

© Copyright 2017

Roger Chao

Navigation and Negotiation: Examining the Ecology of Service-Learning Composition Courses

Roger Chao

A dissertation
submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington
2017

Reading Committee:

Juan Guerra, Chair

Sandra Silberstein

Candice Rai

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

English

University of Washington

Abstract

Navigation and Negotiation: Examining the Ecology of Service-Learning Composition Courses

Roger Chao

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Professor Juan Guerra

American Ethnic Studies

When integrated together, service-learning and composition provide an opportunity for college students to develop as writers and rhetoricians while simultaneously engaging their local community. However, for writing instructors, the integration process is far from simple; when service-learning is taught through composition, instructors must design a course that acknowledges and responds to a wide range of influences. The hybridized position of service-learning programs – lying both between and within the university and the surrounding communities – presents certain challenges. The pedagogy and classroom practices must pull triple duty: prepare students for future college writing, develop a form of rhetorical awareness for engaging audiences beyond the university, and assist in developing a critical awareness of sociopolitical issues. Thus, the process of integrating these components is what makes teaching service-learning unique. When instructors continuously rearrange, revise, and re-negotiate these forces within their pedagogy, they participate in a dynamic ecology that shares and draws on the ideologies and practices of so many other communities, yet ultimately stands as its own specialized learning environment.

This research attempts to look at the various components that construct and perpetuate English 121, the first-year service-learning composition course offered at the University of Washington. However, the scope of this study goes beyond examining the roles that instructors and students play in this ecology, but how other material and discursive factors also contribute to its formation. Drawing on interviews with both students and instructors, as well as institutional and course material, this study analyzes the relationship between the various elements of English 121 in order to gain insight into the types of discourses that emerge out of the classroom. In doing so, we may be able to better understand the process by which writing instructors balance and counterbalance the institutional, communal, and sociopolitical objectives that govern the service-learning context, and how writing instructors and their students come to define and express the values, goals, and ideologies of the English 121 program.

Table of Contents

List of Figures	ii
Chapter 1: Examining Service-Learning’s Complex Relationship to Composition	1
Chapter 2: Study Design and Methods.....	44
Chapter 3: Examining the Metagenres that Construct Service-Learning Composition Courses.....	71
Chapter 4: The Function of Reflection within the Service-Learning Ecology.....	105
Chapter 5: The Pedagogical Role of Physical Space(s) and Kairos within Service-Learning	149
Chapter 6: Building Towards an Ecological Understanding of English 121	190
Coda.....	226
Bibliography	230
Appendix 1: EWP Outcomes	249
Appendix 2: Interview Questions for Instructor and Student Participants.....	250
Appendix 3: Sample English 131 and English 121 Orientation Schedules	253
Appendix 4: Assignment Prompt – Spatial Analysis of Community Organization	256
Appendix 5: Spatial Rhetoric Checklist	258
Appendix 6: Fieldwork Safety Protocol.....	259
Appendix 7: Assignment Prompt – Multimodal Map of Your Service-Learning Experience	260

List of Figures

Figure 6.1. English 121 Metagenre Resource.....	198
Figure 6.2. English 121 Observation Form.....	202
Figure 6.3. English 121 Reflection Rubric.....	216

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my dissertation committee for their unwavering support. Juan Guerra, Candice Rai, and Sandra Silberstein each provided important insight into my research and scholarship and for that I am eternally grateful.

I would like to thank Anis Bawarshi and Elizabeth Simmons-O'Neill for their mentorship and guidance throughout my graduate school career.

Finally, I would like to thank my fellow colleagues in the University of Washington English department. This project would not have been possible without your feedback and help.

Dedication

To my parents and my sister, for all you have given me.

Chapter 1: Examining Service-Learning's Complex Relationship to Composition

Service-learning, described as “vogue” by Adam Davis, has become a permanent tool for experiential learning and local community engagement for universities and colleges. The marriage of service-learning and composition has proved to be a fruitful space for the development and progression of writing pedagogy within the university context. Scholars praise service-learning for its multifacetedness in helping students engage with the community (see Cushman; Adler-Kassner; Duffy; Gorelick) by writing *with* the community, *about* the community, or *for* the community (Deans, *Writing*), though most curricula aim to combine these different approaches. Writing, once conceived as an individual, inward-driven process, was re-interpreted by composition scholars like Patricia Bizzell, Joseph Harris, and Paula Mathieu through movements like the “social” turn the field took during the 1980s and developed through the related “critical” and “public” turns of the 1990s and 2000s, respectively. These shifts in the field of composition resulted in a perception of writing and composing as a situated social action, affecting and affected by the context in which it emerges.

Current service-learning composition scholarship and research focus on a range of pedagogical topics and issues, often holding the students and their experiences at the center. In “Service-Learning at a Glance,” Linda Adler-Kassner notes that “service-learning can be a terrific strategy for helping students realize the power of language, gain broad experience with a variety of genres, and better understand themselves as parts of larger communities” (28). Similarly, service-learning has been defined as a “course-based, credit bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further

understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility” (Bringle and Hatcher “Curriculum, 113). In both of these definitions, the authors distinctly focus on the ideal, desired outcomes that students walk away with from the service-learning experience. However, as scholars have pointed out, little is known about what factors and conditions actually contribute to these desired outcomes, or the process by which these outcomes are actually reached (Bringle, Clatyon, and Hatcher 7).

Within a service-learning program, there is much more to consider besides just the students and their takeaways. In other words, any research on service-learning that is focused only on the students’ final experiences mirrors the early composition research that attempted to understand the writing process by only examining students’ final written products. There is much more that must be investigated in order to gain a clear picture of how a particular service-learning program is structured and formed. For one, the objectives of any service-learning programs are often molded by the governing department. When service-learning is taught through composition, instructors are usually required to design a curriculum that is framed by academic writing objectives specifically set by the English or composition department. Many composition courses, acting as gatekeepers into the rest of the academy environment, implement a set of outcomes that are not only constructed to mold students into effective researchers and critical thinkers, but to familiarize them with the varying discourses of the university and help them transition into the academic community. Thus, even when supplemented with a service-learning component, writing instructors must still make sure their course is informed by the writing outcomes deemed essential by the institution.

Another element that must be considered when examining the effectiveness of a service-learning course are the needs of the local community partners. In addition to accommodating

institutional outcomes in their syllabi, space within the writing classroom must also be carved out for the presence of the community partners, both pedagogically and logistically. First, in terms of course content, service-learning composition requires instructors to teach a sense of rhetorical awareness that prepares students to engage effectively with publics beyond the confines of the university. This requirement parallels the expectations of ancient schools of rhetoric that molded students into citizen-orators, well versed in a diverse range of public discourses. For service-learning writing courses, the rhetorical awareness that students need to possess to be able to write for, with, and about the community is only possible if students are able to develop a critical awareness of language and rhetoric. Logistically, service-learning composition instructors must negotiate their academic expectations with the schedules of their community partners. As a consequence, the inclusion of the community partners in the classroom space requires that a writing instructor develop a dual teacher/administrator disposition.

Finally, scholars argue that service-learning writing courses must also help students develop a critical awareness of the injustices taking place around them. It is not enough for students to simply write about their service experience or practice the conventions of non-academic, public genres; the writing should also serve as a vehicle for them to reflect and discuss the sociopolitical issues that affect the specific communities in which they are working. Composition is often viewed as an effort to prepare students for the rigors of university discourse, but its synthesis with a service-learning component repositions the responsibilities of not just the students, but the instructor as well. Both groups are asked to develop a set of citizen dispositions concurrent with their academic dispositions. Under these circumstances, the writing prompts and classroom practices must pull triple duty: they must prepare students for their future college writing, provide an avenue for writing to audiences beyond the university, and assist in

developing a critical awareness of the issues that affect local communities. Thus, my research is guided by the following overarching questions:

1. What are the pedagogical strategies that service-learning instructors can implement in their courses to effectively engage students in addressing both the institutional outcomes and the needs and goals of their community organizations?
2. How are these pedagogical strategies taken up by the students and what influences do they have on the writing students produce?

To further understand the complexity and challenges that come with teaching service-learning composition, we as scholars must examine the various forces that influence an instructor's development of a composition course. More specifically, we must utilize an "ecomposition" approach, taking into account not just the relationship between instructors and students, but also the relationship between individuals and discourses, locations, and materials. In doing so, we may be able to increase our insight into the procedures instructors use to balance and counterbalance the institutional, communal, and sociopolitical objectives that govern the service-learning context, and develop a better understanding of how writing instructors come to define and express the values, goals, and ideologies of the service-learning community through the goals and outcomes of their courses.

