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Service-learning researchers and practitioners agree that reflection is the essential link between community experience and academic learning. "Reflection is the hinge in service-learning" (Eyler, 2001, p. 33). The context and content of student service experience or to the positive role emotion may play in helping students connect experience with academic study. This neglect needs to end. Recent research in cognitive psychology and neuroscience reveals emotion's central role throughout the thinking and learning process. We explore an approach to reflection that acknowledges the continuous interplay between the intellectual and the emotional throughout the reflective learning process.

I think therefore I am." Rene Descartes (1596-1650)

"The advantage of emotions is that they lead us astray." Oscar Wilde (1854-1900)

Giles and Eyler (1994), Fieco (1996), Hatcher and Bringle (1997), and others trace the theoretical roots of service-learning from John Dewey's educational and social philosophy to David Kolb's concepts of experiential education. Dewey and Kolb embrace a holistic view of learning as a life-long "process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience" (Kolb, 1984, p. 38). They further recognize that not all experiences are "germinally or apprately educational" (Dewey, 1938, p. 25). Instead, reflection acts as a bridge between conceptual understandings and concrete experiences. Service-learning proponents share this view, and research demonstrates that reflection is one of the core program characteristics necessary to effective practice in service-learning (Eyer & Giles, 1999; Eyler, Giles, & Schmelke, 1996; Hatcher & Bringle; Jacoby & As方便s, 1996). Hatcher, Bringle, and Mattathias recently (2004) summarized the consensus among service-learning scholars:

When reflection activities engage the learner in examining and analyzing the relationship between relevant, meaningful service and the interpretive template of a discipline, there is enormous potential for learning to broaden and deepen along academic, social, moral, personal, and civic dimensions. (p. 39)

Reflection and Learning

Dewey's central pillar of reflective thought and reflective activities serve as the foundation for contemporary service-learning practice, although the concept of service-learning had not been articulated when he wrote his philosophy of education. According to Giles and Eyler (1994), Dewey's explorations of "experience, inquiry, and reflection (are) the key elements of a theory of knowing in service-learning" (p. 79). In Dewey's scheme, reflection is a necessary connection between experience and theory. Experience alone does not produce learning; instead, as Bringle and Hatcher (1999) explain, "Experience becomes educative when critical reflective thought creates new meaning and leads to growth and the ability to take informed action." (p. 180). Dewey posits that learners continuously construct new meanings based on experience and analysis, moving from action to reflection to new action. Dewey's influence is apparent in the definitions of reflection in the service-learning literature; for example:

- Reflection "is the process that helps students connect what they observe and experience in the community with their academic study." (Eyler, 2001, p. 35).
- Reflection is "the ability to step back and ponder one's own experience, to abstract from it some meaning or knowledge relevant to other experiences." (Hatchings & Wintzoff, 1988, p. 15).

"It is through careful reflection that service-learning—indeed any form of experiential education generates meaningful learning." (Asch, Clayson, & Adkins, 2005, p. 50).

Dewey's approach to learning clearly establishes the theoretical foundation of service-learning practice and research.

Dewey's philosophy of learning emerged from a Western tradition that values reason above all. His Five Phases or Aspects of Reflective Thought are derived from the scientific method and are explicitly rational:

1. Suggestions
2. Intellectualization
3. The Hypothesis
4. Reasoning
5. Testing the hypothesis in action (from Giles & Eyler, 1994, pp. 79-80).

According to Dewey (1933), structured reflection permits learning to occur from the chaos and ambiguity of experience: "The function of reflection is to bring about a new situation in which the difficulty is resolved, the confusion cleared away, the trouble smoothed out, and the question it puts is answered." (p. 100). Emotion plays a central yet subtle role in Dewey's scheme: "Emotion is the moving and cementing force. It selects what is conscious and dyes it with its color, thereby giving qualitative unity to material externally disparate and dissimilar." (Dewey, 1934, p. 42). For Dewey, reflection is essentially a rational act, and emotion's role is crucial but limited. Emotion serves to catalyze scientific thought.

