explanation of content, process, and premise questions. This reflection includes significant focus on considering personal assumptions, much more so than the beginning reflections. A very
short closing activity is included to encourage servers to review important thoughts they have encountered. This is inspired by Eyler’s (2002) explanation of reflection at the end of service to help servers understand what has occurred, however her ideas are more involved than could be applicable here.

Since this is the last reflection, it is assumed that servers may be concerned about what is next, or what to do because of new ideas considered and new experiences encountered. Therefore, in the support section of this reflection, servers are reminded that it might be helpful to think of how to proceed. The idea that planning future action may be helpful, as well as a method for such planning, are based on Cranton (2006). Eyler (2002) also suggests that, at the end of service, servers might consider next steps.

Support Section

The support section is included to assist servers who might be having a difficult time with the reflections or because of the reflections. The section contains suggestions about actions or ideas that could help. Some of the support suggestions in this section are not listed anywhere else in the educational tool, while others are repeated after having been included in the earlier sections. The repetition and gathering of all support suggestions into one section is intentional; if a server is having trouble, they are supported in a number of places throughout the educational tool and also have quick and easy access to multiple ideas for support by turning to this section.

Most of the support suggestions were discussed above with the reflections they accompanied, and so will not be discussed again here.
Dunlap’s (1998) suggestions about offering servers the student comments and resources from her article, was used. The first six of twelve student comments in Dunlap’s article were listed in the support section of the educational tool. Additionally, a list of possibly useful literature was provided. Literature included Dunlap’s article as well as other articles considering problems of service, which were used in creating this educational tool.

Cranton’s (2006) suggestion to support individuals in action planning is expanded on in this section. Her method is paraphrased for the benefit of the servers. Reading Cranton’s work also inspired the suggestions that it is acceptable to change or keep old opinions and that one might look online or in the library for alternative viewpoints.

References and End Note Section

This section, containing references and one end note, was included in case servers or others want more information about the ideas used in the educational tool or how the educational tool was created.
CONCLUSIONS

It is difficult to find literature and individuals discussing the possible problems of service; however, it can be shown that problems of service exist. Even an initial review of available research reveals problems and solutions. These problems and solutions can be categorized in order to aid in understanding them. Specifically, these can be arranged into four categories. From the fourth category, which is concerned with negative side effects that stem from server attitude, eight problem themes can be distinguished. While multiple solutions of the fourth category can be found, appropriate reflection is the major recommendation to prevent or deal with problems that stem from server attitude. From the knowledge gained about problems and solutions, an educational tool could be created which will hopefully assist servers to avoid problematic service and engage in beneficial service.

Possibilities for further study exist. The educational tool may be evaluated with servers in order to understand its possible impact. Such evaluation could take a variety of directions. Study could be undertaken to determine whether the educational tool has a significant positive effect on servers’ attitudes. Although it is hoped this impact would be positive, perhaps there is actually an unknown negative effect of the educational tool on servers’ attitudes. Along another line, study could be undertaken to determine how a change in server attitude, initiated by the educational tool, affects the service provided. It stands to reason that improving server attitude will improve effectiveness of service; however, this should be verified through further study.
An increase in appropriate literature could also allow future study. Although a
diligent search was undertaken to find appropriate literature to analyze, only a small
amount was discovered. Thus, it is possible that, if more appropriate literature becomes
available, additional problems and solutions might be found in an analysis, to
complement those that were already identified.

Additionally, and especially if more appropriate literature can be found, it may be
possible to analyze categories 1, 2, and 3 as category 4 was analyzed to understand
patterns. From such analysis, perhaps another tool could be created which would assist
service program designers in creating service projects so they avoid the problems in the
first three categories.

Finally, overall study of the problems of service and support for the careful
consideration of service would be useful. As seen above, there are negative ramifications
from failure to face the problems of service. For example, when servers attempt to
convert others to their way of life, they may cause more destruction than assistance, as
Illich explains; helping relationships can take feelings of goodness from the served and
transfer them onto the server, creating dependency, as Schultz notes; and as McKnight
warns, being treated as clients, individuals and even entire communities may eventually
loose the ability to determine their own needs or help themselves. If we want to avoid
these disturbing possibilities, continued investigation into the problems of service, and
their solutions, is needed.