Before we can investigate the types of discourses that exist within English 121, the local service-learning program that served as my site of study, we must first examine the various theories that influence and construct service-learning composition pedagogy. It comes as no surprise that different theorists and writing scholars have defined and conceptualized service-learning composition differently. This introductory chapter examines the relationship between service-learning and composition from a myriad of perspectives. I first map out a brief history of

the relationship between service-learning and college composition. After that, I examine important factors that instructors teaching composition through service-learning must consider, focusing specifically on the role that service-learning plays in developing students' critical awareness and in framing writing as social action in the larger public. Finally, I explain how and why ecocomposition can be used to examine the discourses that construct and maintain service-learning programs.

The Marriage of Service-Learning and Composition

Historically, the joining of service-learning and writing studies falls in line with college-level composition shifting from what was once viewed as a vocational-oriented discipline to one that is much more focused on developing a pluralistic view of language and literacy. During the early 20th century, English served as a gatekeeping discipline for the academic institution, and in some ways, the nation as a whole. Shortly after the First World War, higher education was reimagined as a “social engine” (Wan), a concept that not only reinforced socioeconomic status, but also granted an individual the mobility to increase their socioeconomic standing. As James Berlin explains in his landmark work *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges*, a “new” university was emerging in the United States during the late 19th and early 20th century. Higher education was no longer perceived to be only for the elite, but aimed to certify members of new professions and classes in an expanding economy. With colleges and universities taking in more students and embracing more of a work/career preparatory role, literacy and the teaching of English fulfilled more responsibilities within the academic context. Prior to individuals even entering the university, schools like Harvard toward the end of the 19th century established reading and writing requirements for their students that were assessed through an entrance exam. As a result, “the English class no longer had the simple undertaking

of ‘teaching English’” (Wan 121); rather, teaching English became much more nuanced. The discipline splintered into various aspects of English studies, with composition taking on the role of providing students the literacy skills they needed as they prepared to enter the workforce. The ability to read and write clearly and effectively “made visible the effects of a college education, particularly in the workplace” (116). As a consequence, current-traditional rhetoric—deemed by Berlin as the “rhetoric of the meritocracy” (35) which emphasized practical competence, focusing on spelling, punctuation, grammar, and basic paragraph structure—became the most popular method of college writing instruction during the 20th century. Composition, thus, was reduced to teaching the mechanics of writing, while content was reserved for literary studies. This distinction between teaching grammar and teaching literature not only further highlighted a hierarchy of value between composition and literary studies, it also framed writing as a set of mechanical skills that could be taught independently of content and context.

As composition came to be seen as the primary vehicle for teaching writing proficiency, other disciplines began to distance themselves from the responsibility of teaching reading and writing. It was not until the 1970s—when articles like “Why Can’t Johnny Write” began appearing and critiqued the literacy preparation of American college students, and the field of composition gained more recognition and status in the academy—that new writing-based pedagogical movements began to form. Scholars like Patricia Bizzell, Mina Shaughnessy, and Kenneth Bruffee pushed against views of writing as a context-free set of skills, and instead supported what is now referred to as the “social turn” in composition: the framing of writing as a socially- and situationally-embedded process that produces new knowledge, as well as a pedagogical ideology that is more considerate of the sociopolitical context by which people experience literacy. A major approach to the teaching of writing that emerged during this time

was Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), which paid “pedagogical and curricular attention to writing occurring in university subject matter classes other than those offered by composition or writing programs” (Bazerman et al. 9). This movement aimed to dispel the notion of writing as a “one-size-fits-all” set of skills taught only in English departments and then universally applied into other disciplines.

As we now know, WAC provides opportunities for students to write in the context of other specialized disciplines like history, science, and business. Proponents of WAC also view writing as more than the acquisition of syntax and grammar; it is instead a process that allows for students to better learn and understand new knowledge. One of the major pedagogical pillars of the WAC movement is the “Writing to Learn” philosophy, which looks at the writing process as something that will “help students explore and assimilate new ideas, create links between the unfamiliar and the familiar, mull over possibilities, [and] explain things to the self before explaining them to others” (McLeod 152). Charles Bazerman and other composition scholars have a similar definition, describing “Writing to Learn” as a concept based on the observation that the act of writing gives students the opportunity to grow and clarify their thoughts and understandings of disciplinary topics. By embedding writing pedagogy in disciplines other than composition or literary studies, WAC advances the notion of writing as “highly situated and tied to a field’s discourse and ways of knowing . . . varying greatly according to teachers’ goals, course and program goals, and disciplinary genres and activity systems” (International Network of WAC Programs 1, 5).

Situated writing also directly challenges current-traditional rhetoric, which emphasizes writing as a product and disregards details of the composing process, author, or audience. Instead, research on situated writing suggests that cognitive skills, even those appearing to be

general and ubiquitous, are context-specific and can only be learned and enacted under certain circumstances (Lave and Wenger, Bacon). In addition, scholars like A. Suresh Canagarajah note that situated writing highlights the reactionary nature of the composing process. Writing is not monological, but dialogical; it is “not a one-way transmission of ideas, nor are constructs like writer and text autonomous. The writer’s ‘intentions’ and ‘thoughts’ are considerably influenced by the expectations, norms, and values of the audience (or community)” (213). Situated writing forces individuals to identify and consider the ideologies of the communities they are communicating with, and how their “aims and intentions in writing are thus not merely personal, idiosyncratic, but reflective of the communities to which [they] belong” (Harris 12).

Writing is thus framed as an intersection, where the produced text is one constructed through collaboration between writer, audience, and the community at large. If writing teachers have students consider the context surrounding their writing, they are more prone to analyze the various details beyond simply the words they produce and instead focus on the overall rhetorical situation that calls for the text to be produced in the first place. “Inner-directed” writing (Bizzell) that only considers the needs and objectives of the writer sets individuals up to fall short as they move between situations and modes of writing. As Nora Bacon points out,

If a writer learns in school that she should develop her ideas thoroughly, she may well carry this proposition to another setting [outside of the academy]. . . . She may keep the proposition in mind and attempt to employ it. But how is she to judge the meaning of “thorough” in this context? Standards for thoroughness differ across settings, and they differ across writing tasks even in a single setting. (54)

Thus, it is not simply enough for writers to understand themselves as authors; they must also understand the context in which they are being asked to perform as writers.

Given that one of the responsibilities of WAC is to introduce and expose students to how writing—both as process and product—may change depending on the context, it should come as no surprise that some scholars have pushed for more composition programs to adapt WAC characteristics. As Jacqueline Rhodes and Jonathan Alexander point out, the composition courses that college students take are often their primary introduction to the complexities of language and their function within various discourse communities. By incorporating WAC pedagogy into writing curriculums, this shift towards viewing writing as a socially-oriented process can greatly impact “how students conceptualize writing—conceptualizations that go with them to other courses throughout their college careers, and beyond.” (482). Composition would thus not only help students develop an academic disposition, but professional and civic dispositions as well.

Historically, composition courses, especially first-year writing, are defined as a “transitional character” (Bazerman 9); their responsibilities within the university are to introduce and prepare individuals for the academic discourse they would be encountering as college students¹. As David Bartholomae pointed out in his groundbreaking essay, “Inventing the University,” students entering the university often struggle to learn how to properly engage the various disciplines they enter or to demonstrate an authority over disciplinary concepts because most have never even encountered them before. Bartholomae’s solution to this problem—that “a writer has to ‘build bridges’ between his point of view and his readers [and] has to anticipate and acknowledge his readers’ assumptions and biases” (9) —parallels the same beliefs professed by WAC advocates. Contemporary scholars (Kells; Harris) have also highlighted just how nuanced academic discourse can truly be. Harris notes that the university is in fact a cluster of communities, where the concept of a universal academic discourse is not as concrete as theorists

¹ In some cases, this preparation also required a basic writing component, in order to prepare disadvantaged or underprepared populations. See Mina Shaughnessy’s landmark work *Error and Expectations* for more details.

have posited: “instead of presenting academic discourse as coherent and well-defined, we might be better off viewing it as polyglot, as a sort of space in which competing beliefs and practices intersect with and confront one another” (20). If composition is really in charge of introducing students to so-called “academic discourse,” more emphasis on WAC pedagogy may well be the best way to help prepare students for the various forms of academic writing they are likely to encounter.