Like Dewey, David Kolb (1984) posits a constructivist and rationalist theory of learning. Kolb acknowledges that emotion has a role in the learning process: "To learn is not the special province of a single specialized realm of human functioning such as cognition or perception. It involves the integrated functioning of the total organism—thinking, feeling, perceiving, and behaving." (p. 31). However, Kolb's cycle of experiential learning, like Dewey's, makes emotion simply the catalyst for rational thought.
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Eyrle and Giles (1999) summarize the current state of "One moves from feeling, to observing, to thinking, to doing." (p. 193). Once again, emotion is clearly the trigger for the intellectual work of reflection. The emphasis on the rational is further reflected in Kolbe's four basic learning styles: convergent, divergent, assimilator, accommodator. This approach to learning styles and the learning process, despite holistic window-dressing, fails to recognize emotion as a valid and present aspect of the reflective process.

Emotions and Service-Learning

Dewey and Kolb view not only as the theoretical foundations but also as the practical bases for research on and pedagogical models of reflection in service-learning. The rationalist approach to reflection is evident throughout the research literature on service-learning. Eyrle and Giles (1999) make provocative but passing reference to emotion in Where the Learning is Service-Learning? In their analysis of program characteristics of effective service-learning, Eyrle and Giles emphasize the essential role of connections in good practice, including links "between affective and cognitive learning—experience and analysis, feeling and thinking, now and future" (p. 183). A few pages later, Eyrle and Giles echo Dewey by distinguishing between emotion (the process) and reason (the goal):

Students need considerable emotional support when they work as a group that new to them; there needs to be a safe space where they know that their feelings and insights will be respected and appreciated. As their service develops and their questions become more sophisticated, they need emotional support to think in new ways, develop alternative perspectives and observations, and question their original interpretations of issues and events (p. 185).

The progression from "emotional" response to "more sophisticated" and "intellectual" thinking illuminates the traditions both of separating emotion from reason and of privileging the rational over the emotional. Eyrle and Giles are not unique in maintaining this division. The Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning's special issue on strategic directions for service-learning research (2000), for example, virtually ignores emotion as a consideration in any aspect of the reflective process or of the field's research agenda. The potential for emotion to have a role in reflection is, at most, implicit in service-learning research.

The literature on reflection in practice is no different. Howard (2001) updated Principles of Good Practice for Service-Learning Pedagogy fails to mention emotion as a factor in student learning or faculty teaching. Eyrle and Giles (1999) propose the "5 Cs" as fundamental principles of reflection: connection, context, challenge, change, and coaching. The "5 Cs" do not exclude emotion, but they do not grant any explicit role to emotion in the reflection process. Hatchet and Bringle (1997) suggest that effective reflection must have five characteristics: a link experience to learning, be guided, occur regularly, permit feedback and assessment, and encourage the exploration of values. Hatchet and Bringle add to emotion's possible role only when addressing the clarification of values, noting that faculty can "assist students in processing the conflicting values that are often part of a service experience" and that student reflection may produce "a poignant description of the personal impact of the service" (p. 156-57). In a recent study, Hatchet, Bringle, and Ohlson (1999) develop this theme, demonstrating that "reflection activities should help students not only process the course material but also their personal values, civic attitudes, goals, and intentions" (p. 42). Once again, emotion is hinted at, but not seriously addressed, as a part of the reflective learning process.

The leading guides to service-learning course construction adopt and build on these models (e.g., Heffernan, 2001; Howard, 2001). Heffernan's Fundamentals of Service-Learning Construction, for instance, acknowledges the emotional aspects of service-learning in her initial chapter: "As faculty, students, and communities build upon their previous knowledge as maps that guide students as they develop cognitively affectively, emotionally, and morally over the course of the semester" (p. 16). Indeed, the myriad of examples that Heffernan cites through the text, exemplifies the emotional experience appears less than a handful of times. The most explicit reference is in an excerpt of a syllabus from Wayne State College that includes the following prompt questions in a longer section on "Reflections":

Possible personal reflections include: Would I do this again? Why or why not? Would I do anything differently next time? Was I discovering about myself that I didn't know before?... Without reflection, students simply go through the motions and are likely to become frustrated and emotionally overreacted to the experience (p. 27).

