Education Policy Analysis Archives

Volume 5 Number 4 **January 23, 1997** **ISSN 1068-2341**

A peer-reviewed scholarly electronic journal.

Editor: Gene V Glass Glass@ASU.EDU.

College of Education

Arizona State University,Tempe AZ 85287-2411

Learning from Others: Service-Learning in Costa Rica and Indonesia

David D. Williams
Brigham Young University

William D. Eiserman
Colorado Foundation for Families and Children

Abstract:
Calls are increasingly sounded for universities to better address their communities' and students' needs through service, as well as research and teaching. This article invites policy makers to re-examine university service, research, and teaching responsibilities by reflecting on roles service-learning plays in universities in Indonesia and Costa Rica. We conclude that service-learning plays a critical role and a key to expanding service-learning for students and understanding the utility of such a policy change is increased faculty involvement. Until more faculty explore the "why" and "how" of service-learning, research and teaching will dominate the university agenda.

> "Martin Luther King Jr. once said that "our scientific power has outrun our spiritual power. We have guided missiles and misguided men." I have seen many times men who abandoned their dreams; I have seen those misguided men who believe they can solve all problems with guided missiles. These are men without values, and the world cannot afford their leadership into the twenty-first century.
>
> "The return to a life and a world dominated by values is urgent if we want

peace to prevail. We should no longer be ashamed of feelings of piety. It is not true that they degrade reason and science. Piety is no less than the intelligence of the soul, and we need heart and brains to recover the world in our hands, for the values we cherish.

"Nobody can ignore the problems of today, least of all the intellectuals." (Arias, 1988, pg. 19)

Oscar Arias Sánchez
President of Costa Rica

A new book on service-learning in higher education (Jacoby, 1996) "provides a historical overview and a context for understanding the essential linkage of service and learning; it describes the current state of practice; and it highlights the relationship between service-learning and institutional educational goals" (p. 5). After examining the predominant assumptions underlying the combining of community service and academic learning in higher education and offering several illustrative examples from colleges and universities in the United States, several authors address in part three of the book "organizational, administrative, and policy issues" which "may be the most crucial factors in the initiation and sustainability of service-learning" (p 229).

Reviews of this excellent summary of the field and several related sources (e.g., Albert, 1994; Daloz, et al., 1996; Kendall and Associates, 1990; and many others which are indexed and available through the University of Colorado's service-learning homepage (http://csf.colorado.edu/sl/) raise some questions for educational policy makers to consider:

- What kinds of service belong in higher education?
- How does service enhance and/or detract from learning, teaching, scholarship, and other institutional goals?
- What policies regarding service should be made in higher education?
- What evidence is accruing that might inform policy regarding potential roles of service-learning in higher education?

Though most universities have always claimed that "service" is one of the three main purposes for higher education, both research and teaching continue to dominate the activities of most academics and their institutions. However, growing numbers of community service proponents are arguing that service combined with other kinds of academic learning should receive a more equitable place in higher education. While traditionalists note that there is very little time, incentive, or support for more service in academic life, service-learning proponents insist that the three-pronged mission need not constitute three separate sets of activities. Rather, they contend that activities under each of these missions may be more effective and efficient when integrated into a common set of activities (Jacoby, 1996).

As questions are asked and plans are developed for service-learning programs, whether on individual, institutional or national levels, it would be wise to learn from the experiences of those who have been involved in the development and implementation of service-learning programs in various contexts. Existing programs may inform a new "vision" for higher education's service role and may shape the development of practices for fulfilling that "vision" as well.

Unknown to many higher educators, some of the most comprehensive and innovative approaches to service-learning have been designed and implemented in developing countries (Eberly & Sherraden, 1990). In this study, the University of Costa Rica's compulsory service-learning program, which began in 1975, is explored and compared to a similar, even older program in Indonesia to help readers consider some questions to ask as they examine the role of service-learning in higher education in other societies and in their own contexts.

Following a short case study of a service-learning project in San José, Costa Rica, a brief definition of service-learning, a summary of principles identified in the literature which should under gird such projects, and an overview of methods used in our inquiry, this article explores what can be learned by educators world-wide through understanding the historical roots, program components, perceived outcomes, and perceived strengths and weaknesses of the two programs in Costa Rica and Indonesia.

Helping Children Help Children: One Brief Case

Entering a slum community set aside by the government of Costa Rica for indigent families who own no property, our van pulls off the blacktop onto a dirt road strewn with garbage and dirty-faced children in tattered clothes. Discarded plastic bags, old bottles, and cans clog an open sewage ditch which reeks of stagnant human waste and rotting trash. Stopping in front of a plywood and tin shed, Marta Picado Mesen, a Social Work professor from the University of Costa Rica, explains that this shed was built by World Vision and is intended to be used as a meeting hall exclusively by people living in one of the nine sectors of this settlement. We are visiting this settlement with Marta and four of the twenty-two university students who have joined her for the past few months. This settlement is the focus of a project they are doing as part of the university's community service program, Trabajo Comunal Universitario (TCU), in which students are required to participate before graduation.

As we unload the van, Marta explains that despite the perceptions of many tourists that Costa Rica is a clean and safe, idyllic place, there are many problems with crime, health, and drug abuse. This settlement is a sort of breeding ground for the worst of such things. Brought here from all over Costa Rica, many of these people were removed from squatter sites, while others had been homeless. Now they live here, on the outskirts of Costa Rica's capitol, San José, having been placed in the particular sector of the settlement which corresponds with the section of the country from which they were removed. The majority of the 3,840 individuals living here are members of single parent families and earn no salary. Forty-eight percent of the settlement's residents are children under the age of fifteen and the average family income is between 5,000 and 22,000 colones per month (approximately $36 to $160)--well below the poverty line in Costa Rica. About 15% of the inhabitants are unregistered Nicaraguan refugees, though it appears that nearly everyone in this settlement is a refugee of sorts.

Nearby, men are loudly nailing a sheet of rusted, corrugated tin to a small frame hut to make walls and a roof; a new home in the making. Eager to share their experience, the students explain that people move in every day and are constantly searching for materials to build shelters for themselves. Nearly everyone lives in multiple family dwellings. Each of the twelve-square-meter shelters, of which only 60% have latrines, is home to about 16 people. The only public building is a shed-like school on the edge of the settlement which is staffed by five teachers who teach about 500 children a day in shifts from six in the morning to six at night.

Surprised by the severity of these circumstances, we would like to wander through the settlement to see all of this more close-up, but Marta warns us that it is too dangerous. We must stay here on the edge of the settlement in the World Vision building, with the van parked outside. Inside the tin-roofed meeting hall with a dirt floor, while we sit at weather-beaten tables, Marta explains that the 960 families which live in the nine sectors of the settlement fight among themselves, with gang leaders from each sector leading assaults against people in other sectors. Children are often caught in the middle and, Marta believes, are consequently at serious risk psychologically, physically, and educationally. Marta's TCU project aims to address the needs of some of these children.

The focus of her project is to help a selection of 30 children in the settlement prepare themselves to more effectively deal with the problems they face due to the conditions in which

they live and to reach out as peer leaders to help other children. The scope of the project is broad, starting with activities associated with helping the children understand the dangers of drug abuse, the importance of education, the need to obtain health care, and the need to prevent disease, physical abuse, prostitution, and sexual promiscuity. As the project proceeds, Marta expects it will become more focused on concerns and interests of the participating children. They have already begun to elicit information from the children which will direct the planning for the next phase of the project.

While Marta serves as the director of the project, most of the direct work with children and other members of the community is being done by her TCU students who come from a wide variety of disciplinary backgrounds including nursing, medicine, social work, psychology, dramatic arts, and education. Marta has given four of the students (who are from health, psychology, dramatic arts, and education) responsibility for presenting the project to us. Prepared with handouts and using a portable overhead projector plugged into an outlet from a dangling ceiling light bulb, one-by-one the students present different aspects of the project including the settlement statistics, an overall project description, their specific objectives, the problems they have encountered, and their accomplishments.