However, contemporary scholarship calls for WAC not only to think about how writing occurs within the walls of academic disciplines or majors, but to explore more nuanced and interdisciplinary situations that examine “an ever-expanding range of practices and intellectual pursuits: computer-mediated writing instruction, service-learning, writing-intensive courses, first-year writing seminars, technical and professional writing, interdisciplinary learning communities, writing centers, ESL and bilingual education, and many more” (Kells 91). Traditional models of WAC have been perceived as privileging academic discourse(s) over other discourses and thus ignoring the other contexts in which students work and live. An increasing number of scholars (see Duffy; Harris; Parks and Goldblatt) suggest that all composition courses, not only those limited to teaching first-year writing, should expose students to non-academic writing and rhetoric, as well as invite them to bring their personal experiences into the classroom. Rather than attempting to teach students how to master a particular, seemingly static discourse, the responsibility of composition instructors is to complicate students’ understanding of the relationship between context and language. As Juan Guerra notes: “we must keep in mind that college classrooms — like personal and public spheres in all communities of belonging — are potential sites for the contestation of discourses. Every interaction we have with our students is an opportunity for us to engage in conversations about their and our place in the world”

(“Cultivating” 110). In the context of WAC, the writing instructor inherits much more of a mediating disposition, “helping students contend with the imperfect world of human communication, offering them choices about how to use language . . . and helping [them] find out how writing matters in the university, in the workplace, and in their diverse communities of belonging” (Kells 88). For Michelle Hall Kells, WAC is more than teaching discipline-oriented writing; she refers to it as a form of “advocacy” that encourages learning and building connections to multiple contexts. Some scholars have shifted the Writing Across the Curriculum model towards more of a “Writing Across Communities” model, where the pedagogy focuses on not only teaching students how to properly engage with the discourses in classrooms and on campuses, but also opening up opportunities for students to utilize the discourses of their local communities based on their own learning incomes.

The Writing Across Communities model can be categorized as part of the public turn in composition, which encompasses public writing, community-based literacy, and in particular service-learning composition pedagogy. Stemming from the 1990s, the public turn in composition examines the inherent relationship between how rhetorics and publics construct one another — “that is to say, how each is able to form and rewrite the other” (Farmer 4). Scholars like Harris and Susan Wells urge composition instructors to integrate knowledge regarding publics and the public sphere into the classroom so that students will have an opportunity to closely examine and comprehend how language plays a role in a community’s development and perpetuation. Like all WAC-based curricula, the writing that occurs in service-learning composition is conceptualized not only as an act of demonstrating rhetorical awareness or a means of creating text, but also as a tool for understanding and making sense of the experiences that students are acquiring as they move between the academic environment and their

community partners. That is, students write to learn, utilizing it “for discovering, for shaping meaning, and for reaching understanding” (Fulwiler and Young *x*). Within service-learning, this framing of writing is especially important. As Sidney Dobrin and Christian Weisser argue, “learning more about a particular subject . . . is inseparable from learning to write effectively and well” (584).

Since content in a service-learning classroom is often derived from students’ experiences with community partners and their local publics, a strong investment in course assignments may also lead to students developing a deeper and more thorough understanding of sociopolitical issues. In addition, service-learning pedagogy not only aims to enhance overall student learning by amalgamating community work and academic work (Johnson; Parker-Gwin and Mabry; Smagorinsky), but also provides a space for students to apply their skills and knowledge to “real-life” situations. Furthermore, interacting with local publics helps universities and their members move away from the “ivory tower isolation” that currently dominates current intellectual projects (Cushman). Service-learning, which aims to integrate formal education with civic participation, rests heavily on the philosophy of John Dewey, whose writing on progressive education champions student-centered and experiential pedagogical theories and practices. As Thomas Deans points out, service-learning functions as the ideal vehicle to carry out Dewey’s vision of education, since requiring students to engage with community partners—both within the classroom and beyond it—presents “genuine social situations as scenes for doing and learning” (“Two Keys” 17). With service-learning, local communities are no longer kept on the other side of the institutional wall; instead, their needs, goals, and burdens all act as exigencies for student learning. In the composition classroom specifically, inquiry, the first stage of writing, becomes a “situated sociocultural activity—an activity that is always socially, culturally, and historically

located” (Hallman and Burdick 344). Tereza Joy Kramer suggests that the pairing of service-learning and composition is a notably effective one, in part for students who often struggle to see writing’s “true potential” when it is isolated to the classroom, but also because “civic engagement and the need for effective expression have always been connected” (60). Thus, the amalgamation of service-learning and composition helps instructors construct a curriculum that frames learning to write as well as overall knowledge construction as a situated activity that is developed and relevant across multiple contexts (Bacon; Chaise).

There are numerous approaches to developing a composition curriculum with a service-learning component. However, there is consensus in the literature that suggests effective service-learning requires the integration of publicly-engaging scholarship into the already established expository writing curriculum (Bringle et. al; Duffy). In asking students to engage with communities that lie beyond the campus, instructors must be willing to open their classroom up to styles of communication outside of “traditional” academic rhetoric. Steve Parks and Eli Goldblatt note a discrepancy between the research and the praxis of composition scholars. While the current composition research and theory pushes for public discourse, critical literacy, and other forms of cultural-oriented studies, writing programs are still often limited to only introducing students to the rhetoric of the academy: “Teachers have much to offer students beyond either traditional belletristic notions of the essay or discipline-specific understandings of effective prose” (586). For many composition scholars, the diversification of writing education within the university is crucial for the survival of the field. The addition of a service-learning component utilizes situated writing in the teaching of rhetorical awareness; whether serving at their community organizations or writing about their experiences in the classroom, students

engage multiple rhetorical situations involving differing conventions, genres, audiences, and purposes.

It is important to note, however, that for many composition instructors, teaching rhetorical awareness does not depend on the mastery of complex subject matter and/or disciplines with the hope of guiding students through the mechanics of writing in other communities; that would be highly difficult and ineffective. Rather, writing instructors should “show students how conventions operate in literary texts, how those conventions both enable and limit the writer, how they make reading possible and pleasurable for the reader. . .” (Peterson 44). In other words, instead of teaching writing as a strict set of discipline-oriented rules, instructors should teach the rhetorical strategies that would help students identify and recognize the conventions of any particular discourse or discipline they may encounter in a writing situation. This rhetorical awareness has been seen as a much more transferrable writing skill than the grammar and mechanical-oriented conceptualization of writing once advocated by the current-traditional rhetoric movement. This skill is also crucial to writing in a service-learning class, given that “once [students] have some practice analyzing ‘discourse communities’ to see how language reflects and perpetuates the goals of social groups, they are prepared to function as writers at other times, in other places” (Bacon 59).

Teaching composition with a service-learning component may also help instructors break down the illusion of a major gap between academic discourse and public discourse for new and incoming students. Ellen Cushman argues that service-learning can be used by composition instructors as a method for collapsing “harmful dichotomies that traditional university knowledge espouses: literary/vernacular; high culture/low culture; literature/literacy; objective/subjective; expert/novice” (335), which often places the university and academic

discourse at a higher social position than the local communities they are embedded within.

Building on this idea, Harris argues that the writing instructor's goal should not be to pressure students into the ideologies or practices of any new community, but to provide them with the opportunities and the rhetorical tools that will allow them to reflect critically on the discourses they already engage with, such as home, school, work, and media (19). Their argument mirrors the issue that *Writing Across Communities* advocates highlight: If the composition field is indeed dedicated to expanding and complicating students' understanding of language, then instructors must recognize the value of academic and community-based discourse equally. Otherwise "academic knowledge-making will remain esoteric, seemingly inapplicable, remote, and elitist" (Cushman 335). As students enter the university and interact with new academic disciplines and communities, the inclusion of service-learning allows for public discourses to stay relevant and applicable in students' overall linguistic development.

Service-Learning Composition and the Development of Critical Awareness

The writing that emerges out of service-learning composition courses has been defined by the composition and rhetoric community as not only engaging with conversations that stem from the public, but also an examination that investigates sociopolitical issues within the public as well (Coogan; Franklin; Gorelick; Redd). Recently, this component of service-learning has been examined more closely: Randy Stoecker suggests that some service-learning curriculums lack "the critical perspective that can help students go beyond a surface level analysis to see social structural causes" and "has not been able to significantly move students from volunteerism to social action" (39). There are also varying degrees to how "critical" instructors may design their service-learning component, where some may call for "social action requiring very little of participants other than standing in opposition to some authority, while other forms may require

an analysis of privilege and a questioning of personal and group norms or specific actions to make clear the purpose of the challenge (Franklin 26). Paulo Freire, the Brazilian educator whose philosophy stands as another major pillar in service-learning pedagogy alongside Dewey, emphasized the utilization of education as a lens for guiding students in seeing the various and differing power dynamics between communities centered around culture, class, and race. Neither Freire nor Dewey focused much on writing pedagogy; however, their importance in college composition comes from their comprehensive examination of the intricacies between learning, teaching, ideologies, and social action, “all of which are indivisible from understanding the context, practice, and implications of college writing instruction” (Deans *Writing*, 48). However, a major difference between Dewey and Freire is reflected in how they perceive education being utilized to create action that benefits the larger public. Dewey’s educational philosophy ultimately paints a climate of social collaboration and consensus. Stoecker views Dewey’s approach as a “gradual, peaceful” process that assumes and builds off of the existence of common interests across all communities. In contrast, Freire’s educational construct identifies race, class, and sex/gender as crucial barriers to individual and societal progress.

