

Community Engagement in African Universities

Perspectives, Prospects
and Challenges

Edited by
Julia Preece,
Peggy Gabo Ntseane,
Oitshepile MmaB Modise
and **Mike Osborne**

niace
promoting adult learning

Published by NIACE

© 2012 National Institute of Adult Continuing Education
(England and Wales)
21 De Montfort Street,
Leicester,
LE1 7GE

Company registration no. 2603322
Charity registration no. 1002775

NIACE has a broad remit to promote lifelong learning opportunities for adults. NIACE works to develop increased participation in education and training, particularly for those who do not have easy access because of class, gender, age, race, language and culture, learning difficulties or disabilities or insufficient financial resources.

You can find NIACE online at www.niace.org.uk

The rights of all contributors to be identified as authors of their parts of this work have been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without the written permission of the publishers, save in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency.

Cataloguing in Publications Data

A CIP record for this title is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-86201-599-9 (print)
ISBN 978-1-86201-600-2 (PDF)
ISBN 978-1-86201-601-9 (ePub)
ISBN 978-1-86201-603-3 (online)
ISBN 978-1-86201-602-6 (Kindle)

Cover design by Book Production Services

Designed and typeset by Cambridge Publishing Management, Cambridge, UK

Printed and bound in the UK

Constructing service learning in South Africa: Discourses of engagement

Frances O'Brien

Introduction

The concept and practice of service learning was imported into South Africa in the turbulent first decade of the country's new democracy. Since then, it has taken root in South African higher education institutions, with the growth of interest and expertise constituting 'a quiet revolution' (Higher Education Quality Committee, 2006, p. xxi). Service learning's increased popularity can be attributed to its potential, as a pedagogical tool and an educational approach, to offer much in an era when higher education faces sharply conflicting demands to 'carv[e] out niche areas of innovation within the competitive global arena while meeting the basic development needs of the majority of [its country's] increasingly marginalised and impoverished populations' (Netshandama and Mahlomaholo, 2010, p. 5).

In spite of its growing popularity, service learning has engendered confusion and scepticism (Council on Higher Education, 2010). Muller and Subotzky (2001, p. 172) have suggested that claims of the benefits of service learning are 'sometimes extravagant'. There are also deep concerns about its practicality, its legitimacy as a method of teaching and learning, the various forms of knowledge emerging from it (McMillan, 2002) and, particularly in South Africa, its impact on the communities, off-campus organisations and higher education institutions involved in its implementation (Mitchell and Rautenbach, 2002). Power inequalities constitute a primary concern in relation to its local implementation (Mahlomaholo and Matobako, 2006; Grossman, 2007; Osman and Attwood, 2007).

Driven by these challenges, a framework of engagement Discourses has been constructed and is presented in this chapter. It is intended to offer an understanding broad enough to incorporate multiple facets of service learning, but specific enough to describe and guide the local approach and practice. The Discourses are grounded in a study of South African literature, policies and dialogues, as well as the experiences of 36 service learning initiatives involving at least 96 communities, over 800 higher education students and the academic staff in multiple disciplines at nine universities. The study used grounded theory research methods (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss and Corbin, 1994) for reasons expounded in an earlier publication (O'Brien, 2005), with analysis characterised by a 'constructivist stance' (Charmaz, 2006).

The notion of Discourse needs some preliminary comment. The concept lends itself to utilisation of the diversity that characterises the local practices and understandings of service learning. In this chapter, Gee's (1990) understanding of Discourse is adopted – namely, a confluence or pattern of language and social practices that, together, shape how we interpret events and indicate what is normal and desirable. Gee suggests that a Discourse indicates which areas of interest are seen as legitimate, how we may write and speak about those interests, how we relate to those within and outside the Discourse, and our social identity, which he defines as 'being recognized as a certain "kind of person", in a given context' (Gee, 2000, p. 99). Discourse is, in short, a 'way of being' (Gee, 1999, p. 22), doing, relating, thinking, talking and writing. In this chapter, I take up Gee's (1999) practice of writing 'Discourse' with a capital 'D' so as to emphasise that it means not just language but also the 'other stuff' (Gee, 1999, p. 17), such as societal norms and power relations. An important caveat to the engagement Discourses is that they are not direct reflections of actual service learning initiatives. Rather, they are idealised images that highlight specific characteristics of service learning.