As they present, a dozen or more children from the settlement playfully throw rocks on the roof of our building. Though these rocks are distracting to us as they thunderously roll off the tin roof, this interruption scarcely interferes with the students' steady, enthusiastic presentation of their experiences. These childish pranks, which appear to be commonplace to the students, remind us throughout their presentation of the disturbing harshness of the circumstances in which Marta and these students have been working.

Devoting their entire 300 hours of community service required for graduation from the University of Costa Rica on the initial diagnostic and planning phases of this project, these students have met with formal and informal leaders of the settlement to explain the project and to coordinate their efforts with other organizations within each sector of the settlement. From these efforts, they identified thirty children between the ages of eight and twelve from each of the sectors who are participating in the project. The students then diagnosed the children's challenges with respect to health threats, social problems, and educational needs through data gathering activities including games, discussions, and role-playing directly involving the 30 children. With their 300 hours now complete, these TCU students will be passing the project on to a new group of students who will continue to develop and carry out the next phase of the project, with Marta.

While they have confronted numerous challenges along the way, Marta and the students identify two areas with which they have been especially concerned. First, the students explained that they and the children are from completely different worlds. Previously they had had very little understanding of what these people faced economically and socially. The students consequently question the extent to which they can appropriately reach out to the children with what the children most need. A similar lack of understanding is true in reverse. As one student expressed,

> We know we are looked to as role models by some of these children, but what that means since we are from different worlds, I don't know. Is that helpful? Most of them will never have the opportunities we have. (Note 1)

Second, as this first phase is ending, there is going to be a total team turnover, with the exception of Marta. This represents a challenge since the children's participation in the project is largely a function of the relationships they develop with the TCU students. According to Marta, it is also somewhat traumatic for the TCU students since they come to know and care about these children:

> Making this transition and maintaining continuity within the project is the challenge

we face next.

Marta recognizes that they face many challenges in being able to effectively empower children to help other children face some tremendous difficulties of life in this situation. The importance of this project, according to Marta, is that they are addressing concerns for which there presently are no obvious solutions. In this respect, the TCU project provides a forum for Marta's scholarly research as well, including exploration of such questions as: Will the concept of children helping children work under these conditions, within the culture of this settlement? What will those who are assisted in their peer leadership abilities gain from trying to help other children? Marta explains,

> These are some of our questions. We will have to see. We know that they need what we are trying to provide. We just have to try.

While the focus of the experience has clearly been on what could be provided to the children of this settlement, the university students say this has been a valuable learning experience for them as well. They each describe ways in which they have creatively applied their education to the problems in this situation. For example, the drama student explains how rewarding it has been to use role playing to help the children identify their social problems. He had never seen his art form in this way; actually applied in such a useful manner.

The health student explains that in his previous coursework he had learned about the existence of various health problems and difficulties associated with getting people such as these to use free health services to which they were entitled. His work in this project has given him a chance to actually be a part of an effort aimed at overcoming some of those problems; according to him, a "way" of learning about these issues which other coursework could not have provided.

All of the students say that beyond gaining an appreciation of life in these harsh conditions and an understanding of how their skills could be useful there, both of which address the primary aim of the TCU program, they have learned the value of combining their disciplines with others in a collaborative effort. According to these students, interdisciplinary problem solving in actual, real- life settings is often what distinguishes TCU learning from other coursework.

Three of the four students believe they probably would have participated in some form of service even if TCU had not been compulsory, but they do not know how they could have organized anything like this on their own. Only one student says she would not have been involved in a service project like this if it had not been required because her family did not like the idea of her going into such a dangerous place.

As we leave the settlement with Marta and her students we are filled with questions. Can they succeed in helping these children? How? Is this what is meant by the integration of research, teaching, and service? Is this really working as well as it already seems to be? Why here? Why this project when there are so many other things they could all be doing which would more likely succeed and which would be easier and safer? Why does Marta feel that they "just have to try"?

Principles

Service-learning has been defined in many different ways but the definition used by Jacoby (1996, p. 5) is informative:

> Service-learning is a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service-learning.

Jacoby argues persuasively that service-learning brings the resources of the university to bear on social issues of concern which are not adequately addressed by other means. In addition to benefits for students, faculty, and the community, service-learning may help upgrade the educational institution itself:

> Higher education is being called on to renew its historic commitment to service. Its foremost experts are urging colleges and universities to assume a leadership role in addressing societyUs increasing problems and in meeting growing human needs.... At the same time, higher education is questioning its effectiveness at achieving its most fundamental goal: student learning.... As colleges and universities across the country are developing programs to enable their students to serve their communities, the nation, and the world-- and at the same time to enrich undergraduate education-- it is critical that these programs embrace the concept of service-learning. (Jacoby, pp. 3-5)

A growing number of university policy shapers are accepting the claim that the traditional curriculum and research agenda of universities can be informed via service- learning activities; and community support to the institution may be enhanced in many different ways as a result of the heightened visibility of the institution through its community-based service-learning activities.

While its proponents suggest that service-learning has the potential of addressing a wide variety of aims, perhaps most emphasized is the rationale of service-learning as a viable, maybe even optimal means for impacting students and faculty with regard to the improvement of social and civic responsibility, enhanced intellectual development, cross- cultural learning, leadership development, moral and ethical development, and career development (Kendall and Associates, 1990). Most service-learning programs tend to focus on one or two of these areas rather than address all of them equally, resulting in a wide array of service-learning configurations.

To understand the common threads of service- learning programs, as well as to help construct service- learning programs which possess the most critical elements, in 1989 a set of ten principles was developed by a group of service-learning educators from across the United States. These principles were intended to represent the common threads which distinguish service-learning from other types of learning and from other types of service activities. These principles state that an effective service-learning program:

1. Engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good.
2. Provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.
3. Articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved.
4. Allows for those with needs to define those needs.
5. Clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved.
6. Matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstances.
7. Expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment.
8. Includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals.
9. Insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interests of all involved.
10. Is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations (Kendall and Associates, 1990, p. 40).

While there seems to be considerable agreement among service-learning educators regarding these principles generally, discussion abounds on a number of issues related to how

these principles are to be expressed in practice. In response, we have conducted two studies in universities in developing countries (the Kuliah Kerja Nyata or KKN projects through the University of Indonesia and the Trabajo Comunal Universitario or TCU projects through the University of Costa Rica) which have been practicing diverse versions of service- learning for many years, to better understand how their practices relate to these principles and to discover other principles that might be helpful in guiding similar efforts elsewhere.

Methods

To begin exploring these issues, a qualitative inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994) approach was used, allowing for emergent themes to arise in the context of on-site interviews and observations. Qualitative inquiry provides a means for investigators to refine their questions to better reflect the perspectives of all participants throughout a study. Thus, an attempt was made to blend the concerns of students, faculty, administrators, service recipients, the literature, and the researchers through ongoing refinement of questions in light of concurrent data analyses. New questions arose and were addressed along with questions suggested by the literature.

The second author reviewed documents and interviewed participants in three KKN projects associated with Andalas University in Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia. Then, after analysis and review of that experience, both authors visited eleven TCU projects associated with the University of Costa Rica (of which the case study presented earlier was one) throughout Costa Rica. Details regarding data sources for both studies are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1
Summary of Data Sources for the Indonesian and Costa Rican Studies

Data sources	Indonesia (KNN)	Costa Rica (TCU)
Administrators interviewed	3	10
Faculty/supervisors interviewed	1	12
Students interviewed	19	11
Student questionnaire	19	NA
Community members interviewed	15	30
Projects studied	3	11

Interviews, in Indonesian and Spanish, were conducted with administrative staff, participating faculty (from accounting/business, agriculture, animal husbandry, arts and letters, civil engineering, chemistry, law, and medicine in Indonesia and from history, social work, engineering, linguistics, agronomy, art, anthropology, education, computer science, and nursing in Costa Rica), participating students (from accounting/business, agriculture, animal husbandry, arts and letters, civil engineering, chemistry, law, and medicine in Indonesia and from geology, psychology, drama, English teaching, nursing, botany, and nursing in Costa Rica; many other fields such as architecture, social work, education, art, engineering, sociology, and so on were involved in the Costa Rican projects but we were not able to meet with students from all represented disciplines), as well as various community participants (families being served, teachers in the settings, and visitors at museum and display sites).