Freire “focuses on radical socioeconomic change, which problematizes (and politicizes) the educational system and its place in the dominant (and largely oppressive) social order” (Deans *Writing*, 40). Considered a “radical” perception of education, Freire’s pedagogical teachings challenge students and teachers alike to critique and reflect on the political context of their education. His perspective on literacy demands that educators teach more than the functional reading and writing skills once upheld by schools of thought like current-traditional rhetoric, given that functional literacy “encourages students to progress no further than a naive transitive consciousness and serves dominant rather than liberatory interests” (Deans “Two

Keys”, 21). Freire’s notion of education aims to help students develop a “critical consciousness,” a concept he explores in his landmark 1968 text *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. For Freire, traditional forms of education submerge students in dominant ideologies. Instead, schools should prepare individuals with the necessary skills to “emerge from their submersion and acquire the ability to intervene in reality as it is unveiled. Intervention in reality . . . thus represents a step forward from emergence, and results from the [consciousness] of the situation” (109). Deans nuances this concept, stating that

Freire’s notion of critical consciousness goes beyond most understandings of ‘critical thinking’ as discussed by American educators, who primarily focus on independent thinking and analytical reasoning. Freire demands more—a willingness to enter into dialogue with the dispossessed in society, unpack dominant myths embedded in our socialization, and comprehend power and class relations. (*Writing* 22)

The development of critical consciousness is not, however, universally considered an inherent component of service-learning pedagogy. Freire’s educational views and take on critical consciousness emphasizes an “anthropological approach” (Deans *Writing*, 20) and calls on students and instructors to examine topics of oppression through the lens of race and culture. Yet, there are some service-learning programs that draw more on Dewey’s philosophy, focusing more on civic reform and building cooperation between communities. For Dewey, education was the tool to prepare and motivate individuals for fruitful participation within the social structures already in place. What both Dewey and Freire would agree on though is that as a form of experiential education, students taking part in service-learning composition cannot blindly serve alongside community partners, given that “service-learning requires a critique of power relations and knowledge of the culture of social change” (Franklin 28). This political emphasis on the

teaching of writing has been attributed to the cultural turn in composition, which developed out of the field's social turn and aimed to redefine "the cultural pursuits of everyday people and [to show] the relation of those pursuits to people's social class consciousness" (Durst 91).

Furthermore, studies by scholars like Sean Williams and Renee Love demonstrate that service-learning students develop a sense of agency and empowerment when they have the freedom to critique the issues surrounding the organizations and communities they join. The writing produced in service-learning composition should aim to not only raise or identify concerns of the public, but also to suggest or identify possible solutions; it is much more than simply a "reporting out" of what students have experienced in the community but instead is political in nature and seeks to create a response from the audience.

According to some composition scholars, the public discourses that students must analyze and critique in the classroom serve as another course text in the curriculum, one that moves students to create some type of responsive analysis (Wells; Herzberg "Service"). This utilization of service can be seen in Deans' text, *Writing Partnerships*, where he reflects on his time observing a service-learning course taught by Bruce Herzberg. In a course deemed by Deans as a "writing about the community" course, the students worked as literacy tutors within the community, then returned to the classroom to reflect, analyze, and critique their experiences. One important detail to note however is that the texts produced within Herzberg's service-learning class, while focused on public and community issues, were conveyed through academic essays and reflective journals—familiar genres and styles "that align nicely with a traditional function of first-year composition, initiation into the academic discourse community, and with traditional models of assessment" (*Writing* 108). As Deans points out, the texts are not *public* documents, but constructed using the rhetoric of academic arguments and intended primarily for

the instructor. An emphasis on academic rhetoric “is certainly not contrary to practice within the academy—in fact it supports the kind of abstract thinking and writing valued across the curriculum” (*Writing* 108). Herzberg states, “I’m going to stick with the notion of critique — and academic discourse is the safest place to be. It is an appropriate thing to do because clearly one of our missions is to prepare students in academic discourse” (qtd. in Deans, *Writing* 102). This approach reinforces the framing of service-learning experiences as another source text from which students draw to enhance their academic writing development.

However, there are concerns among some scholars about service-learning composition instructors who position the community within their curriculum as *only* text and limit student writing to *only* academic genres. Multiple scholars argue that a potential weakness of composition courses that teach public writing solely within the confines of academic discourse is the lack of “public exigency” (Wells 338), as students are still writing their analysis for only the instructor to read and assess. Wells reiterates that “the public is not simply a neutral container for historical events: it has its own history, its own vexed construction, its own possibilities of growth and decay” (328). Teaching about social issues and their histories must require engagement with the discourses and genres from which they emerge. By completely separating the issues and topics from the publics in which individuals originally experienced them, the produced text may become decontextualized and detached from significant networks and social relationships. As Canagarajah points out:

The text becomes more and more isolated, detached, abstract, and generic. The values that inform its structure and form are ignored. It becomes empty of content, losing its complexity and depth. With the decontextualized approach, the influences of social

conditions and cultural diversity on text construction are lost. The ways in which texts are shaped by, and in turn shape, sociopolitical realities are obscured. (213)

In limiting student writing only to academic discourse(s), instructors may actually set students up for an inauthentic understanding of rhetoric and literacy: “we do not do justice to this history . . . when we assign students generic public writing . . . ; since there is no place within the culture where student writing on gun control is held to be of general interest, no matter how persuasive the student, or how intimate their acquaintance with guns, ‘public writing’ in such a context means ‘writing for no audience at all’” (Wells 328).

Guerra brings up a parallel critique, suggesting that while students are learning how discourses function across various communities, writing instructors must also ensure that they are developing a critical understanding and awareness of language and culture. Unfortunately, traditional writing classrooms often shut down the alternative discourses that students bring into the classroom in lieu of formal standardized English: “Academic discourses is not just a foreign language; it is a way with words that distances [the students] from the tones and rhythms of the multiple discourse tracks that make up their lives” (*Language* 108). Thus, academic writing is not only alien, but potentially unrelatable to students’ prior knowledge. The discourse of the university environment becomes the wall that separates the students even farther from other discourse communities. In fact, the call for linguistically diversifying the curriculum as a way of creating more students agency and ownership has been long made for composition as a whole, not just for service-learning writing courses.

In 1974, members of the Executive Committee of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) drafted and proposed “Students' Right to Their Own Language” (SRTOL), a statement that pushed for opening up the composition classroom to the

home dialects that students are bringing with them to college campuses nationwide. The arguments made in SRTOL reflect the perspective of the Writing Across Communities movement: to move the composition landscape away from upholding academic discourse as the linguistic benchmark by which all other discourses and dialects are measured against. Instead, NCTE saw the cultural value that writing programs could benefit from if instructors allowed for more complexity in their pedagogy: “[The field’s] major emphasis has been on uniformity, in both speech and writing; would we accomplish more, both educationally and ethically, if we shifted that emphasis to precise, effective, and appropriate communication in diverse ways, whatever the dialect?” (Conference on College Composition and Communication).

A composition course that is committed only to producing academic discourse shelters students from the various language styles they will eventually encounter in work and public spaces after they leave the university. This perception has remained a popular notion within composition, as scholars suggest a linguistically diverse writing classroom challenges language destabilization (see Fecho et al.; Hallman and Burdick), acknowledges the diverse incomes of student populations by “incorporating a study of the various Englishes of our country” (Kirkland 302), and recognizes the linguistic legitimacy of dialects and languages other than formal academic English. More importantly, proponents of SRTOL and Writing Across Communities argue that the inclusion of students’ home dialects in the curriculum forces both instructors and students to acknowledge and examine the sociopolitical tensions that are revealed through language use as individuals move between and inhabit multiple discourse communities.