Even when emotion is given a prominent place in reflection, as this case illustrates, it is framed as "personal" and used primarily to promote larger cognitive goals. The personal-emotional nature of service-learning, in short, echoes the theoretical foundations of service-learning by giving little substantive attention to the role emotion may play in the reflective learning process.

Psychology of Emotions

Recent research in the psychology of emotions has challenged the traditional Western view that separates thinking from feeling, an assumption at the foundation of the reflective practice. Contrary to what Decartes, Star Trek's Mr. Spock, and scores of others have argued for centuries, pure reason cannot be divorced from emotion. Antonio Damasio (1994), for example, has used the tools of neuroscience to demonstrate that "certain aspects of the process of emotion and feeling are indispensable for rationality" (p. 23). Joseph LeDoux (2002) puts it more plainly: "A purely cognitive view of the mind, one that overlooks the role of emotions, simply won't do it." (p. 200). Emotions, in other words, is an essential part of the thinking process, not simply a catalyst for reason nor inherently obstructive to or a distortion from rational thought.

Just as reason and emotion can no longer be viewed as distinct and separable, the traditional divide between mind and body is no longer upheld by current theories of emotions. Instead, psychologists have found that in the elicitation of emotions, the brain is activated through neurological networks (LeDoux, 1996; Lewis & Haviland-Jones, 2000). These networks send signals to different parts of the brain depending on the type of emotion. For example, when a person experiences anger, the central nervous system locates the amygdala, which produces a range of physiological and cognitive responses to emotions—both accelerated heart beat and a constricted awareness (or labeling) of the emotion (LeDoux & Phelps, 2000). Some service networks send signals to different aspects of the brain for emotions, like the same networks notifying the brain of other cognitive and physiological responses. LeDoux (1996) explains "emotions are things that happen to us rather than things we will to occur. Although people can make decisions to modulate their emotions all the time... We have little direct control over emotional reactions." (p. 19). In other words, cognitive and emotional emotions are interrelated rather than parallel processes.

In research that complements these findings on the biological basis of emotions, cognitive psychologists have explored the ways individuals process and label emotions. At the root of all cognitive theories of emotion is the belief that emotions cannot occur without "cognition of one's experience." Lazarus (2001) explained that the term cognitive appraisal "emphasized[s] the complex, judgmental, and conscious process that must often be involved in appraising" an event (p. 51). In this process individuals respond to an experience by asking, implicitly or explicitly, the following questions: (a) How relevant is this event for me? Does it directly affect me or my social reference group? (relevance); (b) What are the implications or consequences of this event and how do these affect my well-being and my immediate or long-term goals? (implications); (c) How well can I cope with or adjust to the consequences of this event? (coping potential); and (d) What is the significance of this event with respect to my self-concept and social norms and values? (normative significance) (Scheier, Schorr & Johnstone, 2001, p. 94). Individual responses to these questions create the scaffolding and labeling of the emotion involved in the experience.

Cognitive theories (Scheier, Schorr, & Johnstone, 2001) have varying views regarding the process individuals use in labeling and assessing their emotions. Scheier (1984) argued that individuals ask themselves the four questions above in a fixed order, with no fluctuation in the sequence of questions. Conversely, Lazarus and Smith (1985) found that individuals move back and forth between these questions in what they perceive as a flexible process. How individuals label their emotions remains an area of debate in the study of emotions (Ekman, 1992; Fradella, 2000; Johnson-Laird & Oakley, 1989; Russell & Lazarus, 2000; Sabini & Silver, 2005). However, research has demonstrated that emotion is not a separate process from cognition. While neurological networks shape the initial physiological experience of emotion, individuals reflect on, make sense of, and label their emotions through the cognitive appraisal process.