In the framework, engagement is the key concept or lens through which service learning is viewed and interpreted. Engagement is understood to mean interaction, be that practical and physical, as in the case of meetings, or conceptual, such as engagement with ideas, curriculum and the like. In the remainder of this chapter, four Discourses of engagement are outlined, namely those of 'scholarship', 'benevolence', 'democracy' and 'professionalism', in terms of their concerns, environments, identities, development processes and products, curricula and power issues. The chapter concludes with suggestions as to possible significance of the Discourses for current service learning and other endeavours that have engagement as a primary activity.

Discourse 1: Service learning as scholarly engagement

Service learning is:

- 'Engagement [to] produc[e] "knowledges"' (Bawa, 2003, p. 58)
- 'A component of the curriculum' (Henning, 1998, p. 44)
- 'An alternative tool in the suite of pedagogical approaches used in teaching, as well as a means to generate new knowledge about learning' (van Rensburg, 2004, p. 136)

In this Discourse, we find ourselves in a scholarly place which has knowledge generation, dissemination, integration and application as its primary concerns. Theoretical and specialised knowledge are held in high esteem. The primary identity of all involved in this Discourse of service learning is a scholarly one that sees academics, students, service providers and communities assume roles as teachers and curriculum developers, learners, knowledge enhancers, mentors, assessors, supervisors and researchers. Academics and students are dominant in this Discourse, and, for them at least, some of these roles are the norm. Other participants find that their scholarly contributions in service learning require a paradigm shift or offer new opportunities. A community member reflects: 'It was a shock to me – hearing [university] people saying they have come to learn from us' (Bruzaz and O'Brien, 2001, p. 24), while others note that their involvement in student assessment 'is a sign of recognition of the mentor's importance in the student's learning process ... It is also a way of influencing the academic institution' (O'Brien, 2001, p. 4).

The Discourse adopts a modernisation notion of development as progress that diffuses outwards from the centre – that centre being the body of knowledge that lies at the core of a discipline. Thus service learning initiatives address development needs by means of diffusing knowledge, with development being synonymous with learning. On an individual level, intellectual development is sought, with critical thinking being highly prized. Change in people is initiated through reflection and critical questioning, with artefacts such as journals, portfolios and publications supporting and evidencing scholarly advancement. At an institutional level, development is deemed to have occurred when service learning is mainstreamed into academic programmes. It is then that service learning commands legitimacy in the scholarly world.

As a curricular activity in this Discourse, service learning prioritises specific (disciplinary) learning outcomes over the critical cross-field outcomes. Structured critical reflection is deemed important in this Discourse because it is

the reflection that turns the service into learning. Reflection is also the key to meta-learning, that is, learning about learning processes. In this Discourse, assessment invariably focuses on students' learning rather than their services or practical, off-campus activities. Integrated assessment is aspired to. Characteristically, assessment comprises written texts in the form of examinations, portfolios, journals and take-home examinations.

Service is a pedagogical strategy that involves students in active engagement with communities. 'Students' texts are their experiences as they work in the real-world' (O'Brien, 2009, p. 31). Service comprises the application of learning, expertise and research, often in ways that loosen disciplinary boundaries. Services are often rendered in off-campus places referred to as 'learning sites'. Theoretical focuses are influential determinants in the choice of community-based learning sites and students' service activities.