Service-Learning Composition as Social Action

Although the examination of critical issues through the lens of various non-academic discourses is an important part of the service-learning composition classroom, scholars suggest

that pedagogy in which students solely critique social issues without performing some form of action is problematic. These two aspects of service-learning — critical awareness and civic engagement — are not inherently connected to one another. For example, some scholars argue that student engagement with the community does not mean students are automatically able to recognize overarching sociopolitical issues (see Herzberg “Community”; Parker-Gwin and Mabry; Westheimer and Kahne), but instead requires teachers to actively build it into their curriculum and cue for it. Service-learning without critical awareness of social issues causes students to “attribute all attitudes, behavior, and material conditions to an individual rather than social source” (Herzberg, “Community” 317). That is, students may assume that issues such as poverty are caused by an individual’s lack of willingness to find a job, rather than investigating the social inequalities that contribute to poverty on a macro scale. Therefore, the self-reflective aspect of the service-learning curriculum is very important for affording students the opportunity to think critically, rather than simply engaging in a surface-level reflection of experiences (see Anson; Franklin). As we will examine in later chapters, reflection thus serves as a powerful tool within the service-learning classroom.

Alternatively, the recognition of social issues and the development of a critical mindset, while beneficial to the students’ overall academic development, does not always offer strategies for producing actual change for members of the public at large. Freire in his earlier writings argues that critical consciousness can lead to social change, but later revised his stance, stating that he had “spoken as if the unveiling of reality automatically made for its transformation” (qtd. in Deans, “Two Keys” 22). Herzberg agrees with this sentiment, suggesting that while students may be able to identify and critique social issues, there is “no guarantee that students will go beyond the individual and symptomatic” assessment of social issues (“Community” 309). David

Coogan poses a crucial question: “If we want our own work in the community to cue the audience in such a way that they will do some thing or even believe something, then it seems we need to stop doing criticism and start doing rhetoric. But how—and where—would we ‘do rhetoric’?” (671). For instructors who are interested in “doing rhetoric,” service-learning may function as the most appropriate tool for producing action in the community. Deans builds off this sentiment, stating that the essence of service-learning is to teach students how to make actual interventions beyond the academy, and that at its heart, it is “a pedagogy of action and reflection, one that centers on a dialectic between community outreach and academic inquiry” (*Writing 2*). This spotlight on service-learning composition as an action-producing dialogue between the university and the public is important to recognize.

One way that service-learning instructors can persuade students to view writing as social action is by constructing the classroom not as a separate entity apart from the surrounding communities but as an additional and equally important integral element of the larger public. Much like how the authority of formal academic discourse can be challenged by designing a curriculum that upholds students’ home dialects, service-learning instructors can also help close the distance between the academy and the community by asking students to compose texts that engage the public. Deans posits that institutional practices in the academy and composition still tend to infantilize students by casting them as learners whose writing matters to few beyond the classroom. “Even the most eloquent student essays will rarely find an audience beyond the teacher, an exigency other than the teacher-designed assignment and due date. . . . Service-learning disrupts this process” (*Writing 44*). By asking students to write for an audience other than the instructor and for a purpose beyond simply getting a grade, writing taught through

service-learning not only helps students develop a stronger grasp of situated writing and rhetorical flexibility, but can also help conceptualize writing as social action.

Community-oriented writing, like the type promoted through service-learning, “requires students to move beyond the kinds of rhetorical awareness that most college and university writing courses typically encourage students to develop and towards what is often missing in classrooms: the rhetorical action and agency that make a difference in one’s life and in the lives of others (Flower 205-206, qtd. in Guerra, “Cultivating” 106). This framing is important. As Mark Bracher and T.R. Johnson argue, traditional literary studies is often perceived to hold little to no power in addressing real-world social issues. However, the issue lies not in the lack of access to power, but rather in the fact that writing instructors have “not learned how to use the power [they] do have” (Johnson 243). Tools like service-learning allow instructors to highlight social issues as they relate to composition pedagogy, helping students see writing as much more than a simple one-off task directed towards the class instructor. Writing also has the potential to produce an actual effect in the social world. According to Canagarajah,

We don't write simply to produce a text and leave it at that. We produce texts to achieve certain interests and purposes. . . . Launched into the public world, [the text we produce] takes a life of its own and effects, results, and processes totally unanticipated by the writer. Therefore, texts not only *mean* but *do*. Their functionality goes to the extent of reconstructing reality, rather than simply reflecting reality. (212, original emphasis)

By establishing the classroom as another discourse community within the larger public, service-learning pedagogy allows for the development of critical awareness to coincide concurrently with the generating of concrete action through produced text. Coogan suggests that “effective advocacy does not begin with the principles of good argument, . . . but with an analysis of those

historical and material conditions that have made some arguments more viable than others” (668). Thus, an understanding of the issues and tensions that exist in the community requires students to directly engage with the genres that are most commonly utilized when discussing them.

Instructors who design service-learning courses focused on writing *for* the community often create assignment prompts that require students to read and create public genres, such as newsletter articles, press releases, websites, and other purpose-driven documents based on the needs and objectives of their community partners (see Bacon; Coogan; Huckin). The utilization of public genres and text that is produced with the goals and objectives of actual, local community organizations upholds Dewey’s notion of effective pedagogy as experiential opportunities that take students out of the classroom and into more civic-oriented environments. Another example can be observed in Kells’ article “Writing Across Communities: Deliberation and the Discursive Possibilities of WAC,” when she discusses an assignment from a first-year service-learning course led by Carson Bennett. One Native American student in particular wrote a letter published in the local newspaper that opposed traffic construction through the Petroglyph National Monument, a piece of land with significant value to the student’s pueblo. Bennett called the student’s project a success, “not because a few letters were published and few heads were turned, but because students learned that writing matters” (qtd. in Kells 97). Writing that reaches beyond the academy also highlights the situatedness of writing as an action; students must develop the kind of rhetorical awareness that will let them know which genres are most effective for accomplishing a particular sociopolitical objective, depending on the public audience they are attempting to interact with.

Service-Learning Composition as a Physical Space

For many composition scholars (Deans *Writing*; Wells; Schiappa; Guerra), a comprehensive understanding of alternative, non-academic rhetoric cannot be achieved when the bridge between the university and the classroom is merely conceptual or imagined; rather, students must physically move and work within academic and local communal spaces. Some scholars (LaDousa; Letter and Livingston; Reynolds) note that there is a distinct physical boundary that separates the academic campus and the surrounding communities, and that this physical movement across the boundary is key for successful learning in the service-learning model: “One must physically leave campus and go elsewhere, usually into the community, or one must bring members of the community onto campus. . . . [In] short, service learning promises that those who cross the boundaries of campus can engage experience and knowledge in ways not possible otherwise” (LaDousa 37). Interaction with individuals in varying physical locations also helps service-learning writing instructors highlight the contextual nature of knowledge acquisition and production. Joe Letter and Judith Livingston observed one particular course offered at Tulane University, in which students served in communities around New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina. As students served among the destroyed landscapes surrounding their campus, the researchers noted that students were able to comprehend specific issues regarding class and poverty in part due to traveling between the nearly undamaged, utopic campus and the devastated neighborhoods in other parts of New Orleans. The shifting conditions of the landscape revealed how the spaces “we arrange our whole lives around . . . are subject to radical interventions and flux . . . [and] such flux can be a part of acquiring knowledge and ultimately of becoming real citizens” (97). Similarly, for Coogan, teaching rhetoric and composition in particular through a service-learning model must be conducted in direct contact

with the public, where community-based writing serves as a laboratory for individuals to develop new inquiries and analyze rhetorical practices. Bruce McComiskey sees a similar function in regards to teaching rhetoric; in his book *Teaching Composition as a Social Process*, McComiskey highlights the significance of student movement between the classroom and the larger public, particularly by framing the classroom as a space where students may be able to negotiate the understanding of language and culture prior to entering other communities. He states: “In order to understand how [the] flow of discourse operates, we need to engage the cycle of production, distribution, and consumption as an analytical and generative heuristic at least twice — first to *understand* how particular discursive formations operate . . . and second to *enter* these discursive formations with new rhetorical interventions” (54-55, original emphasis).

This process of negotiating discourses as students move between the university and other communities also forces instructors and students alike to acknowledge the complicated and nuanced nature of communication within society. Letter and Livingston point out that “we must grapple with our geographic surroundings, not as a simple physical context . . . but as a socially-produced space fraught with tension and competing interests” (83). In fact, various scholars (see Gorelick; Eberly; Harris) have suggested that composition’s use of the term “community” misrepresents the larger public as a whole. Harris argues that the idea of community carries no negative connotation and “since it has no ‘positive opposing’ term, community can soon become an empty and sentimental word” (13). Paula Mathieu suggests that a more accurate term for the writing that students do in service-learning compositions would be “street”-based writing or “street”-based projects. Mathieu argues that “community” suggests collaboration and consensus, which is not always the case as students come to find out as they work alongside their community partners. Often, differing goals and objectives can lead to tension and disagreement,

not only between the academic community and non-academic communities, but between non-academic communities themselves as well. While Mathieu does acknowledge some of the negative connotations that comes with the term “street” — eliciting images of homelessness and gang violence — she argues that its “problems seem generative” (*xiii*), as it prompts instructors and students alike to closely examine and reflect upon the dynamics of the projects that students participate in beyond the university. This reinforces the idea that service-learning composition is built upon an understanding of competing discourses, rather than consensus, thus more closely resembling the actual publics that surround us. As we move through our daily lives, we interact with “a fragmented and contradictory public, a public that must be constructed and reconstructed, that requires multiple negotiations and positionings for every possible speaker” (Wells 333).