This project has been an attempt to further such investigation and to assist others
with their own consideration of service, through the creation of a tool that may alleviate
some of the negative impacts caused when individuals do not think carefully about their service. Even though it is difficult, continued consideration of the questionable aspects of service should be encouraged. The danger that the above problems could become widespread is enough to warrant this precautionary action. We will not improve the situation by continuing to assume that service is automatically good. Everyone involved in service should carefully consider where it leads. Without such reflection and thinking, we could end up causing trouble where we mean to help.
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APPENDIX

EDUCATIONAL TOOL
REFLECTIONS
for Service

Developed by Heather Sanderson
Introduction

Welcome! You have chosen to be involved in service. We hope your experience is beneficial. Thank you for including this booklet in your service experience. The booklet’s purpose is to help you think about the ways service may be carried out and the possible impacts such service may have.

Since you are here, you may already be aware of some benefits and positive effects of service. What many people do not realize is that, depending on how it is carried out, there can be some problems and negative effects of service. This booklet was created after an extensive study of the problems and negative effects of service, as well as solutions for preventing them. This booklet of reflection activities is an attempt to help servers engage in service without unintentionally causing negative effects.

The booklet contains eight individual reflection activities. These activities are not intended to indoctrinate you or to direct you toward a correct answer, but rather to help you think about your reasons for your opinions and the reasons why you might wish to keep or change those opinions.

Additionally, you will never be required to show anyone your reflections or share your ideas with anyone. No one is forcing you to reveal your opinions or any of your thoughts from the reflections. You should feel free to hold opinions contrary those around you, even the majority viewpoint, though you may find that society requires you to keep those opinions to yourself.

Each weekly reflection begins with a short reading or an activity to complete, followed by questions based on the reading or activity. All of the reflections focus on service. It is suggested that you respond to these reflection activities and questions as if you were keeping a journal. That way, if you would like to, you can refer back to any earlier thoughts or reconsider any of the reflections later in your experience. You may use any type of paper you like to keep your journal. For example, you might use a bound notebook, or loose paper kept in a folder. Use the option that suits you best in order to keep all your responses together.

If you are unsure of how to begin, you might try creating a routine. For example: you might always begin on a certain day or at a certain time; you might locate a comfortable place that you could always reflect in; you might use a particular pen or pencil.

The reflection activities are intended to be completed in the order they are listed. Start out with Reflection 1. The following week move to Reflection 2, and so on. The kinds of questions you will consider in these reflections are sometimes hard to deal with, so you only have one reflection activity per week. It is suggested that you don’t push yourself too hard. Don’t try to do them all at once. Don’t worry too much over any one particular reflection, but please take them seriously.

If you find reflection difficult, there are supportive ideas at the end of each activity as well as a longer list of supportive ideas at the end of this booklet.
Reflection 1 – Commitment and Capacity to Care

When we are engaged in service, we make assumptions; however, our assumptions can affect the choices we make and the ways we act. Considering our assumptions may help us carry out service that is beneficial rather than problematic.

Assumptions are ideas “we take for granted or presuppose” (Elder and Paul, 2002: 34). Elder and Paul assert that because there is not time to question everything, people make assumptions constantly in order to deal with the world: These assumptions may be justified if they are based on good reasons, or unjustified if they are not.

In this reflection we will practice identifying and evaluating other people’s assumptions so that eventually you can examine your own.

Here are a few examples to show how an assumption can be identified. Sometimes a statement is actually just an assumption, as in the following: *Happiness is the most important thing.* More often, a statement is built upon one or more hidden assumptions. For instance, consider this assertion: *The world won't get any better until everyone becomes willing to give a few hours each week to their community.* This statement assumes (1) that there is no other way to make the world any better, and (2) that everyone *can* give a few hours each week to their community. Sometimes identifying assumptions is a bit tricky, as in this example: *People should not have too many aspirations for their children.* It may sound like a complete assumption in and of itself, but it is actually built on the notion that something bad will happen if they do have too many aspirations for their children. It is up to you to evaluate whether you think this assumption is valid (perhaps because the parents may become demanding of their children) or invalid (maybe because parents who have no hopes for their children are not motivated to help them succeed).

On the next page there are three narratives from fictitious servers who explain their philosophy about the appropriate level of commitment to and care for the people they serve. You will be determining the assumptions behind each narrative. (These assumptions may be easier to identify if you work with one sentence at a time.) You will also be deciding how valid you feel each assumption is. (Remember, because there isn’t a correct answer here, there may be some assumptions in each narrative that you find more valid, and some assumptions in each narrative that you find less valid.)

