

CHAPTER 4

THE SACRED AND PROFANE **Theorising Knowledge** **Reproduction Processes in a** **Service-Learning Curriculum**

Janice McMillan

This chapter reflects an attempt to develop a theoretical framework to understand and analyse the relationship between academic and everyday knowledge in the context of undergraduate service learning curricula in higher education. One of the challenges of service learning is that in engagement with communities, students and the university come into contact and develop relationships with members of communities. These relationships between knowledge discourses have had little (if any) mention in the literature on research in the field. Drawing largely on studies in the sociology of education, the main focus of the chapter is the development of a conceptual framework which can point to ways in which such relationships can be explored.

INTRODUCTION

The title of this chapter is taken from a paper by Muller and Taylor (1994) who draw on the work of sociologist Emile Durkheim. Durkheim explores

Service-Learning Through a Multidisciplinary Lens
A Volume in: **Advances in Service-Learning Research**, pages 55–70.
Copyright © 2002 by Information Age Publishing, Inc.
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.
ISBN: 1-931576-81-5 (cloth), 1-931576-80-7 (paper)

Authors:
Billig, S.H. &
Furco, A. (Eds)

two orders of existence that relate thought and practice in two fundamentally different ways (Muller & Taylor, 1994). According to Muller and Taylor, Durkheim's hypothesis is that socially constructed knowledge depends on a hard distinction between every day, particular or profane knowledge, and esoteric, generalisable, sacred knowledge, examples of which include religions, sciences, and curricula. It is this relationship—between sacred and profane knowledge—that informs the main purpose of this chapter; namely, to develop a theoretical frame in order to understand the interaction between academic or discipline-based knowledge, and community or every day knowledge as might be played out in service-learning curricula.

The author has been involved in a research project on service-learning practice exploring higher education, community, and service sector partnerships (CHESP) at the University of Cape Town, South Africa. Through the research fieldwork, and through reflections on what was happening in the field, it became clear that looking at the interaction between these two forms of knowledge cannot be the starting point for such a research project. One needs instead to come to this understanding via another route. It is clear from reading the service-learning literature that understanding this form of educational practice often involves understanding a whole range of complex and challenging relationships, processes, and interactions that go beyond what we would understand as the formal curriculum in higher education (Cruz & Giles 2000; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999).

It could therefore be argued that much of service-learning work involves some form of boundary negotiation—of knowledge, language, roles, place, identity, and meaning, amongst other things. However, a theoretical frame to address service-learning as such seems missing from the literature, and in order to research this dimension of service-learning, such a frame seems important. In other words, developing a language and vocabulary for conceptualising and theorising the social and cognitive interactions, processes, and practices that service-learning entails, can assist researchers to come to an understanding of the relationship between forms of knowledge in a service-learning curriculum. In particular, it is hoped that this can lead to exploring service-learning as boundary work involving a wide range of brokers/agents, across a range of sites, engaged in a range of practices. It is through this lens that one can perhaps come to a better understanding, not only of service-learning curricula, but of the relationship between sacred and profane knowledge.

The chapter is as follows. Section One introduces the service-learning project and the South African context in order to provide some background for the reader unfamiliar with it. Section Two, the focus of the chapter, outlines the development of a conceptual framework that can assist one in making sense of service-learning as a form of social practice that can be deeply embedded in a range of contexts. It is hoped that this

frame might challenge researchers to re-think service-learning as educational practice embedded in a range of complex relationships.

SECTION ONE: CONTEXT AND RESEARCH PROJECT Community-Higher Education-Service Partnerships Project (CHESP)

From mid-1999 to the end of 2000, the University of Cape Town (UCT) was the recipient of a Joint Education Trust (JET)-Ford Foundation planning grant as part of a national project aimed at the potential of service-learning in the context of community/higher education/service partnerships (CHESP) across seven universities in South Africa. While the model developed in South Africa aims to address issues relevant to this context, the project has drawn much of its inspiration from the service-learning movement in the United States.