If we acknowledge the inherent links between emotion and intellect in the process of learning from experience, must we incorporate into our current analysis and adopt a "touch-feely" agenda? No. As Damasio (1994) contends knowing about the relevance of feelings in the processes of reason does not suggest that reason is less important than feelings, that is simply "leaning a backseat or in that it should be less culminated. On the contrary, taking into account the preservativ role of feelings may give us a chance of enhancing their positive effects and reducing their potential harm." (p. 200). Just as service and learning are mutually dependent in good practice, we need to acknowledge that both reason and emotion are essential components of the reflective learning process. By considering the continual interplay of reason and emotion, we have the opportunity to develop more sophisticated and more effective theoretical models for research and practice in service-learning.

Emotions in Reflection

By opening the door to emotion, we are not suggesting that we should bring emotion into the reflection process; it has always been, and always will be...
Felin, Gielkens, and Durdy present, nor are we encouraging faculty to get reflection merely by asking students how they feel, nor do we advocate a new list of research simply counting the number of times students cry or get angry during service. Instead, we are suggesting that service-learning researchers and teachers explicitly consider the roles service can play throughout the reflective learning process. This consideration seems particularly important in service-learning because often students are placed in highly challenging community environments. If reflection is always a part of any learning process, it likely plays especially significant roles in the learning equations that link service to academic objectives.

So, what would it mean to take emotion seriously in the reflection and learning process? We will propose some specific steps in this direction, focusing on the way service-learning proponents define, practice, and research the reflective learning process. Our ideas are designed to initiate conversation rather than be the final word in this discussion. At our paper's title suggests, we are just beginning to feel our way toward a new understanding of emotion's role in learning.

We do not need to abandon Dewey and Kohl to define the reflective learning process in a way that acknowledges emotion. As we suggested earlier, Dewey and Kohl grant emotion's role a catalytic for reflective activity. This is not a minor point, and psychological research by Kagan (1994) and others reinforces Dewey and Kohl's attention to difference, discrepancy, and anomaly as a crucial trigger for learning and growth. However, a new definition should allow us to be present throughout the reflective process, not just at the beginning. The adult learning literature provides the baseline for such an approach.

For example, Brodd, Kohl, and Walter (1985) define reflection as a "generic term for those intellecutal and affective activities in which individuals engage to explore their experiences in order to lead to new understandings and appreciation." (p. 3) Integrating emotion into the service-learning literature would mean we re-define effective reflection in service-learning as a process involving the interplay of emotion and cognition in which people (students, teachers, and community partners) intentionally connect service service experiences with academic learning objectives.

Implications for Teaching Practice

Accepting this re-definition should lead to new practices in service-learning pedagogy, although the changes might not be great for some students. Tyler, Giles, and Schinke (1996) suggest that some students already may find ways to bring together intellect and emotion throughout the reflective process.

A more significant point at learning from experience when faculty provide multiple opportunities to practice reflection. Even the best writers will not automatically write on an individual basis during unstructured personal time, or through casual conversations with others. Students commented on the need to balance informal reflection with the more formalized critical thinking that occurs in classroom discussion.

Anecdotal conversations with faculty seem to indicate that at least some service-learning programs provide an opportunity for teachers to focus on reflection and, regular feedback to reinforce reflective learning. Although the recent student communities do not address emotion directly, new research on emotion's role in the learning of poetry suggests that such scaffolding can have a profound effect on student understanding. Eve-Wagemann (2004) experimental study demonstrates that "Explicit attention to feelings and emotions... can lead to deeper, more complex responses to poetry" (p. 189). First-year college students in this study, however, required explicit cues about emotion "to become aware of their affective [or emotional] responses" (p. 190). In this case, poetry and service-learning pedagogy might be parallel — the emotional content of "texts" (poetry and service) are essential for student learning, but students also need scaffolding to access that complexity and to develop their ability in cognitive appraisal. While such scaffolding might appear most often in service-learning journalists assignments such as Pilemperor's explicit attention to emotion in the reflective learning process need not be constrained to solitary writing.