We were able to travel to several project sites to see either the results of the projects or to see them in progress. These visits allowed us to observe KKN and TCU participants at work, gave us a sense of the outcomes from their efforts, and provided us with general observations of

the contexts in which projects were implemented.

Three forms of data were compiled in this inquiry. The primary data were field notes taken by the two investigators. These field notes included reconstruction of interviews and observations as well as our questions and interpretive comments. Supplementary data included photographic documentation of sites, observable outcomes of projects, and exposure to the various participants. Additionally, archival data were collected which were relevant to the questions addressed in this investigation, including official documents describing the goals and objectives of the programs and their implementation criteria, documents provided to faculty and students regarding participation guidelines, student evaluation instruments, as well as student and faculty reports of individual project activities.

Analysis procedures consisted of three activities:

- First, key questions to guide the inquiry were identified through a review of literature and our own experiences with service and learning.
- Second, we elaborated and expanded the key questions by reflecting on information obtained throughout each country's study.
- Third, we interpreted our experiences in these sites by searching for patterns across data sources and by attempting tentative answers to both our original guiding questions and to questions which emerged throughout the study.

Several methodological standards for conducting qualitative inquiry have been proposed (e.g., Eisner, 1991; Guba and Lincoln, 1989) and were used to guide this study. Though each visit was brief (less than a month in each country) we were able to meet the triangulation standards by using multiple investigators, sites, informants, and collection procedures. We also shared our findings with participants and asked for their judgments of accuracy and credibility (member checking), shared our findings with disinterested others to discover our blind spots (peer debriefing), and searched for evidence that would counter our conclusions (negative case analysis) to ensure trustworthiness of the findings. Finally, we have included a case description of one project (at the beginning of this article) to allow readers to hear the voices of the participants and to judge transferability of our findings to readers' sites. We have also kept an audit trail of all our activities throughout this project to increase the likelihood of dependability and confirmability of the study.

Lessons Learned

So what did we learn from participants in these two countries that could help others as they contemplate service- learning and policy setting in university settings? In the remainder of this article, we summarize the lessons learned around the following questions, which are a combination of questions we began the study asking and other questions that arose:

1. What are the historical roots that lead to the formation of these programs?
2. What are the basic program purposes and components?
3. What are the perceived outcomes, concerns, and lingering questions associated with participation in these programs from various perspectives?
4. What are some implications for combining service and learning for university students in other countries?
5. What questions are raised by this study for future inquiry into service and learning in higher education?

Historical Roots

Both of these "non-military national service" programs developed in the 1970's, beginning in grassroots initiatives and culminating in centralized governmental support and/or mandates.

Indonesia. Rooted in a rich history of gotong-royong (or mutual assistance), KKN had its first observable roots as a program implemented between 1945 and 1949 when Indonesians were struggling for independence from the Dutch. Due to a critical lack of teachers in guerrilla areas at that time, members of the student army were recruited to teach in secondary schools in these areas (Hardjasoemantri, 1981). After the fighting ceased, the organized students felt a "moral commitment" to continue providing teaching services on a voluntary basis and subsequently developed a volunteer project called Pergerahan dan Penempatan Tenagaa Mahasiswa (recruitment and placement of students for the purpose of teaching, known as PTM) which lasted until 1962.

In 1966 a major revision of the entire educational system included an institutional service-learning concept that was drawn from the earlier students' experiences with PTM. Several reform objectives eventually emerged from this movement which would become the basis for Kuliah Kerja Nyata or KKN:

1. education would become more Indonesia-based in content,
2. education would relate more closely to the range of skills presently needed in Indonesia,
3. the availability of non-formal education would be increased in order to complement the available formal education, and
4. education would provide greater opportunities for young Indonesians to participate directly in the development of their country in practical and satisfying ways.

With these objectives as a foundation, KKN emerged in 1972 as a formal course which was piloted at three of Indonesia's major universities, including Andalas University. The success of these pilot projects resulted in expansion to all 43 public universities, 90% of which subsequently have determined that KKN is compulsory for all students. Thus the impetus behind service-learning has shifted over the years from a voluntary effort fueled by student initiative to a compulsory "program" mandated by universities.

Costa Rica. Details from Sherraden & Castillo (1990), Gonzalez (1992), a booklet describing TCU entitled Información General (1992) and interviews with TCU administrators and university faculty contribute to understanding the historical roots of TCU as a program initiated by several Costa Rican students and faculty concerned about how to make their university more responsive to the needs of their broader society. They felt that because they were receiving many opportunities at the expense of others, they ought to find a way to compensate the rest of the nation for what they had received. This attitude first emerged in what is described as a small "radically left" group of students and received support from a similar group of faculty during the 1960's and 1970's. Like most modern universities, the University of Costa Rica identifies a three-pronged mission for itself, including teaching, research, and service to the community.

Therefore, in 1974, in an effort to respond to this "service movement," to raise service to the level of importance held by research and teaching, and to better integrate the three within the academic mission of the institution, the University of Costa Rica created an Office of Social Action (Vicerrectoria de Acción Social) to match its two sibling offices of research and teaching; all three of which serve as administrative supports for faculty. Responsible for a variety of service related activities which bridge faculty and students with the community, this office administers several service-learning programs (including TCU which became compulsory for students in 1975) which involve faculty and students from each academic department to promote service as an integral part of the academic mission of the university.

Basic Program Purposes and Components

Costa Rica and Indonesia have many similar objectives and processes for carrying out their service-learning programs. These are summarized in Table 2.

As the details in Table 2 suggest, there are many similarities between these two programs but there are also tremendous differences. In terms of purposes, both programs are viewed as means for bridging university resources with community resources. The emphasis in both is on community improvements and benefits while benefits to the students, faculty, and university as separate from the community are of secondary importance. They both emphasize students' obligations to society more than student learning, although that is an obvious secondary focus.

Table 2
Program Purposes and Components of the Indonesian and Costa Rican Programs

	Indonesia	**Costa Rica**
Purposes	(For Indonesia, these are adapted from Direktorate Pembinaan dan Pengabdian pada Maysarakat Ditjen Kikti Depdikbud, 1986.) 1. Students obtain learning experiences through their involvement in the social life of people in the community where they are directly exposed to everyday problems and address those problems in the process of development pragmatically and inter-disciplinarily. 2. Students contribute their ideas to the people by virtue of sciences, technologies, and arts in the attempt to stimulate and escalate the growth and development of the community as well as set up cadres for continuing development. 3. Universities produce graduates who are more aware of the complex conditions, changes, and problems that the people face in the process of development. Therefore, the graduates of universities can be prepared to overcome problems pragmatically and interdisciplinarily. 4. Relations among universities,	(For Costa Rica, these are adapted from Gonzalez, 1992, pg. 8.) 1. To raise the social consciousness of future professionals by bringing them into direct contact with their society and its problems. 2. To partially reimburse the society for what it has invested in the preparation of its university students. 3. To promote the students' sense of social responsibility so that they will continue to serve their communities throughout their professional careers. 4. To provide feedback to the university regarding how well it is meeting its teaching and research missions. The confrontation of the academic world with the social environment in service-learning settings should lead to important changes in curricula and research projects.

	local government, technical offices and members of the community are strengthened. Consequently, universities will be able to play a broader role and adapt their educational and research activities to the actual demands of the developing society	
Student Motivation	Compulsory for all undergraduates. Generally completed after the third year at the university.	Compulsory for all undergraduates. Generally completed after the third year at the university.
Faculty Motivation	Faculty are assigned to KKN supervisory responsibilities as part of their regular assignment.	Varies. One faculty member (minimum) from each academic department elects to be involved by developing their own project.
Community Motivation	Varies. But usually participation is viewed as a means of obtaining ad-ditional services not otherwise available and sometimes upgrading the status of the community generally.	Varies. But usually participation is viewed as a means of obtaining additional services not otherwise available and sometimes upgrading the status of the community generally.
Program Office	A separate office designed to bridge other units on community and research; reorganization underway to shift KKN under community unit	Equated with sibling offices on research and teaching; provides support to department level TCU activities.
Project development and administration	Centralized within KKN office with guidance from regional and national government input on priorities. Faculty assigned to KKN developed projects and sites.	Decentralized to academic departments and voluntary faculty within those departments. Faculty develop their own projects and get approval by TCU office.
Length of project	Usually two months	Usually three years
Length of service for students	Two months full time-- projects are turned over to the community after this with no new students coming in.	300 hours-- projects usually continue with another group of students and the same faculty member.
Curricular placement	Separate from traditional coursework and concentrated in June-August.	Separate from traditional coursework but ongoing throughout the year.