(continued)
**Server 1:** Caring deeply for each individual I work with is essential for service. In fact, the reason so many are suffering in the world is that people don't care enough for others, especially those they don't know. I feel that caring less about some people than about others is unfair, and so I sometimes feel guilty that I spend more time with friends and relatives than with others who might need my help. Although I sometimes find myself feeling withdrawn from trying to care about all the suffering people in the world, I know that I'm not trying hard enough if I don't care deeply about people I've never met.

**Server 2:** Getting to know the people I work with is important to me, but it takes time, so I don't pretend that I have managed to care for everyone identically. I feel that people are too quick to decide how much they care for others, and it wouldn't be fair if I were to act that way in a rush to express concern. I do put a lot of time into trying to know people—so much, in fact, that sometimes I feel a bit overwhelmed; there are just too many to get to know as well as I would like to.

**Server 3:** A fair amount of professional detachment is required to do this work. I'm not here to get to know people, but to help fix their problem. Getting to know these people closely is difficult and often disappointing. I think this work is important, but sometimes I wish I didn't have to work with people who make me feel uncomfortable. At this point, I consider it a waste of time and effort getting to know everyone I serve personally.

Questions:
1) What are the assumptions behind each narrative?
2) How valid do you find each of these assumptions?

Support:
Remember, you do not have to share your thoughts with anyone. These activities are for you and will not be collected.
Reflection 2 – Impact of Peripheral Activities

Service can be thought of in many ways. One way is to think of direct service with individuals, where servers have interactions with those served, as distinct from activities which are peripheral to direct service, such as fundraising or planning done to support the direct service. Service projects may include both types, or only one or the other. Consider the following example:

First, imagine a service program that focuses on encouraging people to donate their computers to a center where they are used in helping jobless individuals find jobs. Jobseekers who come to the center can use the computers to access the internet and look for job advertisements. They can use email to communicate with potential employers. They can use the computers to create a résumé and complete job applications. There are also individuals who serve at the center to assist these jobseekers and offer advice as they are looking for work. They may explain how to search for jobs, write a résumé, or fill out an application, or they may help individuals set up an email account or learn other computer skills.

Second, imagine one extreme of this program. Individuals are asked to donate their computers to other people who do not have computers, but are looking for work. There is no center where the computers are used and no volunteers to assist individuals in using the donated computers; no emphasis is placed on this type of direct service. Individuals are given computers and it is up to them to use the computers to find a job.

Now imagine another extreme of the original hypothetical program. There is a center where jobless individuals are assisted in finding jobs, however, there are no computers available at the center. Volunteers serve at the center and give advice on finding a job. They may even help jobseekers fill out paper applications. However, no computer resources are available as no emphasis is placed on the peripheral activities that would encourage others to donate computers.

Questions about the example:
1) What is the main purpose of the activity described in the three scenarios above?
2) What might be the benefits and detriments of each of the three scenarios described above?
3) Do you think the effectiveness of the service is fully reached or compromised for each of the three scenarios described above?
4) Would you feel comfortable performing service under each of the three scenarios described above? Why or why not?
5) If you feel that the ideal position on this continuum is somewhere in the middle, could other service activities require different balances?

(continued)
Other questions:
6) Explain whether you think it is possible to have an effective service project that requires no peripheral activities like fundraising.
7) Explain whether you think it is possible to have an effective service project that consists entirely of peripheral activities, and no direct interaction with those served.

Support:
It is ok to consider whether something is working or not. In fact, it is actually important to consider whether or not service is working (Illich, 1968).
Reflection 3 – Ulterior Motives and Responsibility for Problems

This reflection focuses on responsibility for the problems intended to be remedied through service, and motivations for engaging in the service that intends to remedy such problems.

Sometimes servers may engage in service because they feel responsible for a certain problem and they are motivated to address the problem because they want to and are able to do so. At other times one may serve because he or she feels a responsibility to address all the problems of the world. He or she may experience guilt because a problem is occurring, and so desire to remedy it. On different occasions, one may engage in service for reasons other than addressing a problem. For example, a server’s primary motivation may be that the service benefits them personally, like furthering their career, or the server may feel a duty to serve, or feel it is politically advantageous.