The aims of the CHESP project are, amongst others, to provide an opportunity for students to gain credit for academic learning while performing community service and to empower disadvantaged communities through the partnerships. In the local South African context, this translates into work towards "the reconstruction and development of South African civil society through the development of socially accountable models for higher education, research, community service and development" (CHESP project documents: April 1999:1). Central to these aims are the development of partnerships between historically disadvantaged communities, higher education institutions, and the service sector, so as to meet the twin goals of:

- Addressing the needs of these communities; and
- Supporting the transformation of higher education institutions in relation to these priorities.

The emergence of the CHESP project must be seen against the backdrop of a South African context where the need for real change is crucial. In this section, the context of the community, service, and academic partners will be briefly discussed.

(?)
much about the sector!
N/A

Service and Community Partners

Non-government organisations (NGOs) have had a turbulent yet vibrant history in South Africa working closely with communities, civics, trade unions, and destitute people in many areas of the country. Under the apartheid government, this often took the shape of welfare rather than

development work given the poor and often non-existent services available to many communities. Development was clearly part of the agenda, yet for many, the path from welfare to development was not an easy one. Relationships between various stakeholders were often fraught with hostility or were even openly hostile and trust was difficult to establish. In the new context in South Africa, these alliances have shifted somewhat. According to Drabek (1987), the challenge to NGOs in the future will be to act as facilitators or catalysts of local development initiatives. Therefore, NGOs, once the source of both services and empowerment for communities, now need to forge new kinds of partnerships and relationships with government structures, and these are still in their early stages.

Higher Education Partner

In looking at the third partner in the CHESP model—the university—the picture becomes even more complex. In many countries, including South Africa, universities do not have a strong history of being in partnership with other organisations in civil society in order to make a direct impact on addressing development priorities. This is particularly the case with strong research-based universities, such as UCT. While it is clear that many universities might have a strong commitment to community service (Perold, 1998), this has not been the key business of the university sector. Their engagement in development has been indirect through research and publications and while there might be good intent behind the initiatives, these have not been directly assessed or evaluated in terms of broader reconstruction and development issues in the society as a whole. The South African Higher Education White Paper (1997) supports this argument by indicating that too many parts of the system carry out their teaching and learning practices in insular and tightly-bound disciplinary ways, which on the whole, mitigate against addressing “pressing local, regional and national needs of the South African society.”

While higher education globally is confronting a series of challenges (Gibbons et al., 1994), the South Africa setting has provided a stark context for this. This is putting new pressures on higher education institutions to change as Cloete and Muller (1998, p. 525) indicate:

South Africa...provides a particularly sharp example of a higher education system established within the European tradition, in terms of both its institutional and its academic culture, and a society in the process of radical change...[how to enable] South African higher education to be both for 'Western' (in terms of academic values and scientific standards) and also 'African' (in terms of its contribution to building the capacities of all people of South Africa). The tension between the university's claims to represent universal knowledge and the counter-claims that 'local' knowledge traditions should be accorded greater respect, therefore, is much starker than in Europe.

In taking up these challenges, national higher education policy has argued that there are a number of key responses facing institutions, which include:

- Increased participation in higher education by a diverse group of learners;
- Responsiveness to societal needs; and
- Cooperation and partnerships.

The second of these challenges in particular reflects much of the impetus behind the CHESP project, which, in addition to introducing service-learning into higher education, introduces the challenge of partnership development, one of the key goals underpinning the CHESP project.

The Research Project

In setting up this research project it became clear very early on that it is difficult to measure the relationship between kinds of knowledge as they play themselves out in service-learning curricula, particularly over the short two years of the project. Attempts were made to analyse two service-learning courses, one in urban geography and another in the health sciences. The courses both run in the second semester, and students complete a range of projects under the guidance of community and academic staff. These projects have been negotiated with the community partners prior to the course, and community members have been drawn in to work on the projects.