Engagement within this Discourse of 'scholarship' takes the form of bringing together existing and new knowledge, indigenous and Western knowledges, and knowledge from different disciplines, theory and skills and different ways of knowing. It is where 'science meets the public' (Erasmus, 2007, p. 35) and the fundamentally interdisciplinary nature of knowledge comes to the fore. Not all knowledges and ways of acquiring them are held in equal esteem, however, and the differing status of knowledge sources highlights issues of power in scholarly engagement. Power presents as the dominant Discourse (von Kotze and Cooper, 2000). To be legitimate in the academy, knowledge must be presented in prescribed ways, usually written, and individually appropriated to meet institutional assessment practices – in other words 'when it is brought into the routines inside the academy, separated from the engagement and service' (Grossman, 2007, p. 311). Knowledge from people with high prestige in social circles of scholars is considered legitimate and wields more power than knowledge from those lower in the academic hierarchy. There is thus a drive to involve academics with high academic qualifications and research output in service learning so as to increase its legitimacy within academia. This Discourse typically witnesses changes in the power dynamics between academic staff and their students as they engage through service learning, with the traditional distance between them being reduced as each comes to recognise the value of the knowledge of the other.

Discourse 2: Service learning as benevolent engagement

Service learning:

- Means that you will apply your knowledge and skills in the service of a community or organisation (O'Brien, 2010, p. 258)

As 'benevolent' engagement, service learning is about doing good for the benefit of others. The Discourse is primarily concerned with 'good citizenship', promoted in the guise of voluntary service. Such a philanthropic orientation is congruent with perceptions of an environment that is deficient and needs-driven, and in which voluntarism, altruism and civic mindedness are promoted in national policies. Engagement in this Discourse typically takes the form of consultations, needs surveys, planning, service provision and evaluation.

The predominant role in this Discourse is that of server. The lead role player is the service provider, likely to be a government department or not-for-profit organisation (NPO). The higher education institution may provide services directly to communities or may complement the organisations that have service delivery as their primary mandate. A particular category of server is that of the organisations that provide financial resources for service learning initiatives. Whether an organisation, government department or higher education institution, however, service providers are usually perceived as 'outsiders' coming to help the 'poor insiders' (*ibid.*, p. 259).

Communities typically comprise 'historically disadvantaged' residents and, in the service learning encounter, they are service beneficiaries. During the course of a service learning initiative, however, community members are also likely to be good citizens as they fulfil the roles of volunteers, safe-keepers and celebrants in the implementation of service learning initiatives. Students electing to participate in service learning are likely to be those with altruistic intentions or a belief that their relative good fortune, in a country with widespread economic poverty, makes community service incumbent on them. One student explained thus: 'As an economist, I firmly believe that one's income is somebody else's expenditure. By that I mean I need to plough back to the community' (*ibid.*, p. 161). The staff from higher education institutions who become involved in service learning are those seeking to operationalise institutional policies on 'outreach'. Their provision of service through service learning typically sees them playing the role of project coordinator.

Development in this Discourse is deemed to be the progressive fulfilment of needs that leads in the long term to empowerment of the needy and vulnerable. Evidence of development is typically a physical product, facility or service. In addition, people are judged to have developed when they can achieve their goals independently of the service provider. The Discourse puts heavy emphasis on planning and reporting, usually by the service provider or higher education role players to the funders. On the individual development side, increasing self-awareness is valued, with skills rather than just intellectual understanding being recognised as important in the learning process.

As a curriculum strategy, service learning is employed for the development of students' skills. With practical ways of knowing being prioritised, assessment is more likely to be in the form of observation of students' performance of services than through the written assignments favoured in the Discourse of 'scholarly' engagement. In addition to practical skills, however, students are expected to demonstrate compassion and altruism.

This link with community upliftment may well see the curriculum being referred to as a project, with orientation, implementation and evaluation phases. A service is perceived as something that is provided or delivered and is decided on the basis of needs assessments or surveys. Through service learning, students intervene with the aim of instituting or extending a service, typically at 'key delivery sites' (Fourie, 2006, p. 46), with the guidance of 'site coordinators'.

Power in this Discourse lies with the service provider, which utilises its history, experience and other resources to rectify shortcomings in the service recipient. The nature of the service is determined by the service provider, and service beneficiaries have to fulfil criteria set down by the service provider for access. Because the services are delivered in an environment of scarcity, service beneficiaries are in a disempowered position by virtue of the limited options they have from which to choose the services they require. Empowerment is believed to be the way of conferring power on those without it, and both students and communities perceive the provision of services to be a means of empowerment, a notion contested by those outside this Discourse, particularly those in the Discourse of 'democratic' engagement.