Preparation of students	Prior to participation in the program, students complete a coaching orientation.	Prior to participation in the program, students complete a large group course on "national reality."
Project choices	Students are assigned to a team which is assigned to a project setting.	Students are provided with a booklet of about 100 faculty projects from which they may choose and apply.
Setting/focus	All projects are similar. They are interdisciplinary projects focusing on several areas of development reflecting regional and national governmental priorities, usually in rural settings but moving toward urban projects in the future.	Varies greatly from foci on cultural development, to health education, to infrastructure development to literacy concerns. May be focused on a single social issue or on multiple aspects of urban or rural concerns.
Team size (on site)	8 to 10 students and a supervisor	Varies: 10 to 30 and a faculty member.
Team composition	Interdisciplinary	Interdisciplinary
Residency	Students are required to reside in the village community where the project takes place.	Students generally continue to reside at home.
Supervision	Varies but faculty serve as distant supports and evaluators. Students work very independently with little supervision.	Varies but tends to have faculty involved in all phases of projects. Students usually have regular supervision.
Community participation	Varies greatly. Mechanisms exist to promote the development of projects which arise from needs identified by community members, which foster community participation.	Varies greatly. Mechanisms exist to promote the development of projects which arise from needs identified by community members, which foster community participation.
Program evaluation	Formal formative and summative evaluations involve all stake holders.	Formal formative and summative evaluations involve all stake holders.
Student evaluation	Graded, group grading used.	Pass/fail
Faculty involvement	A small core group of faculty (about 20% of all faculty) are actively involved.	A small core group of faculty (about 20% of all faculty) are actively involved.

Reflective component	There is no specified reflective component but there are regular problem-solving/decision-making meetings. These may be formal with participation of faculty and community members or informal with only students. Implicit emphasis is to focus on others and not encourage self-conscious reflection on service.	There is no specified reflective component but there are regular problem-solving/decision-making meetings. These may be formal with participation of faculty and community members or informal with only students. Implicit emphasis is to focus on others and not encourage self-conscious reflection on service.
Finances	Minimal funds are used. Supplemental funds are occasionally received from extension offices. Students are provided one round trip transport to and from the site. Most students pay tuition and often contribute project funds.	Minimal funds are used. Supplemental funds are occasionally received from extension offices. Provides food and transportation to and from out of city sites. 70% of students pay no tuition and students rarely fund projects.

In terms of motivations for participating, community members view the programs in both countries as a means of obtaining services not otherwise available. These programs are also meant to provide a feedback loop so that society can inform the university about the social realities that academia should address. Thus, the community not only receives benefits but should also inform the university via these programs.

Students in both countries are required to participate if they want to graduate (though many of them want to offer their help and do not view this requirement negatively). According to faculty and students interviewed in this study, students who participate in Costa Rica feel some obligation, beyond their university requirement, to participate because about 60% of them pay almost no tuition. Even of those who do, the highest payments are only about the equivalent of $120 a semester. And in Indonesia, all university students feel some obligation to the rest of their society to help, even though they have to pay tuition and often major costs associated with their projects.

Faculty motivations vary more substantially. In Indonesia, faculty are assigned supervisory roles to projects that may or may not be directly relevant to their teaching and research agenda. They do not appear to glean much professionally or personally from participating. But in Costa Rica, faculty volunteer to be involved by proposing their own projects which sometimes grow directly out of their research and teaching activities. It appears that the main incentive for professors' involvement in TCU is to write about it. They are welcome to publish what they learn, just as they would with regular research projects.

Administratively, the programs are very similar in that program offices are set up to bridge service with research and teaching rather than make service a separate activity. However, the Indonesian program administration is centralized within the KKN government office and involves service learning projects for students from many different universities. Though the Costa Rican program has the TCU office and a formal project development and evaluation process (involving reviews of plans, implementation, and outcomes), most of the development and administration is decentralized to academic departments and faculty within those departments. Each academic department in the university has a faculty member assigned to coordinate the efforts of their department with the Office of Social Action. This person helps orient other professors to the Social Action programs, knows the community service projects pertaining to their department, helps solve problems encountered by participants in the program,

encourages integration of service with inquiry and teaching, and otherwise searches for ways to meet the office of Social Action's main responsibility, which is to translate what the university is learning into the society at-large.

Both programs provide minimal financial support, although the Costa Rican program appears to provide slightly more. Most University of Costa Rica departments dedicate at least three percent of their budget to TCU-related projects and allow up to 30% overload or faculty release time to participate in these programs. The TCU office provides an assistant for ten hours a week to help faculty members in whatever ways they see fit. That office also provides food, transportation, hourly assistants, materials, and evaluation/ accreditation assistance for projects they approve. In contrast, the Indonesian students often provide their own financial support for projects in addition to paying tuition, though the program provides travel to and from the project site.

In terms of student requirements and faculty involvement, the TCU program, translated as university community work, is designed to meet the Costa Rican objectives through compulsory "pass/fail" participation of all undergraduate students, in addition to their traditional coursework and departmental practica requirements. Students must complete the equivalent of 300 hours of service by working on a segment of a faculty member's TCU-approved project in less than one year after completing at least 50% of their coursework and taking a class on "national reality" which orients them to the problems of the nation (course content and activities vary widely as each academic department teaches its own version). They may apply to participate in a project after reviewing available project descriptions in a booklet.

These projects usually involve some needs assessment with community leaders or members, span at least three years and are somewhat interdisciplinary in nature. Project foci vary widely from efforts to solve health problems, to improving literacy, to enhancing cultural development, to preserving historical relics, to preserving native dialects. Projects usually grow out of the faculty members' assessment of what a particular community needs in light of each faculty member's primary research and teaching interests and their ongoing relationships with the community. Thus, the faculty members are usually members of these communities or have strong ties to them and are willing to dedicate several years to addressing needs there, working with several cohorts of 10-30 students from many different disciplines throughout the project's history.

The KKN program is also compulsory and subsequent to at least two years of on-campus study. It involves participation in a graded four credit "coaching" class taught for 2-4 hours from January to June within each college (usually in large groups of up to 200 students) to orient students to the infrastructure of villages, as well as production, education, social, cultural, and spiritual issues important in village life. Toward the end of this course, students are divided into small teams of 8-10 which are assigned to participating villages and they meet to prepare for an initial visit to the village. Meanwhile, village leaders are approached by government and university staff to explain the aims of KKN and prepare the villagers to identify needs and prepare for the team to take residence there. Eventually, an initial one day "observation visit" is conducted to allow students to gather data about the situation and needs of the village. However, rather than a formal needs assessment, this visit usually only involves introductions, a short tour of the village, and a short meeting to discuss the starting date, housing arrangements, and the expression of hopes for what will be accomplished.

About a week after this initial visit, the student team moves into the village and spends two months developing relationships, working with village leaders to develop a multi-disciplinary work plan and working collaboratively with one another and villagers to address this plan. The students are supposed to play five main roles: sharers of information from outside sources that the villagers might want to use, motivators to encourage village members to make necessary changes, diffusers of national programs and ideas, inter-system mediators between villagers and offices offering technical services within the region, and supervisors of

project activities. However, actual roles emerge and are negotiated, often resulting in the students spending considerable time physically laboring in the village on projects villagers want. The students also spend time each day informally meeting together to talk about their work, challenges they face, and possible solutions.