Interviews were conducted with students, community members, and academic staff in the hope of being able to discern any interesting issues in relation to knowledge and knowledge boundaries. Once immersed in the fieldwork data, it became apparent that there were a range of other issues to consider and that a theoretical frame was needed that could take account of service-learning as a social practice deeply shaped by relationships, power, and roles. In addition, it is a social practice located in the border terrain between the university and community where the students and academics involved engage the real world of community politics, identity, poverty, and knowledge discourses. Such a framework seemed absent from the service-learning literature, and so the first phase of the project became exactly that: to develop a frame that could support and help analyse what was emerging in the field.

In terms of a research paradigm, a qualitative frame is clearly advocated, given the issues being investigated. Shumer (2000) argues that the approach that is finally selected depends on what the research is intending to measure. He argues that if the intention is to assess or measure *degree of*

20/1/89

degree impact, one can use a quantitative approach, but if you want to understand the process, then one needs to use a qualitative approach.

Whichever approach is selected, Shumer believes that "to insure validity, the approach one takes should adhere to the ontological, epistemological, and methodological constructs that make the paradigm logical and consistent" (p. 81). He argues that while quantitative approaches are ones mostly used in higher education, they are "not sufficient to support the dynamic, professional practitioner in the field of service-learning...other paradigms and approaches...are more philosophically consistent and more able to reveal the fine-grain texture of this work" (p. 81). This is supported by Stanton (2000) who argues that there is a need for more qualitative research that can begin to provide what he terms "rich portraits of practice."

The rest of this chapter attempts to outline this emergent frame. Key concepts informing the frame are social development, curriculum, and the relationship between curriculum and knowledge through understanding the importance of the concepts of boundaries and service-learning as a form of boundary work in higher education.

SECTION TWO: SERVICE-LEARNING AS BOUNDARY WORK: RELATIONSHIPS, POWER, AND KNOWLEDGE

The theoretical frame outlined here is one that attempts to understand service-learning as boundary work, and as a form of educational practice that involves understanding a range of factors that are often outside the frames used to understand and analyse more traditional higher education knowledge reproduction processes (teaching and learning practice). In addition, given the context of South African higher education within which this service-learning project arose, there are key features emanating from this context in particular. However, before one can understand and theorise service-learning in terms of boundaries and potential boundary brokers or agents, the processes, relationships, and sites that serve as signifiers of boundaries in this form of practice need to be unpacked. These include development processes and relationships, the relationship between forms of knowledge and institutional and pedagogic boundaries, and service-learning as a form of potentially transformative pedagogic practice. While this framework is influenced by work in the South African setting, it has relevance across service-learning contexts more broadly.

Social Development and Partnerships: Understanding Relationships

The fact that South Africa is facing enormous development challenges implies that one needs to carefully consider any conceptions of develop-

ment as part of the conceptual frame and as applied and understood in this context. In particular, the notion of development within the context of community/higher education/service partnerships needs to take cognisance of the fact that any conception of development needs to take into account the views of, and relationships between, a wide range of stakeholders—stakeholders that have not had the experience of strong relationships nor common goals given the history and legacy of apartheid in South Africa. In particular, legislation based on racial classifications meant that not only were South Africans forced to live in separate racially-delineated neighbourhoods, but institutions, including universities, were racially segregated. This impacted not only on the levels of education in the country, but also on the budget allocations for services to different neighbourhoods or communities which resulted in the emergence of a sophisticated and well-developed urban core economy with a fairly good technological infrastructure from which the majority black population, who had previously been denied access to education, try to eke out a living (Bawden, 2000).

Therefore, in understanding development, it is important to focus on it as a set of relationships, between institutions and systems, and particularly between people engaged in the processes that development inevitably involves. Horton (1990), in discussing adult education and development, was quoted as saying that "we make the road by walking." This captures two important components of any attempt at arriving at a conception of a term as complex as development: the human *and* physical elements. Roads can be constructed but the process also requires human commitment and will to sustain them and make them useful and meaningful over the long term. In other words, it is clear that there is both a physical and human dimension to any concept of development and that the development process in itself is of importance.