Faculty also might prompt students to integrate emotion into the presentation and portfolios that often conclude service-learning courses. Students could be asked, for example, to draw on individual journals or small group discussions throughout the term to analyze both their own and other emotions emerging from their service experiences. Faculty additionally might have students gather evidence about how their emotions inform the work and perspectives of community members and agency staff at a service site. This evidence might allow students to identify how their emotions influence decision-making and shape social change. The explicit inclusion of emotion in the reflective learning process, then, likely will result in students developing more sophisticated understandings of themselves, their communities, and the academic material they are studying.

Openly including emotion in the service-learning reflection process encourages faculty to make reflection time a true "service." By no means do we advocate the role of emotion in the reflective learning process; we are not trying to create students who simply echo our own personal opinions.

Similarly, prompting students to address emotions in reflection should be designed to guide students as they learn the habits and processes that will help them use emotions productively beyond the classroom world. We are not trying to tell students what or how to feel. The cognitive appraisal literature might be particularly helpful in facilitating the emotional experiences of students.

Feeling a New Theory of Reflection

To facilitate attending to emotion in the analysis of reflection and learning processes, we suggest that students use questioning sequences, including the "What? So what? Now what?" approach to reflection (Tyler & Giles, 1999). Akin to cognitive reflective's work on relevance, implications and coping potential (Schon et al., 2001). Cognitive appraisal research, however, suggests that the reflective learning process should explicitly prompt the labeling of emotion ("How did this experience make you feel?") and then connect that emotional response to the analysis of experience ("What are the implications of this experience?" and of your reaction to it, for how you will think, feel, and act in the future?). Some, perhaps many, service-learning faculty already may have their own examples of such pedagogical tools. However, few models currently exist in the practitioner literature to serve as guides for faculty who seek to explicitly link emotion and intellect in the reflective learning process.

The dearth of examples may be a legacy of not just the rationalistic foundations of service-learning but also of what Howard (2001) has called a "widespread perception in academic circles that community service is a "soft" learning experience." (p. 16). In other words, some practitioners have been skeptical about service-learning's intellectual rigor because they have faced skepticism from colleagues. Acknowledging that our students may not be "soft." Rather, neuroscience and other "hard" disciplines are leading a revolution in understanding of cognition. Taking emotion seriously as one component of the learning process makes us more, not less, rigorous as long as our attention to emotion (like our attention to critical thinking) aims toward academic objectives.

Attending to emotion, however, may not be easy for many service-learning practitioners. Faculty and community partners may legitimately fear that they will not be able to adequately address and domain, variables of faculty emotions—or their own emotions. Faculty also may worry about how guiding emotions the equation; after all, grading service-learning work is complicated enough without adding another layer of subjectivity. Indeed, when teachers acknowledge the role of emotion in the classroom, they tend to highlight the importance of "emotional" control" (McDermott & Alterio, 2002, p. 41). However, such a view focuses on emotion as a negative influence on the classroom, despite the growing evidence that emotion also has a significant positive influence on learning. By ignoring emotions that exist and shape learning, we threaten to share students responsibility as educators and to limit the potential for real reflective learning.