One’s reasons for service may affect the type of service one provides and the ability to provide effective service. For example, servers who are interested in helping and feel they have a responsibility to serve may take their service position seriously, which benefits the organization they are involved with, but if this sentiment is taken to extremes it might result in burnout and frustration for the servers. In another example, an individual may engage in service because there is some personal reward for doing so, and then is cold towards or possibly unhelpful to those they are serving.

Since our feelings of responsibility for a problem, and our motivation to engage in service, may affect the service we provide, it may help to consider such topics.

Ideas to consider:
1) Try to think of a situation where one person or group is unintentionally playing a role in another’s misfortune and it would be irresponsible for the first person/group to benefit from or disregard the misfortune of the second (rather than attempting to alleviate the misfortune).
2) Try to think of a situation where an individual gets to be in an unfortunate position due to repeated poor choices or actions, and it would be irresponsible to alleviate the misfortune and thus enable that person to continue this pattern.
3) Write down some negative outcomes that could result from taking too much responsibility for a problem that is not, even in part, yours to remedy.
4) Write down some negative outcomes that could result from performing service for ulterior motives (such as to add a line on a résumé) when you have some personal responsibility for remedying the problem.

(continued)
Support:
Sometimes activities that encourage quiet, like meditation or yoga, can help with reflection.

When reflection is emotionally difficult, it can be helpful to talk to someone you trust or a professional who can help you work through any concerns or difficulties. Feel free to consider approaching people who you think may be supportive and able to help you.
Reflection 4 – Valuing of Lifestyles

For this reflection, you will engage in a role play. You can choose to do this on your own by writing or imagining. You can choose to act this out on your own or you can have someone else assist you with the role play by acting along with you.

Your role is described in the following paragraph. In the description, “you” refers to the real you, while “R” refers to the role/person that you will play. You can develop the situation, words, and actions for your role based on your own knowledge, ideas and experience. You can choose a name and background for R. You will determine what R does and says.

Description of your role:
R is a recipient of the service you currently provide. R is having a conversation with a friend about why R is involved with the service you are currently providing. R’s friend is asking questions, which R must respond to in some way determined by you. You can choose any setting for the discussion (for example, R’s neighborhood, the site where the service takes place, etc.).

These are the basic questions R’s friend asks:
How are you?
What’s going on in your life right now?
What led you to become a part of this service program?

Once you have finished the role play, return to this sentence to continue the reflection.

If you haven’t already, write down some notes about what you thought, said, and did during your role play.

Now consider the following questions (as yourself):
1) How did it feel to take a different perspective?
2) Did you have any questions about what to say or do in your role?
3) What assumptions did you make when deciding what you would say or do in your role? (It might help to look back at your notes in order to remember.)
4) What assumptions did you make about R’s lifestyle?
5) Do you have any evidence as to whether or not these assumptions are representative of real people who are recipients of the service you provide?
6) What other information would you need to gather to determine if your assumptions are justified or not?
7) What assumptions did you make about your own lifestyle in relation to R’s?
8) What assumptions did you make about the value of R’s lifestyle?
9) What assumptions did you make about the value of your own lifestyle?
Support:
It is ok to have assumptions, everyone does. Because there is not time to question everything, people make assumptions constantly in order to deal with the world (Elder and Paul, 2002). Don’t feel like you are a bad person or have done something wrong by having assumptions. We just need to look at our assumptions and decide whether we have good reasons for them.
Reflection 5 – Individual Abilities

In this reflection, you will be considering situations that have occurred during service. These will be called “critical incidents” (Brookfield, 2005: 55). In the first part, you will read another server’s critical incident and consider questions about it. In the second part, you will recall one of your own critical incidents and consider questions about that.

Part 1: Another Server’s Critical Incident

Example Incident:

Part of my service time is spent at an inner-city elementary school, working with kids in their classroom. Last week one of the students, I’ll call him “S,” was near the coat rack, crying. He looked like he was really upset so I wanted to help him. I asked him what was wrong. He said his grandma was going to be mad and he was going to get in trouble. (He lives with his grandma.) When I asked why, he said he lost his beanie. (His knit hat.) He said his grandma would be really mad that he lost his beanie. I tried to console him, but it didn’t really work. He said his grandma was still going to be mad. Later that day, I got an idea. Since it’s winter, we just got a large donation of beanies at the center. S needed a beanie just as much as the other people we serve at the center. The next day, when S arrived at school, I saw that he wasn’t wearing a beanie. When he was hanging his coat on the rack, I went up to give him the new beanie. I made sure other kids weren’t around listening, because I thought he might be a little embarrassed if they heard he was being given a beanie. I pulled out the beanie and asked him if he needed one. I explained that this was for him because he had lost his old one. He just looked at me for a bit. I said, “Didn’t you lose yours? This is for you so your grandma won’t be mad.” Then he took it and stuffed it in his coat. I don’t think he said anything. If he did, he said it very quietly. I thought he would be so happy that he got a new beanie to replace the lost one. I thought I was doing something that would help him, but I’m not sure if it helped.