This leads one to an understanding of change as social development—a process involving a complex set of relationships, connections, and interactions between various groups over a period of time. Implicit in the idea of relationships is the concept of power and various people's access to it in meaningful ways. Furthermore, it is important to understand social development as distinct from infrastructural and economic development: "It is through human development that individual, organisational, and community capacities are cultivated, and it is these that allow infrastructural and economic development to take hold and persist" (CDRA Annual Report, 2000/2001, p. 5). Social development is therefore about human development, and thus, when one seeks change in social development, one essentially seeks change in relationships. This is not however, in the realm of the purely internal, not in the field of individual self-development. Rather, it is:

social relationship, that invisible but richly alive space between people that constitutes so much of what it means to be human at all. Development happens not between things, but between people...[T]his requires of us a simul-

taneous ability to understand each situation's unique circumstances in its own context and time; where things are coming from and where they are going to *in their own terms* (CDRA Annual Report, 2000/2001, p. 6, 8, emphasis in the original).

Understanding development as social development, as relationships and relationship-building, brings up the next important issue: the need to understand that embedded in relationships and relationship-building, the issues of boundaries and boundary work lay—boundaries between people, institutions, values, paradigms, and ways of knowing amongst others. Educational practice that strives build new forms of practice needs to heed this information and how these boundaries can both serve to facilitate but also to inhibit new ways of knowing, working, and doing. The next section begins to explore some of these issues as they play themselves out in curriculum theory and debates.

a site of struggle

Curriculum, Boundaries, and Knowledge

According to Bernstein (1999), curricula reform emerges out of struggles between groups to make their preferences (and focus) state policy and practice. Curricula consist of different kinds of knowledge, selected and organised in particular ways depending on the context. Bernstein argues that there are two kinds of discourses, which in the educational field are sometimes referred to as school(ed) or official knowledge on the one hand, and every day common sense or local knowledge on the other. He also refers to them as vertical and horizontal discourses (2000). A vertical discourse is represented by the specialised symbolic structure of organised knowledge represented by formal, schooled knowledge, which aims at generality and abstraction. Thus, a specific context will control a whole range of things that need to be taught and will articulate a graded performance. The practice of a vertical knowledge discourse typically occurs in an official institution such as the school.

A horizontal discourse on the other hand, is the common sense knowledge of the everyday. Bernstein argues that it is common for three reasons:

- It is accessible to all;
- It is applicable/relevant to all; and
- It comes out of day-to-day practices.

Horizontal discourse includes a set of strategies that are local, context specific, and dependent. Linked to these characteristics, Bernstein argues that horizontal discourse is segmented; that is, it evolves or develops at particular points in time around certain activities that need to be learned. The knowledge and competencies in a horizontal discourse are contextually

specific and context-dependent, embedded in ongoing practices and directed towards specific immediate goals that are highly relevant to the acquirer in the context of his/her life.

Bernstein's ideas have been used by others seeking to develop a new form of potentially transformative pedagogy. Muller and Taylor (1994), for example, explore boundaries and boundary negotiation in the school curriculum. They are interested in the relationship between the "ordinary every day knowledge, and the codes, texts and canons the mastery of which is assessed and certified at school" (p. 2). Drawing on Bernstein, Pierre Bourdieu, and Emile Durkheim, Muller and Taylor interrogate the debate within which accounts of curriculum constitution and change are framed by the organising poles of insulation and hybridity. These two concepts are helpful in understanding curriculum knowledge in terms of boundaries. Insulation, represented by the traditional disciplines, emphasises the impermeability of cultural boundaries, of disciplinary autonomy, and the integral differences between systems of knowledge. Hybridity, in contrast, emphasises the continuity of forms and kinds of knowledge and the permeability of classificatory boundaries.