Discourse 3: Service learning as democratic engagement

Service learning is:

- A radical response to the problems of building a new South Africa (O'Brien, 2010, p. 266)
- A social practice deeply shaped by relationships, power and roles (McMillan, 2002, p. 59)

The typical context of this Discourse is a political one, with issues of social justice and diversity being of primary concern. The main focus or *raison d'être* for service learning is enhancement of the public or common good. Needing to operate in a context of 'competing interests and power relations', however (von Kotze and Cooper, 2000, p. 217), public good is deemed to exist when there is a climate of *ubuntu*, 'affirm[ing] commonality and unity, while ... validat[ing] diversity and individuality among human beings' (Goduka, 1999, p. 37). The Discourse defines engagement as dialogue, with the emphasis on understanding the other's life space rather than necessarily converting that space to mirror one's own. Engagement is characterised by mutuality and the flattening of the hierarchies prominent in the previous two Discourses.

Those participating in service learning in this Discourse share with those in the previous Discourse a primary identity as citizens. However, in contrast to the strong altruistic brief of the citizens in the 'benevolent' engagement Discourse, the democratically engaged citizens exhibit strong commitment to social action or societal change. The citizen strives to be 'free' rather than good, as in the previous Discourse. And if academic staff and students dominated the Discourse of 'scholarly' engagement, and service providers that of 'benevolent' engagement, in this Discourse communities are prominent. Their members are likely to be initiators, organisers and networkers in service learning endeavours, getting involved in order to connect with and share resources. Community members are typically defined in terms of their residence in a specific area or institution, or their membership of a work or social facility, rather than in terms of their deficits.

Students aspire to being change agents at best, or supporters, at least, of those encountering structural disadvantages. Along with service providers, higher education staff recognise opportunities and strengths in others, and emphasise their roles as advocate, supporter and sustainer of service learning relationships. Service providers are predominantly NPOs or community-controlled

structures. They identify themselves as brokers and mediators between communities and the service learning participants from higher education.

'A genuine partnership can develop by having to seek direction with potential partners rather than guiding them on a track known to (one party) in advance' (personal communication with staff member at University of KwaZulu-Natal, 18 October 1999). This observation typifies the social, political or people-centred development germane to this Discourse. Development aims for 'interdependence between' sectors, as opposed to 'dependence upon' or 'independence from' others, a characteristic of development in the 'scholarship' and 'development' Discourses respectively. Service learning aspires to a greater cohesion among different sectors in society through partnership, collaboration and the like in our policies.

The Discourse mandates that a curriculum reflects the negotiation of many voices not traditionally heard in the development of academic or service delivery programmes. The content of the curriculum is strongly, though not exclusively, driven by community interests. Of importance in developing the curriculum are the assets that each sector can contribute to the collaboration between them. This is in contrast with the priority given to community needs and service availability which drive academic curricula in the previous Discourses.

In this 'democratic' engagement Discourse, feelings and common sense, or intuitive knowledge, are seen as being on a par with the conceptualisation valued in the 'scholarly' engagement Discourse. Personal experience is held in high esteem, based on the assumption that deep knowing emerges from being. Knowledge is seen as culturally defined and co-created, relative and multilayered. Learning outcomes for students typically include increased awareness of issues such as social justice, stereotyping and diversity and the development of civic and analytical skills. Interpersonal skills, insight, sensitivity to difference, tolerance and empathy take precedence as learning outcomes over the intellectual and practical skills emphasised by the 'scholarly' and 'benevolent' engagement Discourses respectively. The primary purpose of student involvement in communities' activities is to show solidarity with them. All in all, services in this Discourse are seen as bringing 'new life' to those involved and a shared identity. Such learning outcomes under 'democratic' engagement are reflected by this student, quoted in a study by van Rensburg:

I was a responsible tourist in the Community Service-Learning project. As a white English-speaking female in South Africa, I have developed through active participation to satisfy the needs of the community, a community I now realize was a foreign country to me. ... It developed a strong sense of caring for others in me. All tourists, however, must at some point, leave the foreign country. I left with a sense of 'being there'. It wasn't a 'been there, done that, bought the T-shirt' experience though. I was questioning my status as a tourist in my own country for the first time. I was beginning to see what the old system [of apartheid] did to people like me. The Community Service-Learning project was in the end, like applying for asylum, fleeing from the past, and applying for citizenship in a new country. (van Rensburg 2004, pp. 138–9)

The value placed in this Discourse on equity, reciprocity, goal alignment and co-created knowledge indicates a deep concern with power. There is a sensitivity, possibly heightened in South Africa, to historical power inequities, which saw service delivery and research endeavours, in particular, characterised by a lack of mutual accountability. Power appears as a direct focus and content of the academic curriculum. It is something to be studied.

In addition to studying power, the underlying goal of service learning in this Discourse is to alter power relations. The relationships and associations that constitute the primary vehicles for service learning are also critiqued in this respect. Participants 'draw attention to the ways in which power relations might be concealed within [their service learning practices], ultimately subjecting them to the very same forces they [those involved] claim to be resisting' (Osman and Attwood, 2007, p. 19). Engagement that prioritises power sharing utilises strategies such as joint ownership, negotiation, mutual accountability, participatory research techniques and dialogue, aiming for close alignment between the goals and concerns of all participants: 'successful negotiation of power issues [being] ... probably the single biggest challenge facing' relationship building and nurturing (O'Brien, 2010, p. 271).

Discourse 4: Service learning as professional engagement

Service learning:

- Is ... a sound investment towards the delivery of a more socially responsible student 'product' (Erasmus, 2007, p. 28)
- Facilitates the development of ... future leaders who are not only knowledgeable and competent, but also socially conscious and ethical professionals (O'Brien, 2010, p. 275)

A society committed to economic growth but challenged by insufficient high-level, relevant skills, inadequate funds and poor infrastructure is the environment constructed by this Discourse. It is primarily concerned with the procurement and maintenance of resources, particularly human resources, in contrast to the previous Discourses' interests in knowledge, service and social justice. Here, the engagement that is service learning is perceived as a transaction, replete with references to quality management and national accreditation.

Engagement between the academic, community and service provider sectors takes place at formal occasions convened for the purpose of discussion and planning. The engagement typically yields artefacts such as budgets, timetables, deadlines, contracts, and quality and logical frameworks, all of which enable service learning to be planned, implemented and evaluated. Time and high workloads are significant constraints for all, while higher education staff, in particular, worry about the sustainability of resources and the opportunity costs incurred when they buy into service learning.

The language of the marketplace dominates this Discourse. References to 'client', 'products' and 'management' are commonplace, and there is interest in seeking 'buy-in' for service learning – that is, commitment and participation by strategic stakeholders from different sectors. In addition, service learning becomes part of job descriptions and a criterion for staff selection and promotion, particularly in academic institutions. Such preoccupation with human and organisational development is congruent with many understandings of professionalism (Evans, 2008; Webster-Wright, 2009).

If those pursuing service learning in this Discourse have a common identity, it may be conceptualised as a stakeholder. That identity conveys the idea of an "interest group" with some stake in a policy or a project ...' (Nefjees, 2000, p. 102). As in the 'benevolent' engagement Discourse, the service provider is dominant in this 'professional' engagement Discourse. However, the

service provider coming to the fore here is the professional or occupational association or the professional-in-practice who assumes the roles of employer, supervisor and modeller for the student. Community members are the clients, learners, patients or users of the professional service rendered by students under the supervision of the service provider. Higher education staff highlight their roles as administrators, monitors, accreditors and managers in the service learning process. They may also assume the role of direct service provider. In such instances, academic staff also become employer, manager, supervisor, skills trainer and provider of material resources. Students typically fulfil roles of professional-in-training, employee and mentee, but may also see themselves as owner of interventions and creator of new products. Their stake in service learning is typically expressed as furthering their future professional prospects.