The foci of the projects usually combine several areas of development reflecting local, regional, and national governmental priorities. Some examples include rodent control, building an irrigation canal, reactivation of a local chapter of the national family education and welfare organization for women, activation of youth in village projects through sports, traditional dancing, and drama, renovation of a bridge, advice on legal issues, conservation of traditional folk drama through education of the youth by knowledgeable villagers, education on health maintenance and hygiene, conducting a census, and mobilizing funds for economic development. The students are supervised and evaluated/graded at the end of the two months by faculty assigned to their project who do not usually reside in the village with the students but make occasional visits. These evaluations include observations of projects, interviews with key village leaders, and review of a final report prepared by the students which describes the village, current problems in it, and students' activities and project outcomes.

One important component of service-learning programs according to the literature is "reflection" by participants on what they are learning from their giving of service. Neither of these programs specify a "reflective" component per se. However, there are many opportunities for the students in the Indonesian teams and the students and faculty in the Costa Rican projects to meet, talk, make decisions, and solve problems together. Thus, there is an emphasis on being thoughtful about what they are doing as they address real problems of their communities. But reflection is implied rather than highlighted. Also, the focus is on encouraging an orientation toward helping others rather than on self-conscious service (e.g., what am I getting out of this?).

Perceived Outcomes

To facilitate interpretation of the findings of these two studies, overall results as perceived by participants and by us as visitors are presented in Table 3 then discussed briefly.

The first substantial finding of this investigation was that the goals of both KKN and TCU are actually being translated into practices and experiences of faculty, students, and members of the community. It became clear that the service missions of these programs are being expressed in tangible, though somewhat different ways.

Table 3
Perceived Outcomes for the Indonesian and Costa Rican Programs

Area of Perceived Outcomes	Indonesia	Costa Rica
1. In terms of official objectives	The first three objectives are clearly being met. However, although relations among participating universities and communities are improving, it is not clear that the universities are adapting their teaching and research activities to the demands of the developing society.	All four objectives appear to be addressed by the current program. The service mission of TCU is being actualized into practices and experiences of faculty, students, and members of the community.

2. Relative emphasis is on community outcomes	The primary benefit is what the villagers receive from their involvement in KKN projects--direct help with health, agricultural, educational, and other challenges as well as increased status for being a KKN project village.	While students, faculty, and university are benefiting, the explicit emphasis is on community benefits. The community members felt listened to and responded to by university representatives. They were invited to collaborate with students and faculty to address their own problems in small steps over time.
3. Student outcomes	In contrast with other coursework, KKN participation is perceived to develop self-management and interpersonal skills, and values, perspectives, and ideas related to social responsibility and multicultural awareness. It is also one rite of passage into adulthood.	With few exceptions, students feel that participation in TCU helps them develop civic responsibility and caring for others in society while they refine their skills and apply knowledge in their majors. They see this as one way to begin "paying back" their fellow citizens for this opportunity for a higher education.
4. Faculty/university outcomes	The universities which participate receive greater visibility in the communities involved and most graduates have a deeper knowledge of and commitment to the society; but faculty do not appear to benefit directly and curriculum and research programs are not affected directly.	Faculty who choose to participate report professional growth and learning while noting that participation helps them be better teachers and researchers and to integrate those responsibilities with service in meaningful ways.
5. Interdisciplinary focus	Students from many different disciplines are organized into teams which are assigned to address realistic project problems in villages.	The focus of TCU projects on real problems faced by communities leads naturally to integration of various disciplines to cooperatively address those problems.
6. Project focus	Use of original service projects to coalesce student and faculty effort in groups around community problems helps focus their efforts in ways that could not be achieved through solo service hours spent in existing service agencies.	Use of original service projects to coalesce student and faculty effort in groups around community problems helps focus their efforts in ways that could not be achieved through solo service hours spent in existing service agencies.
7. Placement in curriculum	Service in KKN as a requirement separate from all other coursework emphasizes the importance of the community needs in	Service in TCU as a requirement separate from all other coursework emphasizes the importance of the community needs over university

	conjunction with university requirements.	requirements and makes the use of student time much more flexible.
8. Role of compulsion	The compulsory nature of the program is critical to its success but carries some problematic side effects.	The compulsory nature of the program is essential to its success but may lead to problems if other universities don't require it.
9. How well the program meets the Principles of Service Learning	Clearly meets 6 of 10 but does not emphasize critical reflection (Principle 2), often fails to clarify the responsibilities of participants (Principle 5), often lacks sufficient supervision of students (Principle 8), and provides insufficient time for many projects to be completed satisfactorily (Principle 9).	Clearly meets 8 of 10 but does not emphasize critical reflection (Principle 2) nor articulation of learning goals (Principle 3).
10. Main lesson learned	The focus on serving takes precedence over a focus on learning; this seems to be a strength rather than a weakness of the program.	The emphasis on social action for others by students and faculty leads to meaningful learning without (and maybe better than) an explicit focus on learning benefits to participants (particularly students).
11. Problems faced	1. Faculty supervisor to student ratio is too small-- due to compulsory nature of the program. They need a mechanism to release faculty from other responsibilities in order to be placed with students in villages longer. 2. Lack of funds-- undue load carried by the students. 3. Length of program is too short for students to see consequences of their service. 4. Disagreement over the purposes and foci of KKN projects between students and villagers-- often an overemphasis on highly visible projects involving	1. Quality of students' experience depends on the faculty member, the project, and the student and appears to vary considerably. 2. Compulsory element can lead to a negative experience for some students who would rather not participate. 3. There is a potential threat from other universities which do not require service; they may take over the higher education market. Therefore, there is growing pressure to justify TCU with respect to student benefits. 4. There is a need to involve more faculty in the program. While TCU provides an infrastructure for integrating research,

	physical labor to satisfy villager's expectations while under emphasizing other student roles. 5. Institutionalization of the KKN by the central government facilitates the amassing of resources and support from many sources but it can also lead to a focus on governmental goals and projects rather than local interests. 6. They need to develop more urban projects instead of working only on rural problems. 7. They need more external evaluation of their programs, including research on processes and outcomes of programs.	teaching and service, how it is used depends largely on the academic departments' understanding of and commitment to the integration possibilities of TCU projects. Increasingly TCU staff are feeling the need to be able to demonstrate more convincingly the benefits to faculty and the university which emerge from TCU involvement so more departments will support research through this program and not require faculty to do research in competing areas. 5. Funding for projects needs to be increased. 6. They need more external evaluation of their programs, including research on processes and outcomes of programs.

Second, while students, faculty, and the university seem to be benefiting in a variety of ways, both programs are distinguished by their explicit emphasis (in terms of stated objectives and the planned activities of participants) on community benefits with more subtle or implicit emphasis on benefits to students, faculty, and the associated universities generally. Members of the communities being served by the university students and faculty reported that they felt understood and listened to by the academics. They were usually very involved in identifying their needs, developing the programs that would address those needs and evaluating their success in collaboration with the faculty and students involved. As one Costa Rican community leader said,

> This project has been good. . . it has helped people to get involved, to listen to one another. Some of our people have volunteered with building a canal here, because of this project. This land, you know, was given to us. This is a problem.. People sometimes begin to think other people should always solve their problems. This project has begun to show them that outside help is important, but it requires effort from us. Change requires collaboration. The best outside help is like this, when they help us decide, help us plan, help us accomplish our goals.

Third, however, with only a few exceptions, most of the university students felt that participation also helped them develop a realistic sense of civic responsibility, understanding, and caring for others in their society while providing an opportunity for them to refine their skills and apply knowledge obtained through their studies in new and useful ways. As one Indonesian student noted,

> I never realized that the villagers might have a set of customs and beliefs about what materials can be used for something like a water system and that concrete was not a part of that. This required a great deal of discussion. At times I was frustrated that we could not proceed faster. But I also gained an appreciation for their ability to deliberate on these matters. Without this sort of deliberation, important aspects of the culture could be lost. ... those ways might actually be there because they are the most effective. I suppose I did not realize that slow progress may sometimes be appropriate. ... KKN helped me learn the importance of examining these cultural issues, especially when drastic changes are being suggested. They know their reasons for previous practices and they know some of the barriers to change which outsiders can not anticipate."