The paper by Muller and Taylor (1994) explores border crossing between knowledge domains and some of the perils or problems in doing this uncritically and unaware. The point Muller and Taylor end up making is not whether it is a good/bad thing to cross the boundary in curriculum terms between two forms of knowledge. Rather, they believe that one has to be mindful that these boundaries do exist and "to cross the line without knowing it is to be at the mercy of the power inscribed in the line" (p. 18). The key question they believe is "how to cross," and this they argue "means paying detailed attention to the politics of re-description, to the means required for a successful crossing" (p. 18). In other words, they argue that for a study of knowledge and curriculum, a useful starting point is to understand that a boundary, however problematic and seemingly exclusive, between forms of knowledge, does exist and that we need to be mindful of this.

In order to look at this in more concrete ways, it is useful to look at some of the work written on workplace and work-based learning studies. Solomon and McIntyre (2000) have looked at the issue of boundaries and reflect on the issue of interaction between modes of knowledge in their writings on work-based learning. Exploring these issues at both the level of learning arrangements or partnerships, as well as at the level of curriculum and knowledge, they argue that we need to understand that such learning arrangements are often based on a three-way partnership between the organisation, the learner(s), and the university. Such a partnership, they argue, "sets up additional layers of politics and power relations that are manifested in new discursive practices around the co-production of knowledge" (Solomon & McIntyre, 2000, p. 6).

insulation

The result of this is that various boundaries—between theory and practice, between one discipline and another, between working and learning—have become blurred. In addition, these boundaries have become “objects of contestation,” and while they are being dismantled, new and different kinds of boundaries are emerging that provide the frame around work-based learning. In other words, the authors argue that the work-based learning curriculum is not unbounded or deregulated—rather it is “bounded and regulated in different ways...(and)...the knowledge that is involved is locally specific, more complex, more contested and more fluid” (Solomon & McIntyre, p. 7). As a consequence, academics and curriculum designers have to pay attention to boundaries and their roles as boundary workers or knowledge brokers.

These are important insights in understanding service-learning curricula. Such curricula are often negotiated across a range of stakeholders with different world views and knowledge bases. How these different viewpoints impact on curriculum, and how boundaries are negotiated, is important to understand. The next section looks at some of these concerns.

Service-Learning, Boundaries, and Knowledge

The concepts of boundaries and boundary brokering are important and useful in understanding service-learning practice as social practice.

While not discussing boundaries explicitly, Zlotkowski (1998) has looked at service-learning as a form of pedagogy that plays a potentially mediating role. The author argues that one of reasons why service-learning has increased in popularity and is increasingly evident on campuses across the U.S. for example, is that it is positioned at the point where two comprehensive sets of contemporary educational concerns intersect. On the one hand, it represents a pedagogy that extends our range of pedagogical resources by addressing directly those “problems of greatest human concern” that are “messy and confusing and incapable of technical solution” (Schon cited in Zlotkowski, p. 3). By linking the classroom to the world of praxis, it allows:

induction to complement deduction, personal discovery to challenge received truths, immediate experience to balance generalisations and abstract theory. In and through service-learning, students learn to engage in problem definition and problem-solving in an authentic, powerful way (Zlotkowski, 1998, p. 3/4).

On the other hand, service-learning is positioned at a second, intersecting axis: “From knowledge as self-interest and private good, it creates a bridge to knowledge as civic responsibility and public good” (Zlotkowski, 1998, p. 4). Zlotkowski argues that it shows important qualities of flexibility

and inclusion—just as knowledge as public work in no way denies the validity of knowledge as private good, knowledge as private good should also not exclude the former. Through service-learning activities, students can learn about the importance of attending to their needs as individuals and as members of a community. By bringing public work into the very heart of the educational system (i.e. the curriculum), service-learning helps students to avoid seeing private advancement disassociated from public standards and public need. This could be seen to be a form of boundary negotiation that students engage in through service-learning.