In this Discourse, development is primarily predicated on a neo-liberal ideology and comprises growth in human and economic 'capital'. In relation to service learning, such capital will manifest as the trained worker or professional, the productive community member and the academic with access to research and project funding. Communities and service providers are appreciated for the value they add to the curriculum. At an institutional level, the development of service learning is likely to be managed by the upper echelons, grounded in institutional policies, subject to quality promotion procedures and geared to attract scarce physical resources to facilitate it.

Curriculum in this Discourse prioritises the application of knowledge, with both practical and experiential knowledge put in the foreground. The attention given to skills development is akin to the pedagogy in the 'benevolent' engagement Discourse. In contrast with that Discourse, however, the choice of skills to be included in the curriculum is dictated by the profession for which the students are being groomed. Experiential knowledge is of equal importance in this Discourse, and service learning is admitted into the curriculum primarily for the opportunities it offers to expose students to the experience of an authentic work context in which they begin to take on the identity of the professional that they aspire to be.

Power in this Discourse is held by those with the resources to undertake service learning and those with accredited expertise. While higher education institutions may accredit students' learning, thereby enabling them to exit the institution with a formal qualification, only professional bodies can accredit those graduates to practise the profession for which they were educated. Power imbalances reveal themselves in all intersectoral relationships – in particular,

between service providers and community members (those in receipt of their services), higher education and community, and between service providers and students – with the latter in each duo being in relatively disempowered positions.

Power between stakeholders in this Discourse is mediated structurally. One structure is the partnership, which comes into being through:

A formal written contract outlining the community selection criteria used, objectives for service learning, expected duties from both partners, the content/process to carry out service learning, and time commitments, and which is signed by both partners prior to the implementation of service learning. (University of Natal, 2002, p. 21)

Table 1: Matrix of service learning Discourses

Engagement	Scholarly	Benevolent	Democratic	Professional
Primary focus	Knowledge	Good citizenship	Social change	Resource development
Predominant context	Research dominated	Poverty	Political and diverse	Under-resourced
Primary identity of participants	Scholar	Service provider, recipient	Activist	Stakeholder
Principal purpose of service learning	To increase knowledge	To do good	To promote equitable participation	To increase efficiency
Development: individual level	Intellectual	Practical	Interpersonal	Skills/ethical
Development: societal level	Curriculum	Infrastructural	Democracy	Human resources
Curriculum orientation	Research	Service	Experience	Practice
Power holder	Academic	Service provider	Community	Service provider
Engagement via	Inter-disciplinarity	Consultation	Dialogue	Transactions

Partnership is a means to an end – unlike its role in the 'democratic' engagement Discourse in which an equitable partnership is the desired goal. Partners favour meetings as a means of communicating effectively, in contrast to the debates, group discussions and dialogues that characterise the 'scholarly', 'benevolent' and 'democratic' engagement Discourses.

To provide an overview of each Discourse, the primary ideas and concepts are listed in a matrix in table 1.

Conclusion

In an effort to enhance our understanding of service learning, theorise it and increase its potential to benefit rather than harm those involved, the Discourses of 'scholarly', 'benevolent', 'democratic' and 'professional' engagement were constructed. They were grounded in the experiences, dialogues and scholarship around service learning in South Africa. Charmaz (2006, p. 185) has argued that taking the 'constructivist position to its logical extension' means that 'knowledge (should) transform practice and social processes', and 'grounded theory studies (should) contribute to a better world'. Cognisant of these directives, this chapter ends with the following recommendations.

Definitional flexibility

The framework makes explicit that considerable variation may be anticipated in different service learning initiatives. While some service learning endeavours may have similar features, each practice is likely to be unique in important respects. We should thus be cautious and critical in response to any attempt to develop a single definition of service learning. 'Definitional certainty' (Butin, 2003, p. 1687) will see service learning being defined so broadly that it offers little meaningful information, encourages scepticism and invites failure in at least some ways. It may be more helpful to use the Discourse elements (context, identity, development, curriculum, power and engagement) to structure dialogue and discussions in planning a service learning initiative collaboratively. In this way, each initiative will have a 'situated identity' (Gee, 1999) that allows evolvment of a definition of service learning that is shared, explicit and utilitarian. At the same time, the very process of its development will promote deeper understanding between those implementing the initiative and offer a transparent, authentic and realistic statement of their undertaking.