Questions about the example incident:
1) What needs and abilities do you think each person brought to this incident?
2) The server may have made assumptions about the child’s needs and about the child’s ability to deal with them. The server may have also made assumptions about his or her own needs and abilities. What assumptions do you think the server made?
Part 2: Your Own Critical Incident
Think back to something specific that you were involved in recently at your service site, where help, assistance, need, or ability was involved. Describe the incident in writing. Include as many details as you can remember, such as: what happened, who was involved, what did each person say, how did people react, etc. Also explain whether you felt it was positive or negative, and why.

Now, ask yourself these questions:
1) What needs and abilities do you think each person brought to this incident?
2) Was this a beneficial situation for the people involved? What details or evidence lead you to conclude this? If you are unsure, what further information would you need in order to make a conclusion?
3) What assumptions did you make in writing about this incident?
4) What might result if servers saw themselves at the only ones who had abilities and only the recipients were seen as having needs?
5) What might result if servers saw themselves as the only ones who had needs and only the recipients were seen as having abilities?

Support:
It is alright to have needs. Everyone has needs that can be responded to (Radest, 1993). You don’t have to feel like you must be perfect.
Reflection 6 – Lasting Effectiveness of Service

Take some time to have a discussion with someone who is directly served in your program. If this is not possible, have a discussion with another person who is involved in the work at your service site, preferably someone who has been there for a while and is knowledgeable about the concerns of those you serve and the problem your service is attempting to remedy. In your discussion, ask the other person for thoughts about the following questions. (Feel free to also think about how you would answer these questions.)

1) Our service attempts to address a problem; how would you describe that problem?
2) Why is the problem occurring?
3) What needs to happen to address the problem?
4) How would you describe any effects our service is having on the problem? How long do the effects last, and are they positive or negative?

After the discussion, return to this sentence to continue the reflection activity.

Now, consider these questions on your own:
1) How do the other person’s thoughts on the questions above compare to your own thoughts?
2) How long should positive effects of your service be expected to last?
3) What are negatives of doing service, the effects of which are extremely short-lasting?
4) What are negatives of setting goals for service to have such long-lasting effects that you cannot meet the goals?
5) What are negatives about doing service and assuming short-term effects are not important?
6) What are negatives about doing service and assuming long-term effects are not important?

Support:
This kind of reflection can be hard work, especially if we feel that we’re not doing a good job. Remember to consider things you might also be doing well.

Remember, all knowledge can be considered critically. No knowledge needs to be taken for granted or assumed correct automatically. This includes the knowledge and experience of the people involved (Guevara, 2004). Other people’s knowledge, as well as our own, can be considered critically.
Reflection 7 – Individual and Group Differences and Similarities

Talk with someone connected with your service who you think may have a background or perspective very different from your own. You will want to be at least a little comfortable with the person. Talk with this person about their life. You might ask them to explain some major parts of their life, such as: where they were born, where they grew up, what events they feel were significant in their life, or how they got to where they are today. You could ask what ideas and activities are important to them. You may ask if they have been involved in any activities they would consider service and if so, to share a bit with you. (Their definition of service does not matter.) You may also think of something that is important to you and ask if they have any thoughts about it. During or after your conversation, make notes about what was discussed so that you do not forget.

The purpose for gathering this information is to get to know a person who you think may be different from yourself. The intent is not to pry into the person’s life, expose secrets, or make the person feel uncomfortable. Please be kind, be respectful of the person, and do not share the information with others unless the person has given their permission. Additionally, let the person know that they do not have to share anything that they do not wish to. You should also be willing to share some information about yourself, if both of you agree to that.

If you are unable to communicate with someone connected to your service, you can talk with someone else who may have a background or perspective very different from your own. If you are unable to find anyone, you may read an autobiography of someone who you think may have a background or perspective very different from your own.