Bawden (2000), drawing on the work of Ernest Boyer and his notion of a ‘scholarship of engagement,’ has explored service-learning as the need for engagement in ‘discourse as communities’ and argues that universities need to work towards a ‘universe of human discourse’ in order to meet many of the challenges posed by globalisation. Engagement for Bawden does not, however, necessarily mean the dissolution of identity and thus of boundaries and the search for homogeneity. Rather, he believes it is about “the preservation and utilisation of difference as the sources of synergy” (p. 6). Following from this, he makes the point:

It is this synergy, this emergence of surprising outcomes through interactions of difference that lies at the heart of the argument for engagement for communal discourse; for a communicative ethic that not only allows us to cross boundaries in our search for what might be termed ‘inclusive well-being’ (Prozesky, 1999 in Bawden, 2000) but impels us to do so (p. 6).

Chesler and Scalera (2000) look at service-learning as a form of pedagogy that allows one to better understand notions of difference through border crossing. The authors argue that various culturally-constructed differences, (e.g., race and gender), are more easily discussed and analysed through service-learning. In addition, given that these issues are relevant to all areas of higher education, Chester and Scalera argue that if service-learning is supported as an alternative educational experience, it needs to address, confront, and challenge sexism and racism in higher education. In other words, higher education needs to challenge cultural and political boundaries. Service-learning offers the opportunity of border crossing: through working with new and different groups of people outside of campus, service-learning can provide a real experience of linking theory with real life issues for both students and academics.

One study in South Africa has begun to look at these issues and is worth noting here. Muller & Subotzky (2001) have looked at the issue of modes of knowledge production in asking questions about the knowledge needed in the new millennium. Drawing on the work of Gibbons et al. (1994) and the thesis of new modes of knowledge production, Muller and Subotzky look at some of the pressing issues facing higher education in the context of globalisation. Through analysing community-based academic ser-

vice-learning, they argue that service-learning is a way of giving substance to the notion of the 'engaged university.' As such, service-learning is claimed to be an effective means towards bridging the perceived widening gap between what they term the "knowing academy" and the "needy society." For the academy, this provides the opportunity:

to break its myopic preoccupation with academic forms of knowledge... [F]urther, 'public intellectuals' are emerging who defy both the detachment of conventional academe... [T]his new faculty place strong emphasis on the social utility of research and are typically informed by particularist epistemologies in which truth should not be separated from personal experience (Muller and Subotzky, p. 10).

Muller and Subotzky go on to say that the combination of formal and informal knowledge production implies an expanded notion of socially-relevant scholarship that embraces and rewards not only more conventional discipline-based inquiry, but also Boyer's other three forms of scholarship; namely integration, outreach engagement, and teaching. Furthermore, such academics must therefore recognise the validity of:

experiential, indigenous, tacit and pre-theoretical knowledge... (they) have to learn to bridge the gap between the meaning of research findings and the meaning(s) constructed by those affected by the results, and between academic and 'political' truth (Muller and Subotzky, p. 10).

Understanding Learning in Service-Learning

As can be seen from Solomon and McIntyre (2000), and Bernstein (1999), educational knowledge is generated in sites of tension and contestation. This could mean that a service-learning curriculum might not be as useful a unit of analysis unless one also begins to look at the question of learning—both within formal learning contexts as well as within community knowledge contexts. Therefore, not only how one thinks about knowledge, but also how we think about and define what counts as valid learning, is important to consider if we wish to find evidence for a shift in the power that more traditional discipline-based curricula have over what counts as knowledge.

What is not discussed however, is the impact of this on learning. This author believes it is an omission, and it is an important dimension to add to the framework. Given the attention to service-learning as a social practice, a starting point is understanding learning from the perspective of activity theory and situated learning—frames that focus explicitly on the varied contexts in which learning processes occur. This is a particularly useful lens to use to research learning processes situated, at least in part, in new learning contexts; namely, the context of relating to community priorities.

Situated learning theorists place high value on the relationship between social and cultural processes and view human knowledge and interaction as inseparable from the world. It contributes to a developing body of research in the human sciences that explores the situated character of human understanding and communication, and it takes as its focus, the relationship between learning and the social situations in which it occurs. This view of learning draws from the work of Vygotsky (1978) and his social development theory. His main argument is that learning happens first in relation to others and only later is it internalised individually. In other words, individual consciousness is built from the outside through social relations—it is social interaction that leads to cognitive development, not the other way around. Learning therefore becomes a social phenomenon, closely bound to context, inseparable from the world. In this frame, *inter-subjectivity* (or agency) becomes important—learning happens through the understandings that develop between individuals/sub-communities as a result of interaction (Harris, 2000).