So how should we conceptualize the function of the composition classroom in relation to the larger public? While the discourses that govern academic spaces often feel entirely distinct from the discourses that permeate non-academic communities, scholars like Rosa Eberly argues that a classroom could never exist on its own as a true public sphere, the conceptualization popularized by German philosopher Jürgen Habermas. The perceptions surrounding the public sphere, its makeup, and its rhetorical capabilities have expanded immensely. Originally, Habermas defines the public sphere as a “realm of our social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed” (49). As a social mechanism, its purpose was to offer citizens a location outside of bureaucratic control where public concerns and common interests may be addressed. The separation of citizen from state apparatus was key. Nancy Fraser stresses that Habermas’ public sphere was imagined to act as a counterbalance to governing forces:

The public sphere, in short, is not the state; it is rather the informally mobilized body of nongovernmental discursive opinion that can serve as a counterweight to the state.

Indeed, in the bourgeois conception, it is precisely this extragovernmental character of the public sphere that confers an aura of independence, autonomy, and legitimacy on the “public opinion” generated in it. (75)

While a writing classroom may involve a multitude of voices and incomes, where students may come together to critique and investigate social issues, Eberly argues that classrooms are not public spheres since they come into existence not by social or political causes, but through institutional shaping—students often select classes that best fit their schedules and/or the credit requirements dictated by their majors and the instructors, especially graduate students, are often assigned particular classes to teach by the governing writing program. In addition, instructors hold a different position within the classroom than the students, a characteristic that opposes the open democratic conceptualization that Habermas laid out. Despite its citizen-oriented conceptualization, there have been many critiques of Habermas’ public sphere, one of the most popular being its exclusion of certain populations. Fraser argues that Habermas’ model excludes minority populations such as laborers, women of all classes and non-white ethnicities not only in a physical sense but in their participatory abilities as well. Habermas’ singular public sphere model simply could not provide the discourse necessary for these groups to participate fully in conversations and discussion. Therefore, the “writing classroom as public sphere” should not be the idealized paradigm. Instead, it may be more effective to imagine the classroom as a “counterpublic.” This model parallels what Gerald Hauser describes as a “reticulate” of publics instead of a singular public sphere, where discussions regarding public opinion take place between publics which interlock and overlap. Counterpublics, most notably discussed by Fraser,

are smaller, less defined public spheres “where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses, which in turn permit them to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs” (67).

These counterpublics also serve an emancipatory purpose; they are imagined to lie beyond the gaze of the dominant groups, allowing marginalized populations to engage in secure discourse (Brouwer and Asen). Fraser notes that counterpublics allow for “withdraw and regroupments . . . , bases and training grounds for agitational activities directed toward wider publics” (qtd. in Brouwer and Asen 7). These characteristics are much more in line with how composition scholars have imagined Writing Across Communities classrooms, as counterpublics advance “communication theory by forcing recognition that human actors participate in multiple publics” (Brouwer 198). As a counterpublic, the service-learning writing classroom functions as a site of pause and reflection, where students can come back together after serving alongside community partners to critically engage and reflect upon public discourses, allowing for the inevitable clash of discourses but in a safe and non-threatening atmosphere (see Hallman and Burdick; Eberly; Chaden et al.; Fleming). The varying contexts, audiences, roles, and purposes that students must consider as a part of service-learning can be a complicated process; for this reason, students in a classroom are given an opportunity to use the space to “practice public discourse by thinking, talking, and writing about and for different publics in different *ethes*” (Eberley 172). The negotiation of ideologies and shared meaning making that takes place in a service-learning class makes it a space for discourse experimentation that prepares students for the publics they will eventually enter. In addition, a reflective space that is somewhat distanced from the publics where students serve may be crucial to authentic learning. Building on Freire’s notion of pedagogy as action-reflection, Deans suggests that practice and reflection must occur

simultaneously in service-learning curriculums, as each component is not only dependent on one another, but cannot exist without the other: the sacrifice of action leads to verbalism, vacant words; lithe sacrifice of reflection leads to activism, uncritical behavior” (*Writing* 20).

The establishment of the writing classroom as an equal and participating community within the larger public also requires certain ideologies and practices about local partners to be recognized and perpetuated throughout the curriculum, especially the idea of reciprocity. Instructors utilizing service-learning must recognize that all participants in the relationship—not just the students—are entitled to benefits from the partnership (Kapustka; Duffy). However, the needs of students and their personal development are often prioritized over the community. This way of thinking can be seen in the results of a study conducted by Janet Eyler and Dwight E. Giles Jr., in which 1100 students across 20 colleges and universities were interviewed in regards to their service-learning experiences. Students noted that going through service-learning led to “greater self-knowledge” and a sense of “reward in helping others” (qtd. in Johnson 251). These responses place the students’ own experiences at the core of doing service, which potentially overlooks details of the relationship dynamics between the student and the community organization they are working with. Multiple scholars have argued that service is a complicated concept; Adam Davis uses the acronym SINS—”Service is Not Simple”—to highlight the dangers of doing service simply because it satisfies a sense of morality. Often, the self-gratification that comes with providing service can blind students to underlying social issues that cause service to be needed in the first place. Along with Davis, numerous scholars (Eby, Westheimer and Kahne, Barber, Boyte) contend that academic institutions and their faculty have failed to create conditions in their classrooms (and beyond) that would equip students with a critical awareness of language and culture necessary to effectively engage in service-learning. As

instructors, we must ensure that our programs define service-learning as a reciprocal relationship between the classroom and community partners.

Establishing service-learning as a reciprocal relationship between the academic institution and the community partners also shifts power dynamics and how instructors and students both come to perceive their role in the overall paradigm. Despite contemporary movements to bring more student incomes and experiences into the classroom, Heidi Hallman and Melanie Burdick argue that the “teacher as authority” classroom model is still the most dominant paradigm, which positions the instructor as the sole distributor of knowledge and students as passive recipients. Their critique mirrors the “banking” conception that Freire first established in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, in which he argues this method of education shuts down students’ ability to think critically while negating learning as a process of inquiry. It also amplifies the distance between the instructor and the rest of class. Alternatively, service-learning offers instructors an opportunity to challenge this classroom paradigm, through pedagogical strategies that distribute some of the disciplinary expertise to both students and community partners. Deans argues that community-based writing changes the traditional composition classroom by modifying the teacher-student relationship as “the classroom instructor is no longer the sole authority in creating or assessing assignments” (“Two Keys” 24).

Typically, in situations where writing is limited to only the classroom and course texts, “usually, the reader — the teacher — knows more about the topic than the writer The reader, then, has more power and authority than the writer” (Bacon 61). However, in the case of service-learning composition courses, where students have the opportunity to write for and/or about settings outside of the university, the roles become reversed; the students’ service experience grants them a level of authority and insight over the instructor on certain local issues. The

instructor and the students must then work together to synthesize service experiences with theories and concepts from course readings, thereby shifting away from the oft-criticized banking conception and creating a much more balanced power dynamic between both parties. As a result, “service learning can encourage prospective English teachers to complicate notions of teacher/student, official/unofficial language, singular authority/pluralistic power, and server/served. . .[and] provide new experiences and open up thinking that deconstructs the traditional dichotomies present in language and classroom positioning” (Hallman and Burdick 341). Within the service-learning model, instructors may move towards more of a facilitator role, especially if it helps students think through their experiences at their service sites. As Kramer suggests, when instructors guide rather than dictate, students have the opportunity to move towards a deeper understanding of community engagement by framing their thinking and writing not in terms of classroom or course objectives, but the wants and needs of the local communities they serve within and alongside (73).

An environment of reciprocity also relies on instructors working directly with community organizations, which Parks and Goldblatt argue is lacking in many service-learning programs. When writing program administrators and writing instructors engage with communities outside of the academy, it can lead to new perspectives of what writing means *within* the university (Dejoy; Gorelick). There are pedagogical benefits produced by stronger collaboration between instructor and community leaders; as Bacon observed in her case studies, faculty members reported gaining new perspectives on teaching, insights into their discipline, and an overall stronger commitment to civic engagement. Similarly, Kendra Fullwood’s 2011 study of a community literacy partnership at Shaw University revealed that for the classrooms that utilize community-led educational programs, their literacy-learning practices were grounded more in

communal and cultural knowledge than academic knowledge. Not only does this finding validate the educational value of non-traditional forms of literacy, but it also emphasizes the importance of service-learning courses in rhetoric and composition departments.