Another student from Costa Rica explained,

> I'm a boy from the city, but now my heart beats to the rhythm of the village. ...now I know the condition of many people in my country which I could have easily been shielded from my entire life. It is possible, you know, to pursue your own interests above the needs of people who are suffering nearby. We learn to navigate around them, those people, so well that we remain completely ignorant of their circumstances. But once you know about them first hand, ...then you no longer can only pursue your own interests. TCU helps you accept some responsibility for your society.

Fourth, Costa Rican faculty who choose to participate are also affected positively while Indonesian faculty are more tangential to their program. The universities in Indonesia which participate receive greater visibility in the communities involved and have the satisfaction of believing that most of their graduates have a deeper knowledge of and commitment to the society; but faculty do not appear to benefit directly and most curriculum and research programs are not affected directly by the service component.

In contrast, TCU appears to serve as a sort of faculty and university development program for at least a small proportion of the faculty. Participating faculty reported they benefited in many of the same ways students did, which was not surprising because one of the most obvious elements of faculty involvement across all Costa Rican sites was that faculty viewed themselves as learners alongside the students. As one professor reflected,

> This project gives me a chance to go to areas I never would otherwise go. I meet people I never would know and learn about circumstances I have only heard about. It is one thing to have an opinion or a solution in your mind. It is another to confront it, to address the problem, just as it exists, with all of the complications. ... And to do it in the peace of high mountain villages. Well, it is enjoyable and difficult at the same time. It changes you, personally and professionally. It anchors who you are and why you do what you do.

Others noted that participation helped them be better teachers and researchers and to integrate those responsibilities with service in meaningful ways:

> By blending them, I am not as torn between my responsibilities as I would be if I had them all separated.

> Doing different things is a good way to stay interesting to your students. Somehow I think I am more lively now when I teach my courses because TCU has gotten me out

into the fresh air, off campus. TCU is a good reminder of what I am really doing as an instructor. It is easy to forget about that.

For me it has been a good way to integrate research and service...and teaching. It has given me many ideas for teaching and research. I am very excited about this research. It is full of surprises.

One of the striking features of the research being conducted in the context of TCU projects is the way research questions arise. Many of the ideas for research projects emerge in the contexts in which they are being executed. Rather than formulating a research agenda out of context and imposing it on "subjects", the requirements of TCU call for projects which arise from community needs. For many researchers, this calls for a methodological departure often moving from highly reductionistic, quantitative approaches to more individualistic, qualitative research approaches. Several faculty find themselves developing new research skills as they ask different questions, often more directly bridging their research with practice.

Inasmuch as faculty experience personal or professional development, it is likely the university itself is indirectly being upgraded. Faculty indicated that the most apparent way the university benefits from their TCU experiences is that the curriculum is informed by the community-based projects. The strengthened community relationships which result from many TCU projects, including collaboration with various public and private agencies, also are perceived as beneficial to the university. And a student explained that as the faculty have improved through participation in this program, the whole university has benefited too,

TCU makes the university more realistic. It forces faculty to take their theories into the streets, not just to test them, but to use them. And I think that when they teach, their experience of having used a certain theory or method in a real situation makes their lesson more meaningful to students, more valid. This improves the university generally, I think..

Fifth, programs in both countries address real problems of their national and local communities using interdisciplinary teams of students. In Indonesia, this occurs because the teams are created through a mixing of students from a variety of majors; then the teams are assigned to villages where the problems to be addressed are negotiated with the villagers and the students are able to call upon their experiences and coursework to address these real needs.

In Costa Rica, the faculties' focus in their TCU projects on real problems faced by communities throughout the country has lead naturally to the integration of various disciplines to cooperatively address those problems. The students join the projects from many different majors after reviewing brief summaries of the projects and in response to requests from the faculty members for students with particular expertise.

In both situations, the interdisciplinary efforts are breaking down barriers between people with different perspectives while identifying better solutions to problems they all face. As one student said,

I am from the hard sciences. It was helpful to work with social workers on this. I would not have thought to do this, maybe because I was never taught to think that way, that inclusively, in my coursework. They helped me understand why people were making the decisions they were about how they built their houses; why they did or did not take care of their land like I thought they should. This was necessary to understand if we wanted to get them to change how they did things. It was humbling, I guess you would say, to realize that our solutions were useless until we learned how to reach them. This is why TCU is valuable to me. It is my work to help solve

human's problems, but in my school, we do not study humans. We study the earth. TCU taught me the human side to geology that never appeared in my books.

And a faculty member noted,

I have learned many things from this project already. I am a social worker, but I have had to learn about geology and geography, even architecture in order to make the social changes I am interested in making there. None of us can work in isolation when we are applying what we do to real life problems. This has helped me question my methodology and others' methodologies as well. What can it mean when people are working within a single perspective? What kinds of solutions to problems can they offer?

Sixth, in both countries, original service projects are created by the participants to coalesce efforts of all group members around community problems. This approach helps focus their efforts in ways that could not be achieved through solo service hours spent in existing service agencies. Students are not just giving service-- they are part of a team which supports them, challenges them, and helps them see that they are part of something bigger than themselves. They are learning to collaborate as citizens for the common good.

Seventh, although the Indonesian students are graded while the Costa Ricans receive pass/fail ratings only, both programs include the service curriculum as a separate requirement for students, outside of all coursework, again emphasizing the focus on community needs first and university structure and requirements second. Interestingly, several of the Costa Rican faculty who were interviewed as well as the TCU administrators, commented on how the aims of TCU depend on the freedom this external placement of the program provides. As one faculty member noted (and this seems to apply in Indonesia as well),

I think it is better to have TCU separate as well as non-graded. It helps me achieve many of the objectives of TCU related to social responsibility. The interdisciplinary nature of TCU would be much more difficult if TCU were part of specific courses. And how can you respond to community needs if you have to do projects which must operate on the semester calendar? The way TCU works now, students are involved for 300 hours. How those hours are distributed depends totally on the nature of the work to be done for the community. It all depends on the community project. ...Having TCU non-graded is also very good, at least for me. It helped me use the evaluation process to achieve the objectives of social responsibility. If I had to grade the students, they would be motivated by a grade rather than by doing something which was meaningful to them and to others. The TCU process is just more real and so is the way they are evaluated. Don't you think it is good to learn how to evaluate your own work in your own terms? And, the students were more motivated than students ever are when grades are a part of it. This is ironic because some people, other faculty, who don't participate in TCU, say that it is impossible to motivate students if you are not grading them. Those of us who are committed to TCU do not find this to be true.

Eighth, one of the most hotly debated issues regarding the composition of university service-learning programs is whether service-learning should be cumpulsory or voluntary. Many of the elements in these programs which were cited as key in determining the value they have for their various participants are a function of their compulsory nature. The compulsory nature of the programs appears to be critical to their success; but this characteristic also bears some problematic side effects. In Indonesia, because nearly all universities participate in this national

program, there are more students needing supervision and guidance than the existing faculty can appropriately serve. So, although many villages are receiving help, the quality may suffer.

In Costa Rica, in addition to the requirements placed on the students, each academic department at the University of Costa Rica is expected to have at least one TCU project underway at all times. Most participants seem to agree that the compulsory nature of the program has been essential to its overall success. A staff member who has been in the TCU program since its inception summarized,

> Once we had general commitment to TCU, we were able to be more creative in what we expected of students. When you require them to be in TCU, you can require them to be creative and to have the more intense experience, the better experience... maybe better than they would choose if you allowed them to choose it or not.

However, as mentioned earlier, as other universities which do not have this requirement continue to emerge and to compete for student enrollments, the compulsory nature of TCU is coming under increasing attack both from within and outside the university.