After your discussion, ask yourself the four questions below. Rather than making assumptions about the person, try to find evidence for your ideas in the notes from your discussion. You may be reluctant to consider how someone is different from you, or may be typical of a group. It is important, however, to remember that our similarities and differences with other individuals and groups are valid and important aspects of our personal identity (Radest, 1993).

Questions
1) How am I similar to this person?
2) How am I different from this person?
3) How might this person be similar to other people who might be seen as being of the same “group” (for example, people of the same age, ethnicity, gender, religion, etc.)?
4) How might this person be different from other people who might be seen as being of the same “group” (e.g., people of the same age, ethnicity, gender, religion, etc.)?
Support:
Individuals sometimes need to be reminded that it is alright to consider differences. As Michelle Dunlap, who works with servers and has written about their concerns, says, “it is okay to notice, think about, and discuss issues of difference” (Dunlap, 1998: 64). For more ideas from Michelle Dunlap about considering differences, including quotes from other servers, see the support section at the end of this booklet.
Reflection 8 – Problem Severity

Sometimes servers may underestimate the severity of a problem they hope to remedy through service. They may believe that any goal is realistic to achieve easily if their desire is strong enough. Or, they may believe that simply intending to do good will assure that their service effectively addresses the problem without causing negative effects.

On the opposite extreme, servers may overestimate the severity of a problem they hope to remedy through service. They may see the problem as a crisis or emergency that must be fixed right away, leading them to become careless in their service as they desperately initiate activities aimed at addressing the emergency. Alternatively, overestimating the severity of a problem may paralyze some servers from doing anything to address a situation which seems insurmountable.

Consider these questions:
1) Try to think of any possible negative effects that could result from underestimating the severity of the problem you are trying to remedy with your service.
2) Try to think of any possible negative effects that could result from overestimating the severity of the problem you are trying to remedy with your service.
3) What level of attention or urgency do you think should be given to the problem you are attempting to address through your service?
4) Why do you think this level of attention or urgency should be given?
5) How did you come to hold this view, e.g., did you arrive at it through discussions with friends, reading, television, your faith, etc.?
6) How might your thoughts about the severity of the problem affect the way you view your service?

Closing Activity
It is hoped that, through these reflections, you have not felt pushed towards a correct answer that you must believe, but that you have considered ways service can be carried out and possible effects it can have. At this point, take the opportunity to recall what you have considered and note any thoughts, ideas, or lessons that you have found especially important during your service and reflection.

Support:
Sometimes, after considering new ideas or going through a new experience, individuals might feel uneasy or unsure about how to proceed. Some people find it is helpful to spend time considering the effect they want these new ideas and experiences to have on their life, and trying to decide what’s next. If you have a method for thinking about what’s next, feel free to engage in that. If not, you may find a method in the support section at the end of this booklet.
Support

Listed below are a number of suggestions that might help if you are having trouble reflecting or if you are having any difficulty because of ideas or emotions brought up during reflections. Some of these suggestions have been listed before, at the end of the reflection activities.

• Remember, these activities are not intended to indoctrinate you or to direct you toward a correct answer, but rather to help you think about your reasons for your opinions and the reasons why you might wish to keep or change those opinions.

• You don’t ever have to show anyone your reflections or share your ideas with anyone. No one is requiring you to reveal your opinions or any of your thoughts from the reflections. You should feel free to hold opinions contrary those around you, even the majority viewpoint, though you may find that society requires you to keep those opinions to yourself. (It is an unfortunate reality that sometimes certain opinions can be so unpopular that it might be unwise to express them in certain venues when there is nothing to be gained from doing so.)

• It is ok to consider whether something is working or not. In fact, it is actually important to consider whether or not service is working (Illich, 1968).

• Sometimes activities that encourage quiet, like meditation or yoga, can help with reflection.

• When reflection is emotionally difficult, it can be helpful to talk to someone you trust or a professional who can help you work through any concerns or difficulties. Feel free to consider approaching people who you think may be supportive and able to help you.

• It is ok to have assumptions, everyone does. Because there is not time to question everything, people make assumptions constantly in order to deal with the world (Elder and Paul, 2002). Don’t feel like you are a bad person or have done something wrong by having assumptions. We just need to look at our assumptions and decide whether we have good reasons for them.