If a service-learning writing course is designed to teach students to write for, with, and about the community, then instructors must understand the literacy practices of their local context. In addition, for teachers who have brought non-academic literacies into their service-learning classrooms, the key is not just to have students learn how literacy can be *defined*, but rather develop a deeper understanding of the social causes and resulting consequences that surround existing literacies. In other words, the course should investigate *how* literacies come to be. Community literacy often forms from the absence or censorship of voice; when formal reading and writing education is denied to a particular population, literacy begins to emerge in communal settings like women's shelters, living rooms, and community centers, often through collaborative means and without formally-trained teachers (see Gere; Rosenberg; Branch). As Kirk Branch points out, "the absence of literacy matters as much as its presence ever has" (71). Robert Bringle and his co-researchers summarize the ideal relationship between service-learning participants: "regardless of these design choices, community members are to be partners in the process of developing and implementing service learning, not merely recipients of service" ("Research" 8). It must be noted, however, that in working with community partners, the writing instructor may uphold a different set of values and objectives. As a consequence, composition instructors must be able to negotiate the inevitable conflicts that come with cross-communal curricula. This is no easy task; differences in ideology, scheduling, and vision all act as potential barriers to effective collaboration with community partners (Goldblatt *Because*; Tryon et al.). Yet, as colleges and universities become increasingly invested in engagement with local

communities and publics at large, the teacher must take on the role of a citizen-educator, ensuring that the needs and wants of the institution do not overshadow the goals of its smaller, less powerful partners, at the same time that he or she works to develop a writing program that teaches the literacies most critically needed in the local communities.

As the preceding sections have demonstrated, service-learning pedagogy reveals an intricate relationship between the university, the larger public, and the students and instructors that move between them. It is fair to suggest that each element plays a key role in the formation of a service-learning program. In addition, these factors all must be considered by instructors when designing a writing course. In light of these circumstances, it may be beneficial to conceptualize service-learning as an ecological setting, where multiple forces, human and non-human, material and immaterial, all contribute to the discourse that make up the community. We must also acknowledge the many social forces that contribute to the multiplicity of variables which affect the production of text. As Bruce McComiskey and Cynthia Ryan point out, “The phrase ‘writing does not happen in a vacuum,’ has become a kind of mantra for compositionists at least since the 1980s.” (10). Nevertheless, McComiskey and Ryan go on to argue that the reduction of the socially embedded nature of writing to a single phrase is not sufficient and leads to oversimplification. If writing indeed does not occur in a vacuum, then where does it occur? That “where”—the context that both creates and is created by writing—needs to be investigated with great detail. Anis Bawarshi agrees with this call, suggesting that “what we lack is a theoretical perspective for perceiving the self and the social as recursively at work on one another, as engaged in an ecologically symbiotic relationship” (“Ecology” 70). One approach that has emerged in response to this call is ecocomposition, a theory of writing that conceptualizes writing as an ecological act. Annie Merrill Ingram sees composition pedagogy as

already inherently ecological: “As teachers of composition, we must instruct our students to communicate clearly and effectively. . . . Clear and effective communication, is after all, a sustainable practice: one requiring a sensitivity to audience and environment, [and] an awareness of immediate purpose and long-range consequences. . . .” (222-223). In the following section, I briefly investigate the nuances of ecocomposition, and more specifically, how it serves as an ideal lens for analyzing the writing that occurs within a service-learning environment.

Examining Service-Learning Composition through Ecocomposition

In the 1980s as the social turn in composition emerged, the field moved from focusing on the isolated writer and their cognitive process to a conception of writing that acknowledged the social forces which act upon all individuals. Social constructivism “expanded the ways we thought of identity, asserting that it emerges not just from the internal processes of the individual but also from a wider variety of influences: the social conventions we share with other human beings” (Weisser 83-84). Marilyn Cooper expanded upon this notion in her oft-cited 1986 essay “The Ecology of Writing.” It was in this essay that Cooper specifically argues for an ecological lens to examine the writing process; she contended that writing is a force that both relies on *and* acts upon a socially-constituted system. In challenging the conception of a writer working and learning in solitude, Cooper suggests that ideas are “always continuations, as they arise within and modify particular fields of discourse. . . . [A piece of] writing must connect with the relevant idea system” (369). In the course of writing and speaking within a system, people learn the genres, as well as the attitudes and ideas of the groups they interact with. Thus, “writing is not simply a way of thinking but more fundamentally a way of acting” (373).

The parallel drawn between an ecosystem and the context in which writing takes place is calculated and intentional on Cooper’s part. As she points out, “an important characteristic of

ecological systems is that they are inherently dynamic; though their structures and contexts can be specified at a given moment, in real time they are constantly changing” (368). There are two key features to take away from this depiction of an ecosystem. First, the articulation of writing as a system is integral to its ecological disposition. For Cooper, the idea of writing as a system rather than a singular entity further emphasizes the notion of writing as an action embedded within a web, where “anything that affects one strand of the web vibrates through the whole” (370). Jenny Rice concurs, suggesting that the notion of a singular writer whose thoughts and ideas emerges solely from his or her detached cognition simply does not exist. Instead, “this writer works within an active exchange of texts, conversations, responses and memories” (12). The second feature highlighted in Cooper’s ecological model of writing is that it is dynamic. In a biological ecosystem, the relationship between the various organisms and the environment is one built on response and reaction. Similarly, writers are not static beings who only operate within one social group but instead “move group to group, bringing with them complexes of ideas, purposes, and norms, different ways of interacting, different interpersonal roles and textual forms.” This constant movement and intersecting of various modes and means of communication constructs a system that is neither concrete nor established, but “made and remade by writers in the act of writing. . . It is in this sense that writing changes social reality. . .” (368). Thus, the process of writing simultaneously creates the system it operates within. This detail is what distinguishes an ecological view of writing from our more traditional understanding of context. Cooper argues that “context” is often viewed unconnected with other situations, similar to a backdrop that situates a particular text. Dobrin and Weisser also critique the detached, seemingly measurable concept of “context,” arguing that it “suggests potential effects of *all* local systems can be identified through heuristics in order to provide writers with accurate and complete

information prior to writing” (568, original emphasis). An ecological conception of writing, on the other hand, embeds context in the composing process, making it another element in the overall system. Bawarshi, echoing Cooper, states that “it is not that a writer merely functions within a context, but that a writer participates in the construction of that context” (“Ecology” 71).

In the final paragraph of her essay, Cooper pushes her readers to view writing not only as a system that is oriented and focused on an individual-to-individual relationship, but one that moves beyond such constraints and accounts for the influence of external environmental variables. Elements such as difference in power dynamics may affect interpersonal interactions, while “cultural institutions and attitudes discourage writing as often as they encourage it” (373). This shift has been picked up by contemporary scholars, who view the ecology of writing as more than a web of writers and audiences. Rather, there has been a push for the consideration of how the landscape and the environment factors into the act of composing.² Dobrin and Weisser argue that “Cooper’s article emphasizes human communicative systems to the exclusion of nonhuman physical locations in which such discourse exists; the actual places where writing develops and occurs were not considered” (575).

Despite the social turn expanding the field’s view of text production beyond the writer’s own cognition and towards social forces like gender, race, and class, Dobrin and Weisser argue that there was still little consideration given to environment beyond “theoretical understandings of ideology and other constructed critical categories” (575). In their 2002 article “Breaking Ground in Ecomposition: Exploring Relationships between Discourse and Environment”,

² It should be noted that Cooper’s article touches on how environment affects writing and knowledge production, but only briefly. In discussing systems, Cooper points out that “ideas are not so much fixed constructs to be transferred from one mind to the page and then to another mind; instead, ideas are out there in the world, a landscape that is always being modified by ongoing human discourse” (372). Even prior to the development of ecomposition, it seems Cooper began to acknowledge the theory that other social forces were at work within systems of writing.