Ninth, an analysis of the Indonesian and Costa Rican program in terms of the ten principles of good practice for combining service and learning cited earlier (Kendall and Associates, 1990, p. 40) suggests both programs confirm and conform to most of these principles. It appears that eight of them were clearly represented in the experiences of participants in the TCU projects examined in this study. For example, relating to the seventh principle of service- learning, "An effective program expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment," it appeared that TCU enjoys considerable institutional support. This support includes the compulsory nature of the program, the requirement of each academic department to be involved in TCU, financial and administrative support, and the clear articulation of TCU's mission and its relationship to the overall mission of the university.

However, in both countries there is evidence also that they do not follow these principles exactly. For instance, the Indonesian program clearly meets six of the ten but does not emphasize critical reflection (Principle 2), often incompletely clarifies the responsibilities of participants (Principle 5), lacks sufficient supervision of students (Principle 8), and provides insufficient time for many projects to be completed satisfactorily (Principle 9). Although the Indonesians would agree that they should meet the latter three principles better and they are searching for ways to do so, they do not appear to value the critical reflection component as much as the authors of the principles do.

Likewise, in Costa Rica, there is very little evidence that principle 2 (critical reflection) or the learning focus of principle 3 (articulation of clear learning goals) were explicitly addressed at all, almost in direct relation to the major emphasis of the program on "community" benefits. While there are many references in goal statements and program objectives to helping the communities associated with the university, neither of these principles that focus on more typical concerns of universities for their students are expressly manifest in the TCU program.

From many service-learning educators' perspectives, the absence of these student-centered components would be viewed as a programmatic weakness. In fact, some service-learning educators (see several in Jacoby, 1996) suggest that it is the presence of some of these components which distinguishes service-learning from non-educational volunteerism. They argue that one can volunteer but not necessarily interpret their volunteer experience accurately or ethically and not necessarily learn anything new without a reflective component and clearly stated learning goals. Thus, the absence of explicit student learning objectives in the TCU program and a reflective component in both programs may technically be noted as a weakness of these programs.

Paradoxically, however, it is possible that the lack of these particular ingredients may actually facilitate the objectives of both programs while better addressing the learning goals of

students and faculty than the principles could, in this context. Perhaps to include components focusing on student learning objectives and a student- centered reflective process would be somewhat contradictory to the underlying philosophy of what the TCU and KKN experiences "ought" to mean to students since they emphasize an "other" orientation; and a focus on student outcomes emphasizes a "me" orientation. One of the TCU staff, pretending to be a student, tried to illustrate this point:

> TCU is not about me. Its about other people. Its about my community. ...Or the environment. It is not about ME!

The implication is that being a part of some action or activity which is other focused is a form of learning itself. Conversely, to demand the setting of student learning goals and objectives and the use of a formal reflective process for students to examine their experiences could be to undo the essence of the experience TCU and KKN are designed to facilitate. The exclusion of such elements may be as vital to the success of these programs as their inclusion in programs with different learning aims. The question which some service-learning educators will inevitably ask is whether the benefits students receive due to the absence of those elements can be called "learning".

When speaking about student experiences, TCU and KKN staff do not talk about learning as much as they talk about "social action" and service. In university settings where behavioral components of learning rarely appear, can such action constitute learning in and of itself? Some vehemently argue that the conscious processing of action is what constitutes the learning and is what may ensure that the actions have been "appropriately" interpreted and incorporated into the students' ethical and information systems.

Finally, in terms of challenges, participants in both countries are searching for ways to involve more faculty, to clarify the purposes of the program for potential participants, to obtain greater supporting funds, to improve the quality of the experience for all participants, to overcome negative side effects associated with their programs being compulsory, to have external evaluation assistance, and to conduct research on the processes and outcomes of their programs.

The Indonesians are also seeking to develop more urban projects rather than focus only on rural problems, and they are searching for ways to place faculty directly in field settings with students. The University of Costa Rica has found ways to deal with both these problems but finds that other newer universities throughout the country are not requiring students to give this kind of service and so they may lose enrollments over time if the program doesn't become a national one.

Lingering Questions

Our inquiries into the service learning programs of Indonesia and Costa Rica have clarified many of the issues that educators everywhere ought to consider as they contemplate similar programs in their contexts. But we have also encountered several questions that merit the attention and considered thinking of these educators as well. Some of these follow:

1. What are the relative advantages and disadvantages of attempting to develop or sustain a university program which is "action" oriented versus "learning" oriented?
2. What adaptations to the university mission are necessary to incorporate social action into the educational agenda?
3. What are the advantages and disadvantages (either in terms of learning or action) of including elements in programs which encourage student-centered thought or reflection?
4. What types of educational processes are helpful and for what purposes?

5. How to create a balance between national and local community needs?
6. How to decide if enough student learning is occurring in a program, how to determine what learning is occurring, and how to expand learning benefits (if so desired).
7. What is the relationship between various programmatic elements and students' learning outcomes, including relative focus on the importance and function of training, monitoring, evaluation processes, reflective components, and concomitant traditional study?
8. How should teaching, research, and service be blended most appropriately.
9. How to demonstrate most convincingly the benefits to faculty and the university which emerge from involvement in service learning? What these benefits are, what elements are necessary to produce them, and how they can be documented and presented represent important research questions which need to be addressed.
10. What are the unexpected outcomes or side-effects of service learning programs?
11. To what extent are the experiences of the community, students, faculty, the university (i.e.. benefits, involvement, challenges) dependent on whether the program assumes a service project focus or consists of solo service activities? In what ways is the meaning of the service- learning experience for each participant influenced by this aspect of the program's design?
12. How do community, student, and faculty experiences differ depending on whether the service-learning activities are embedded in or external to traditional coursework?
13. What other aspects of participants' experiences are a result of the compulsory nature of programs and how do participants' experiences compare with the experiences of those involved in voluntary service-learning programs?

These questions mark important needs for future investigation.

Conclusions and Implications

Universities all over the world have continually aligned themselves with a three-pronged mission which includes research, teaching, and community service. While the ways in which each of these missions are defined may vary significantly from one university to the next, the priority service usually receives in comparison with the other two is quite consistent across many different university contexts in which service at least ostensibly appears as a part of the mission. Almost without exception, service in academic life remains a low priority, is often ambiguously and narrowly defined, frequently refers only to on-campus service within or between departments, rarely is integrated into research and teaching activities and involvement with students, and is rarely considered as an equally viable component in promotion and tenure evaluations.

The KKN and TCU programs serve as examples of university programs which promote service, though still as a "third" priority, as a more legitimate part of students' and faculties' academic lives than in most universities in the world.

Increasingly universities everywhere are receiving the message that students need to be developing a greater sense of community membership, interdisciplinary understanding of social problems, and an enhanced ability to apply their knowledge and skills to a wide variety of circumstances. Communities which host universities often feel isolated from the university members, frequently serving only as subjects for their research, and often removed from the wealth of resources housed in those "ivory" towers. As a result, universities are increasingly re-evaluating their service missions and asking the question, "Why is service part of the university's mission and what does it mean?"

In this study, we have begun to examine the meaning of the KKN and TCU experiences as well as challenges they face from many different participants' perspectives. While the focus of

both programs seems to be on benefits to the community, participants also acknowledged that better linkages need to be forged between students' learning needs, faculty needs, and the needs of communities in which students and faculty are involved if more faculty are going to get involved and if financial support from various sources is going to be forthcoming.

It seems fair to conclude from our experiences in these two countries that the key variable to overcoming challenges and expanding service-learning beyond the levels that have been achieved is increased faculty involvement. The communities are already benefiting and welcoming whatever the universities are offering. The students participate because it is mandated. But until more faculty are involved by helping them understand both the "why" and the "how" of service-learning, both these exemplary programs are limited. The Indonesian program is unable to grow due to lack of supervision while the Costa Rican program remains fairly small because fewer than 20% of the faculty are involved in developing projects in which students may engage.

In an effort to understand the faculty role better, we asked faculty who were involved why they considered involvement a legitimate expenditure of their time and energy. However, their answers to this question usually did not quench our curiosities. Their responses were,

"We must."
"It is important, don't you think so?"
"It is interesting."

It began to be clear that while the support mechanisms associated with these programs were necessary and helpful, they were not what made the prospect of involvement compelling for faculty. All faculty in the University of Costa Rica and the Indonesian system are repeatedly provided with this information, yet only about one fifth of the faculty participate. Why do some choose to get involved and view participation as an ideal way to combine teaching, research and service while others simply don't participate?