Indeed, neglecting emotions in our classrooms and service-learning experiences may leave students to do their most difficult course work alone.
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If service-learning’s “best practices” literature were to take emotion into account, policymakers would have resources to help address important pedagogical questions including:

- What are effective ways to help students (and faculty) anticipate and learn from their emotional responses to community experiences?
- What types of exercises (journaling, discussion, etc.) most effectively help students integrate the emotional and intellectual components of reflective learning?
- What types of feedback from faculty or community partners most effectively helps students integrate the emotional and intellectual components of reflective learning?
- What are effective ways for faculty to leverage the range of emotions likely to emerge at varying times during a service-learning project?
- How might storytelling and other narrative techniques (McDermott & Alterio, 2007) be adapted to foster reflection that honors the interplay of the emotional and intellectual in service-learning classes?
- What can college service-learning faculty learn from new initiatives on Social and Emotional Learning in K-12 education? (Education Commission of the States, 2003)
- What feedback and grading approaches best support students as they engage in both the intellectual and emotional aspects of the reflective learning process?

The implications of these questions are not likely to be abandoned. How do we know the “best practices” of service-learning pedagogy, but rather think in new ways about what we already do in our courses?

**Implications for Research**

The service-learning research agenda also should expand to consider emotion throughout the reflective learning process. Once again, we will not propose a fully-formed theoretical model here, nor will we lay out a detailed research agenda. We simply want pose the question researchers might consider:

- Does explicit attention to the interplay of emotion and intellect throughout the reflective process produce enhanced achievement of academic learning goals?
- Does it result in different levels of student motivation and engagement? Does it lead to increased clarification of student values? Does it enable more purposeful civic learning by students?

- At what points in the reflective learning process (beyond catalysis) is emotion most significant?
- What are the characteristics of informal (non-faculty initiated) reflection activities that some students use in highly challenging community environments? How does this informal reflection influence both faculty-initiated reflection and overall student learning?
- How might service-learning researchers adapt innovative methodologies used by scholars studying emotion and cognition to answer significant questions in this field? Possible approaches to open new lines of research would include employing techniques developed to explore cognitive appraisal (Scheier et al., 2001), positive psychology (Peterson & Seligman, 2004), and social and emotional learning (Education Commission of the States, 2003).

As these questions suggest, many important research areas deserve attention.
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This paper introduces a conceptual model for supporting the continued development of service-learning as a pedagogy of engagement. A logic diagram is used to facilitate understanding of service-learning. The model illustrates the (a) complex elements involved in creating or sustaining a strong program, (b) potential tensions within the field, and (c) evaluation requirements at the level of a program or campus. The logic model also identifies tensions and issues that merit ongoing discussion amongst those committed to the continued development of service-learning in higher education.

Interest in service-learning has grown dramatically over the last 20 years. It is practiced in an increasing number of colleges and universities, and the literature on service-learning is expanding by leaps and bounds. Indeed, this pedagogy may be moving from the periphery of the academy to center stage as institutions of higher learning realize their place in the democratic project (Coles, 1999).

Promoted by these developments, the Indiana Campus Compact Faculty Fellows Class of 2003-2004 determined that a year-long conversation about service-learning’s standing and prospects might prove useful. Three questions guided our effort: What have we, as a group of practitioners, learned to date? How might we contribute to the ongoing conversation about the nature and future of service-learning? And what concerns would we recommend that the field focus on over the course of the next decade?

We approached our extended conversation with a sense of trepidation. After all, others have faced the inquiry possible. In fact, the service-learning model around which we organized our investigation draws significantly upon the contributions of other scholars and practitioners. At the same time, a comprehensive review of the literature extended beyond the scope of this project. We therefore decided to focus first on certain tensions that have become evident and then look forward. A summary of our deliberations follows on how service-learning practitioners should proceed.

The purpose of this paper is to introduce a conceptual model for supporting the continued development of service-learning as a pedagogy of engagement. In the first section, a service-learning model structured in the form of a logic diagram is presented. This logic diagram, though built to our own specifications, has the potential to act as a powerful vehicle for understanding the complexities of service-learning, analyzing differences in conceptions of the field, and permitting evaluations of specific campuses or programs. As such, the introduction of a model based on a logic diagram provides an example of Boyer’s (1990) scholarship of integration, allowing identification and discussion of tensions in the field while creating the