• It is alright to have needs. Everyone has needs that can be responded to (Radest, 1993). You don’t have to feel like you must be perfect.

• This kind of reflection can be hard work, especially if we feel that we’re not doing a good job. Remember to consider things you might also be doing well.
• Remember, all knowledge can be considered critically. No knowledge needs to be
taken for granted or assumed correct automatically. This includes the knowledge and
experience of the people involved (Guevara, 2004). Other people’s knowledge, as
well as our own, can be considered critically.

• Sometimes, after considering new ideas or going through a new experience,
individuals might feel uneasy or unsure about how to proceed. Some people find it is
helpful to spend time considering the effect they want these new ideas and
experiences to have on their life, and trying to decide what’s next. If you have a
method for thinking about what’s next, feel free to engage in that. If not, you can find
one method in at the end of this section.

• It is ok to change your opinion or keep your old opinions after you have considered
them carefully. It is hoped that, either way, your reasons for your opinions will be
more clear to you once considered.

• If no one around you is supportive of considering alternative viewpoints, you might
look online or in the library for individuals or groups that are considering alternative
viewpoints.

Considering Differences
Individuals sometimes need to be reminded that it is alright to consider
differences. As Michelle Dunlap, who works with servers and has written about their
concerns, says, “it is okay to notice, think about, and discuss issues of difference”
(Dunlap, 1998: 64). She has also suggested that in multicultural service settings, servers
be provided with comments that her student-servers have shared in the past. Some of
those comments are listed below, in case they might help you. Please note that these
quotes are not considered to be the right or wrong way to think or feel; they are here to
assure you that other people are thinking about possibly-sensitive issues, in the hope that
you may also feel that it is ok to consider such issues.

“I knew that I had to go into it with an open mind. Which was really hard to do…I
knew that if I did have a pre-set mind…it would not be fair to myself, the teacher, or
any of the kids” (Dunlap, 1998: 60).

“I think if one focuses…on race, it is counterproductive and ultimately works to
separate, not unify, people” (Dunlap, 1998: 60).

“I’ll never truly know what it means to be black or Asian or Puerto Rican. They’ll
never know what it’s like to be white. No matter though, such is not the basis of our
relationships…However, we are all not the same. It’s vital to understand this concept.
The key is to accept and appreciate the variations while not letting them stand in your
way” (Dunlap, 1998: 60).
“I am ashamed that I was taught so little about the lives of people that aren’t like me. Because I knew so little, I have found it hard to discuss my feelings about it. I feel like I don’t want to offend anyone, but at the same time, I don’t even really know what is offensive” (Dunlap, 1998: 61).

“I had the weirdest experience toward the end of my time there. I caught a glimpse of myself in the two-way mirror. I saw myself peering through with my sapphire and diamond ring on one hand and an opal one on the left. I saw the sparkle of my equally costly bracelet on my wrist and I began to feel a wave of guilt” (Dunlap, 1998: 61).

“One incident that I feel a need to mention is one of a racial nature. One of the African American girls solely referred to one of their peers as ‘Yo, Chinese Girl.’ While the girl was obviously Asian, it appalled me. All I could think of is how this girl would react if she was called ‘black girl.’ The Asian girl did not have any response to the girl who spoke to her” (Dunlap, 1998: 61).

Relevant Literature

Some people may find it helpful to read relevant literature about service. The citations for possibly helpful literature are given below. This list includes Dunlap’s article, which provided the servers’ quotes above.


Considering What’s Next

After encountering a new idea or going through a new experience, some people may feel something has changed, but be unsure of how to proceed, not knowing if they want to undertake a new action, let go of an old action, or remain the same. Some people may find it helpful to spend time considering how to proceed. The following is one method that can be used to consider what’s next. This method is based on work by Cranton (2006: 172-173). It is only a suggestion, not a requirement.

- Envision your goals: What might you hope to do? The goals can be large or small.
- Consider the future: Which goals are short-term and which are long-term?
- Realize constraints: There may be boundaries that have to be placed on the goals. These might include financial resources, how the goal may affect others, or being realistic about what one can accomplish in the time allowed.
- Think about alternatives and consequences: Are there other options besides the goals immediately in mind? What are possible consequences of pursuing each goal?
- Determine how to make the change: What steps will be taken to implement the goal?
- Request feedback: Other people may notice or be affected by a change an individual makes. The individual may want to ask these people for feedback.
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