We were reminded of the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas (1987) who suggests that when one truly comes to acknowledge another person and their call upon the acknowledger, engaging with that "other" ethically comes naturally, as do methods for responding to the call of the other. This view prompts us to wonder if in our study of methods used in these two service-learning programs, perhaps we only brushed the surface of the most important characteristics of KKN and TCU: the reasons why some faculty (and universities) are committed to these programs; and, conversely, why some faculty, even though they have the same information about how these programs operate, choose not to be involved?

Is it possible that the critical issue is one of philosophy or paradigm; how those involved with service- learning see the world differently than those who are not involved? Perhaps what is needed to expand these programs is vision--the assumptions of individuals and their organizations in relation to the communities which surround and support them. The question becomes, "How can this vision be shared?"

Some faculty criticize these programs as free labor given to the community. Reflecting on this perceived problem, a TCU staff member stated,

> We need ideas for educating our faculty, for motivating them about TCU in a positive way. Clearly they do not understand TCU when they feel that way. TCU is not free labor. We need a way to show them how educational it is for students. But its more than that. I don't know. It is difficult to explain. But we need this more and more because their sentiment seems to be growing."

They need more of what? As qualitative researchers who have spent considerable time exploring the paradigmatic assumptions of this form of inquiry, we recognize significant parallels

between the assumptions of a qualitative inquiry paradigm and the underlying assumptions of service-learning. For example, qualitative inquirers assume that to develop an understanding of another phenomenon such as a person, it is necessary to interact with them from multiple perspectives, to allow the phenomenon to affect oneself. Qualitative researchers also assume there are no simple causal relationships but rather complex interrelationships that generally require interdisciplinary perspectives to be understood, that values influence all constructions of knowledge (simple objectivity is impossible), that constructs about phenomena should be defined within their own context and language, and that to influence phenomena with any amount of deliberation, all of these assumptions must be encountered.

We also noticed, as we have in our work with researchers (whether quantitative or qualitative), a sort of blindness on the part of "insiders" in these service-learning programs regarding the assumptions they were operating under. Similar to researchers we have worked with, the "insiders" were often unable to articulate their assumptions clearly. And so, it is perhaps this inability to understand one's own assumptions that handicaps them in being able to expand their programs to other faculty and associated students and community members. For example, a person who has not considered their teaching, learning, and research paradigms, especially if they contrast drastically with those of participants in service-learning programs, would likely find statements like, "TCU is a must" or "KKN is important" not very convincing arguments for engaging in these programs. But it is those kinds of statements faculty tend to make regarding the impetus for their involvement.

If what we have found in our experience in helping researchers consider alternative paradigms of inquiry relates to the process of helping faculty consider their entire professional paradigms, it may require an in-depth examination of their paradigmatic assumptions in order for them to understand what service-learning is based on and why they should be involved.

A subsequent related question is, what risks are involved in bringing these assumptions into the primary awareness of those persons already committed to and engaged in service-learning? Polanyi (1962), in *Personal Knowledge* discusses the value of both primary and subsidiary awareness and what elements of experience belong to each. He offers the example of a pianist who suddenly pays attention to his fingers and immediately falters. While sometimes it is helpful to focus on the fingers, in developing form for example, at other times it is not. Addressing the point that some "information" belongs only to the realm of tacit knowledge, Polanyi also points out how explicit mathematical descriptions of what is involved in keeping a bicycle balanced as it is ridden down a sidewalk do not help the bicyclist accomplish this task.

Therefore, pulling up the underlying assumptions of what fuels commitment and understanding of service-learning programs such as TCU and KKN, may create self-conscious servers for the future and may not actually lead to others' participation. But, our experience in helping researchers consider alternative paradigms of inquiry suggests that such examination can be extremely liberating for people and can help them make choices they never consciously made before. Furthermore, by understanding those assumptions, they are less likely to violate them and, consequently, are more likely to be successful within the parameters upon which the paradigm enables them to act.

TCU and KKN represent rich fields of inquiry in which the principles of good practice for combining service and learning can be explored. This inquiry has demonstrated the need for research in many different areas regarding university service-learning. This inquiry of TCU and KKN also serves as evidence that there is great potential value in looking in unexpected places for innovation and the need for educators to look to educators in developing countries to see what they can teach us for a change.

References

Albert, G. (Ed.) (1994). Service-learning reader: reflections and perspectives on service. Raleigh, N. C.: National Society for Experiential Education.

Arias Sanchez, O. (1988). We seek ... Not peace alone. Commencement address at Harvard University, *Harvard Magazine*, July-August, 19-22.

Daloz, L. A. P., Keen, C. H., Keen, J. P., & Parks, S. D. (1996). Common fire: lives of commitment in a complex world. Boston, MA: Deacon Press.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Direktorate Pembinaan dan Pengabdian pada Maysarakat Ditjen Kikti Depdikbud, 1986.

Eberly, D. J. & Sherraden, M. (Editors) (1990). *The moral equivalent of war? A study of non-military service in nine nations.* New York: Greenwood Press.

Eisner, E. (1991). *The enlightened eye: qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practices*. New York: Macmillan.

Gonzalez, M. A. (1992). In Eberly, D. J. (Ed.), *National youth service: A global perspective.* Washington, DC.: National Service Secretariat.

Hardjasoemantri, K. (1981). Study-service as a subsystem in Indonesian higher education. Unpublished dissertation.

Información General (1992). (General Information). San José, Costa Rica: The University of Costa Rica, Vice Rectory of Social Action.

Jacoby, B. and Associates (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: concepts and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kendall, J. C. & Associates (Eds.) (1990). Combining service and learning: a resource book for community and public service, Volume I. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Polanyi, M. (1962). *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sherraden, M. & Castillo, C. M. (1990). "Costa Rica: Non- military service in a nation with no army." In Eberly, D. J. and Sherraden, M. (Editors), *The moral equivalent of war? A study of non-military service in nine nations*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Acknowledgment

This project was supported by Fulbright for visits to Indonesia and by the National Service Secretariat for visits to Costa Rica.

Note

All quotes are based on actual comments made by interviewees; however, because most of these people spoke Spanish, they are not literal quotes. Rather, they have been embellished by us

to reflect the spirit of what they said.

About the Authors

David D. Williams

Brigham Young University

e-mail: David_Williams@byu.edu

David D. Williams is an Associate Professor in the David O. McKay School of Education at Brigham Young University. He earned his PhD in Educational Research and Evaluation Methods at the University of Colorado, Boulder in 1981. His M.A. (1978) in Educational Leadership (emphasis in evaluation) is from Western Michigan University; his Bachelors degree (1976) is from Brigham Young University.

Dr. Williams holds an appointment in the Department of Instructional Psychology and Technology at BYU, where he teaches graduate courses in qualitative inquiry, research methods, and educational evaluation. He conducts research in the areas of service and experiential learning, international education and development, integrated curricula, qualitative methods of research and evaluation, use of computers in education, and the role of the learner in the education process. He is currently conducting an evaluation of an innovative teacher preparation and professional development program in Utah.

See David Williams's Homepage for more details. Visit his qualitative inquiry class homepage.

William D. Eiserman

Colorado Foundation for Families and Children

Jivio@aol.com

William D. Eiserman earned his Ph.D. in Instructional Design at Brigham Young University in 1986. Currently Dr. Eiserman is on the research faculty in the Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Sciences at the University of Colorado-Boulder. He also has a joint appointment at the Colorado Foundation for Families and Children in Denver, Colorado. Dr. Eiserman's research focuses on the needs of families as they adapt to the birth of a child with a disability and on the various ways communities support these families and children. He also has a strong interest in service and experiential learning and has engaged in research on this topic in a variety of international contexts, one of which was initiated while on a Fulbright Fellowship in Indonesia.

Shepherd: shepherd@asu.edu . The Commentary Editor is Casey D. Cobb: casey@olam.ed.asu.edu .

EPAA Editorial Board