In this vein, the work of Lave and Wenger (1991) is important. They argue that the intersubjective aspects of learning are about positionings in the social world. Their concept of *legitimate peripheral participation in communities of practice* is particularly useful. The learning process, viewed in this way, becomes synonymous with identity change and transformation of the social practice—the practice of all the participants and the social practice as a whole is changed. Learning is therefore part of the generation of social practice, and the emphasis is on learning as a social practice rather than as pedagogic strategy.

In other words, Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that most accounts of learning have ignored its social character. They take an important step by proposing that learning is a process of participating in communities of practice. Rather than asking what kinds of cognitive processes and conceptual structures are involved in learning, they ask, "What kinds of social engagements provide the proper context for learning to take place" (Hanks, 1991, p. 14). The individual learner is therefore not gaining a discrete body of abstract knowledge which he/she will then transport and reapply in later contexts; he/she

[A]quires the skills to perform by actually engaging in the process, under the attenuated conditions of *legitimate peripheral participation* (Hanks, p. 14, emphasis in the original).

From this point of view, the activities of people and environment are seen as parts of a mutually constructed whole. There is a constant dialectic and mutual dependence between individual, mind, and culture—as a consequence, the learner acts *with* the environment rather than *on* it (Harris, 2000). As Lave (1991, p. 29) argues:

'Legitimate peripheral participation' provides a way to speak about the relationships between newcomers and old-timers, and about activities, identities, artifacts, and communities of knowledge and practice. It concerns the process by which newcomers become part of a community of practice. A person's intentions to learn are engaged and the meaning of learning is configured through the process of becoming a full participant in a sociocultural practice.

In terms of understanding service-learning as boundary work and as the relationship between kinds of knowledge, forms of practice, and ways of knowing, this is important insight. Situated learning allows one to understand that learning in service-learning is also about boundary work. It is about meaning-making and negotiation in context (McMillan, 1997) and involves understanding relationships and issues of power, identity, and context.

This has implications thinking about the roles and identities of academics. Johnston (1998) argues that in discussing this and the reconfigurations of boundaries, one of the key new roles for academics is that of the profession of knowledge-broker. She looks at the role of the university by considering it in relation to Boyer's four areas of scholarship (discovery, teaching, application, and integration), and argues that "this role is becoming ever more important in a rapidly changing world where values, standards, and quality are regarded as relative rather than absolute" (p. 267). In addition, such a role needs increasingly to mediate between various binaries: community or organisational learning/individual learning; informal/formal learning; development or performance outcomes/learning outcomes; doing/knowing; and community or working knowledge/disciplinary knowledge (Solomon & McIntyre, 2000). This will clearly pose challenges to the role of academics in higher education, including those involved in service-learning.

CONCLUSION

This chapter set out to explore the development of a theoretical framework for researching the practice of service-learning. In particular, it has argued for the usefulness of the concept of boundaries, boundary negotiation, and boundary brokers. This frame has emerged out of an immersion into practice and of a need to better understand service-learning as a complex and challenging form of educational practice. As argued earlier in the chapter, a frame such as the one presented here seemed absent from the literature on service-learning and made fieldwork data analysis difficult. It is this author's belief that drawing on this framework will allow one to understand service-learning as a form of boundary work in higher education. Many studies that one reads in the field (e.g., Chesler & Scalera, 2000) have alluded to the

understanding of service-learning as a complex practice and for the need for more interpretive frames (e.g., Stanton, 2000). This chapter is an attempt to develop one that can begin to do justice to the rich and complex fields of both service-learning practice and research.