Curriculum coherence

The framework underlines the existence of points of diversion and collision between the Discourses. We are thus alerted to the importance of coherence within a curriculum. Unnecessary confusion for students and damage to intersectoral relationships are likely to result when the practical requirements for running the module and assessing the students' progress undermine the goals and articulated philosophies behind the module.

Flexibility in implementation

The varied contexts and identities that became apparent when looking across the Discourses indicate the need for flexibility in implementing service learning and in evaluating its impact. This flexibility is to take into account the different timetables and priorities of the participating sectors and their different states of readiness to engage with each other, to learn, serve and evaluate their participation. It may thus be necessary to adjust the initial plans in consultation with those involved. One may anticipate tensions between flexible implementation of and research around service learning and the current managerial ethos in which measurement, rigid plans and adherence to these are valued by our higher education sector. What it means, in the current higher education context, to pursue service learning within a 'democratic' Discourse, in particular, may indeed be a worthwhile topic for further research.

Questioning intersectoral boundaries

The focusing of the framework on engagement raises questions about the nature of the boundaries through and across which interaction occurs. The crossing of boundaries is a familiar notion in service learning and is particularly important in South Africa, with its history of enforced and often impermeable divisions between people and places. Do the thin lines we use in diagrams of interaction accurately represent the differences between the knowledges, the service and learning sites, and the people and sectors that service learning strives to traverse? Or would it be more realistic to depict 'chasms' (Bruzas, 2004, p. 57)? Future research into service learning would be usefully employed in problematising the differences that it encounters.

Use of framework outside service learning

The framework lends itself to use as an analytic tool for exploration of practices other than service learning, but that are in essence 'engaged'. Leadership, research and intersectoral projects, such as health promotion, are examples of such practices. The composite parts of the Discourse – namely, its context, the identity and roles of those involved, the development, learning and serving

taking place and the prevalent power dynamics – may serve as ‘theoretical codes’ (Charmaz, 2006) with which to analyse other engaged practices. Higher education institutions may also develop indicators for each ‘code’ in order to assess the quality of engagement in their curricula and other practices.

The framework as an evolving process

Finally, it must be remembered that, by its very nature, a Discourse can be split, melded or elaborated. It evolves as other Discourses in society change and as new knowledge is constructed. The use of information and mobile technologies in service learning initiatives, and the place of indigenous knowledges in that work, are two issues that appeared only on the periphery of the service learning experiences that grounded the Discourses. One may anticipate that such issues will become more prominent and may well impact on the Discourses to a greater or lesser degree in the future. Thus the Discourses as presented in this chapter should be seen as springboards for further research and critical consideration. Indeed, continued analysis of local initiatives may well reveal other Discourses or a collapsing of two or more of the ones presented here. In this respect, the theoretical framework typifies what the originators of grounded theory called ‘an ever-developing entity’ rather than ‘a perfected product’, frozen in a particular time and context (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 32).

References

- Bawa, A. (2003) ‘Rethinking community-based learning in the context of globalisation’, in H. Perold, S. Stroud and M. Sherraden (Eds), *Service Enquiry in the 21st Century*. Johannesburg: Global Service Institute and Volunteer and Service Enquiry Southern Africa, pp. 47–60.
- Bruzas, C. (2004) ‘The role of the service partner in service learning’. Unpublished Master’s thesis, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.
- Bruzas, C. and O'Brien, F. (2001) ‘Interim institutional narrative report of the University of Natal’, Durban. Unpublished overview for the Joint Education Trust of CHESP Service-Learning Projects.
- Butin, D.W. (2003) ‘Of what use is it? Multiple conceptualizations of service learning within education’, *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 105 No 9, pp. 1674–92.

Charmaz, K. (2006) *Constructing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Council on Higher Education (Ed.) (2010) *Community Engagement in South African Higher Education*. Kagisano No 6. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Erasmus, M.A. (2007) 'Service learning: Preparing a new generation of scientists for a mode 2 society', *Journal for New Generation Sciences*, Vol. 5 No 2, pp. 26–40.

Evans, L. (2008) 'Professionalism, professionalism and the development of education professionals', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 56 No 1, pp. 20–38.

Fourie, F. (2006) 'Towards a South African scholarship of engagement: Core and supplemental tasks of a university?' Paper presented at the community engagement in higher education conference, Cape Town, September. Retrieved 5 November 2009 from <http://www.che.ac.za/documents/d000153/>

Gee, J.P. (1990) *Social Linguistics and Literacies Ideology in Discourse*. London: Falmer Press.

Gee, J.P. (1999) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Gee, J.P. (2000) 'Identity as an analytic lens for research in education', *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 25, pp. 99–125.

Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.

Goduka, M.I. (1999) *Affirming Unity in Diversity in Education: Healing with Ubuntu*. Cape Town: Juta.

Grossman, J. (2007) 'Social responsiveness and workers' knowledge in our own backyards: The blunted challenge of service learning'. Paper presented at the fifth international conference on researching work and learning, Cape Town, December.

Henning, E. (1998) 'Service learning in the university curriculum: Partnerships in community education', *South African Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 12 No 1, pp. 44–53.

- Higher Education Quality Committee (2006) *Service-Learning in the Curriculum: A Resource for Higher Education Institutions*. Pretoria: Council on Higher Education.
- Mahlomaholo, S. and Matobako, T. (2006) 'Service learning in South Africa held terminally captive by legacies of the past', *Alternation*, Vol. 13 No 1, pp. 203–17.
- McMillan, J. (2002) 'The sacred and profane. Theorising knowledge reproduction processes in a service-learning curriculum', in S.H. Billig and A. Furco (Eds), *Service-Learning through a Multidisciplinary Lens*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, pp. 55–70.
- Mitchell, C. and Rautenbach, S. (2005) 'Questioning service learning in South Africa: Problematizing partnerships in the South African context. A case study from the University of KwaZulu-Natal', *South African Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 19 No 1, pp. 101–12.
- Muller, J. and Subotzky, G. (2001) 'What knowledge is needed in the new millennium?' *Organisation*, Vol. 8 No 2, pp. 163–82.
- Neefjes, K. (2000) *Environments and Livelihoods: Strategies for Sustainability*. Oxford: Oxfam.
- Netshandama, V. and Mahlomaholo, S. (2010) 'The role of community engagement in higher education: Focus on the discourse relating to knowledge development'. Paper presented at the third global conference: 'Intellectuals: knowledge-power', Prague, Czech Republic, May.
- O'Brien, F. (2001) 'Sites for service-learning'. Seminar presentation to the School of Community Development and Adult Learning, University of Natal, Durban, April.
- O'Brien, F. (2005) 'Grounding service learning in South Africa', *Acta Academica Supplementum*, Vol. 3, pp. 64–98.
- O'Brien, F. (2009) 'In pursuit of African scholarship: Unpacking engagement', *Higher Education*, Vol. 58, pp. 29–39.

O'Brien, F. (2010) 'Grounding service learning in South Africa: The development of a theoretical framework'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban.

Osman, R. and Attwood, G. (2007) 'Power and participation in and through service learning', *Education as Change*, Vol. 11 No 3, pp. 18–21.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1994) 'Grounded theory methodology', in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage, pp. 273–84.

University of Natal (2002) 'CHESP pilot service learning modules narrative report: Community placement project'. Unpublished report, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg.

van Rensburg, W. (2004) 'Writing partnerships: Academic writing and service-learning'. *Education as Change*, Vol. 8 No 2, pp. 134–45.

von Kotze A. and Cooper L. (2000) 'Exploring the transformative potential of project-based learning in university adult education', *Studies in the Education of Adults*, Vol. 32 No 2, pp. 212–28.

Webster-Wright, A. (2009) 'Reframing professional development through understanding authentic professional learning', *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 79 No 2, pp. 702–39.