Researching educational practice is therefore often a difficult practice, particularly when one is trying to work with new frames and a different lens. However, it is often the most exciting kind of research, and for those service-learning researchers involved, it is demanding and challenging. It is hoped that new communities of researchers will come together to create rich "portraits of practice" and to explore service-learning as a field of practice and enquiry that challenges many of the boundaries that more traditional educational research implies. What is important is to identify key constructs, sites, and potential brokers or facilitating and/or inhibiting factors, as these can potentially provide a language for boundary-crossings and a way of describing and analysing a very complex practice, which, perhaps ultimately, can begin to address the relationship between sacred and profane knowledge as they play themselves out in service-learning curricula.

Acknowledgment: I would like to acknowledge the support of the National Research Foundation (NRF) of South Africa whose initial funding for the First Annual International K-H Service-Learning Research Conference in October 2001 resulted in the conference paper from which this chapter was born.

REFERENCES

- Bawden, R. (2000). CHESP and the scholarship of engagement: Strategies towards a universe of human discourse. A report by Professor Richard Bawden on his visit to the eight CHESP pilot projects, South Africa.
- Bernstein, B. (1999). Official knowledge and pedagogic identities. In F. Christie, *Pedagogy and the shaping of consciousness: Linguistic and social processes* London: Continuum.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). Vertical and horizontal discourse: An essay. In *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity: Revised edition*. Oxford, UK: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Chesler, M., & Scalera, C. (2000, Fall). Race and gender issues related to service-learning research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (Special Issue 2000), 18-27.
- Cloete, N. & Muller, J. (1998). South African higher education reform: What comes after post-colonialism? *European Review*, 6(4), 525-542.
- Community Development Resource Association (CDRA). (2000/2001). Measuring development: Holding infinity. Annual Report published by CDRA, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Cruz, N. & Giles, D. (2000, Fall). Where's the community in service-learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (Special Issue 2000), 28-34.

- Department of Education. (1997). South African Higher Education White Paper. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Drabek, A. (1987). Development alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs—An overview of the issues. *World Development*, 15, Supplement, ix-xv.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Scharztman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge*. London: Sage.
- Hanks, W. F. (1991). Foreword. In J. Lave & E. Wenger (Eds.), *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, J. (2000). Theories of learning and the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL): Implications for South African Education and Training. Report prepared for the National Centre for Curriculum Research and Development (NCCRD), Department of Education, South Africa.
- Horton, M. (1990). *The long haul*. New York: Doubleday.
- Johnston, R. (1998). The university of the future: Boyer revisited. *Higher Education*, 36, 253-272.
- Joint Education Trust (JET). (1999, April). Community-Higher Education-Service Partnerships (CHESP) project planning phase documents. Capte Town: Author.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McMillan, J. (1997). Adult learners, access and higher education: Learning as meaning-making and negotiation in context. Unpublished M. Phil dissertation, Faculty of Education, University of the Western Cape.
- Muller, J., & Taylor, N. (1994). Schooling and everyday life: Knowledge sacred and profane. Unpublished paper presented to School of Education seminar, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
- *Muller, J., & Subotzky, G. (2001). What knowledge is needed in the new millennium? *Organisation*, 8(2), 163-182.
- Perold, H. (1998). Community service in higher education: Final report. Braamfontein, South Africa: JET.
- Shumer, R. (2000, Fall). Science or storytelling: How should we conduct and report on service-learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (Special Issue 2000), 76-83.
- Solomon, N., & McIntyre, J. (2000). Deschooling vocational knowledge: Work-based learning and the politics of curriculum. In C. Symes & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Working knowledge: The new vocationalism and higher education*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Stanton, T. (2000, Fall). Bringing reciprocity to service-learning research and practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (Special Issue 2000), 119-123.
- Stanton, T., Giles, D., & Cruz, N. (1999). *Service learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- University of Cape Town CHESP Strategic Plan. (2000). Centre for Higher Education Development (CHED), University of Cape Town.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Zlotkowski, E. (Ed.). (1998). *Successful service-learning programs: New models for excellence in higher education*. Boston: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

PART III

SERVICE-LEARNING AND THE DISCIPLINES