Dobrin and Weisser further develop an ecological model of writing and expand it into what the field now recognizes as ecocomposition. In their view, we can understand the relationship between writers and the larger systems they inhabit by studying the influence of environment, place, and/or locations in the production and circulation of discourse. Moreover, they point out that “within the past few years, some compositions . . . have begun to assert that identity—and how it is manifested through discourse—is shaped by more than social conventions and is also influenced by our relationship with particular locations and environments” (567). Rice expands on this argument, stating that “discourse and environments are inseparable from each other. We always write from a place, and our writing itself creates places” (12). While ecocomposition explores how places and environments shape writing and vice versa, it should be noted that there is a distinction between ecocomposition and ecocriticism, the study of the relationship between literature and environment first introduced by William Rueckert and developed by literary scholars like Cheryl Glotfelty. Ecocriticism focuses on nature writing—or how literary texts interpret and construct our understanding of the natural world. Citing Glotfelty and Harold Fromm’s 1996 collection *The Ecocriticism Reader*, Dobrin and Weisser depict the types of questions that ecocritics ask: “How is nature represented in this sonnet? What role does the physical setting play in the plot of this novel? . . . How do our metaphors of the land influence the way we treat it?” (*xix*, qtd. in Dobrin and Weisser 569). Ecocomposition casts a more extensive net, studying the relationships between discourses of all types and a wide range of environments. Moreover, it is not limited only to the natural; it also includes the constructed and even the imagined. Thus, all ecologies, from political to electronic to ideological, are available to analysis. “[Ecocomposition focuses] on such topics as the ways in which city-dwellers develop certain patterns of behavior or how Internet chat rooms allow people to come together in

“locations” that best suit their needs” (581); or as Dobrin and Weisser succinctly put it, “any site where discourse exists” (573). Ecocomposition therefore pushes composition studies to continue questioning and exploring the act of composing as a dynamic system of not just writers, texts, discourses, and ideologies, but also of spaces, environments, and communities.

Upon closer examination, it’s clear that there is a lot of overlap and mutual support between ecocomposition and service-learning writing pedagogy. Much like the experiential learning that occurs in service-learning courses, Dobrin and Weisser argue that an ecocomposition-based pedagogy encourages engagement between students and their local communities, which opens up opportunities for students to write beyond the limited scope of the classroom and toward a larger, public audience. However, one way that service-learning can legitimize the role of audience in writing is that it offers students not only the opportunity to write for a non-academic audience, but a *real* non-academic audience; that is, students have the opportunity to create texts and projects that are experienced by other individuals, among them other faculty, community partners, or other college students. Within service-learning, students are also taught to deal with varying publicly-oriented purposes and exigencies, and this diversity, as Cooper states, is important for an ecological model of writing:

Ideas are out there in the world, a landscape that is always being modified by ongoing human discourse. [Writers] ‘find ideas’ in writing because they thus enter the field of discourse, finding in the exchange of language certain structures that they modify to suit their purposes. Nor for them do purposes arise solely out of individual desires, but rather arise out of the interaction between their needs and the needs of the various groups that structure their society. (372-373)

Although Cooper did not have service-learning in mind, her argument aligns fully with the goals of service-learning pedagogy; students are expected to write *for* and *with* the community. In addition, instructors are faced with the task of aligning institutional and departmental objectives in a manner that helps students understand the needs of their community partners.

The opening of service-learning composition pedagogy beyond the confines of the classroom allows writing to be more convincingly framed as a form of social action, another perception that is championed by both ecocompositionists and service-learning instructors alike. Paul Heilker, for example, argues that composition confined to the classroom cannot offer students real rhetorical situations in which to understand the sociopolitical nature of composing (71). Dobrin and Weisser agree, suggesting that writing assignments “should be context-driven and provide students with the room to direct their writing towards issues of both local and global concern” (*Natural* 142). The two authors also acknowledge a Freirian influence within ecocomposition, suggesting that “When Freire offers his problem-posing approach to gaining hold of local discourses and local literacies, he is, in essence, asking members of a community to question the very roles of their environments and to engage those environments in dialogue” (142). Consequently, ecocomposition pedagogy offers students the opportunity to write within environments rather than merely about them. In doing so, students are encouraged to be critically aware of their locality and developing a stronger sense of citizenship through active participation.

The previous sections aim to illustrate some of the elements that give service-learning its complicated character, from its origins in the social and public turn in composition, to the sociopolitical ideologies embedded in the model, to the responsibility of citizenship cultivation that service-learning instructors are often charged with. The varying utilizations and applications

of service-learning remind us of Deans' advice: "[W]e should resist the impulse to recruit service-learning practitioners into a single philosophical, theoretical, or pedagogical framework. Rather, service-learning will be better served if teacher-scholars develop, over time, a pantheon of exemplars" ("Two Keys" 26). Given the parallels between ecocomposition and service-learning, an ecocomposition approach to examining service-learning writing courses may help unearth its unique positions in composition studies, the academy and the larger public. Rather than ignore its highly-contextualized nature or attempt to paint a monolithic model of service-learning, an ecocomposition lens instead grants significance and validates the environmental variables within any service-learning ecology.

Chapter Overview

To demonstrate how an ecocomposition lens may better help us recognize the complexity of service-learning composition pedagogy, this qualitative study seeks to examine how the multiple environments of a first-year service-learning composition program factor in the production of discourse. Specifically, my research investigates English 121, the first-year service-learning expository writing course offered at the University of Washington. The course is molded by multiple components including the English department, the larger university institution, and the local Seattle community. In chapter 2, I introduce and give an outline of the programmatic structure of English 121: the writing objectives and outcomes that frame the course, its position within the larger English department, and the other organizations, both academic and community-based, that influence its formation and development. In addition, I discuss my methodology and the specific types of data I collected for my project, as well as the development of a preliminary coding process that allowed me to specifically identify three elements of the English 121 ecology that play a major role in its formation and continuation:

genres, reflection, and spatial rhetoric. Through instructor interviews and analyzing the end-of-term surveys of past English 121 instructors, I found that instructors often grappled with deciding which genres to utilize as formal assignments in their courses. Specifically, assignments had to be designed with both EWP outcomes as well as community goals and objectives in mind. I discuss my findings more in chapter 3, where I aim to construct a nuanced picture of the relationship between discourse and ideology in English 121 by analyzing the genres of the assignments most often utilized by service-learning instructors and the “metagenres” they reveal. The second component that consistently emerged in my codes was reflection and reflective writing. It came as no surprise that reflection would play an integral part in my study. The function of reflection has been investigated extensively in service-learning research, with scholars like Eyler and Giles describing it as the hyphen in service-learning: “it is the link that ties student experience in the community to academic learning” (17). Similarly, composition scholars like Kathleen Blake Yancey have championed the role of reflection in writing studies. However, as I discuss further in chapter 4, I was not only interested in the types of content and analysis that students were doing in their reflective writing, but *how* instructors were designing and facilitating reflective assignments. In addition, my findings also uncover how reflection functions outside of the classroom, particularly in terms of instructor training and orientation. The final component that appeared during my initial coding run were discussions of space and place. Given the multiple locations both on campus and off where service-learning occurs, initial analysis indicated physical space and locations to be a logistical barrier for instructors and students alike. Drawing upon theories from rhetorical ecology, ecocomposition, and actor-network theory, I make the argument in chapter 5 that effective service-learning pedagogy requires instructors to acknowledge space as a meaning-making force in their courses. Finally,

using my findings on genre, reflection, and spatial rhetoric, I propose an updated English 121 model in chapter 6, specifically looking at how elements such as instructor training, programmatic assessment, and assignment sequencing can be designed more ecologically.

Chapter 2: Study Design and Methods

As I noted in chapter 1, service-learning composition occupies a hybridized space within the larger university environment. The learning that occurs often takes place across multiple environments such as the classroom, the campus, and the local publics. In addition, research and scholarship discussed in the preceding chapter reveal the multiple elements that influence its pedagogy, such as the public turn in composition as well as community-based writing practices. However, in order to gain further insight into how writing instructors go about designing a course that addresses the diverse range of experiences that make up service-learning we must shift from theoretical conceptualizations of service-learning toward an authentic “on-the-ground” investigation of an actual program. Thus, for this study, I specifically focused on English 121, the first-year service-learning writing course offered at the University of Washington (UW). Initially, my research was guided by two overarching research questions:

1. What are the pedagogical strategies that service-learning instructors can implement in their courses to effectively engage students in addressing both the institutional outcomes and the needs and goals of their community organizations?
2. How are these pedagogical strategies taken up by the students and what influences do they have on the writing students produce?

Given the degree by which each English 121 course could vary from one to the next, I wanted to start off with broad, open-ended research questions that would be molded into a more specific set of research inquires once I began collecting data. It is my hope that this project will contribute towards understanding how writing instructors perceive and design composition pedagogy when implemented alongside community engagement, as well as determining the types of resources and strategies necessary to prepare new instructors to become service-learning faculty. Entering into a new academic community like service-learning is no easy feat; instructors will “need to have to good sense of how service-learning relates to their disciplines and specifically to course content, and also need an understanding of their role with respect to working with community partners” (Gelmon et al. 45).

In this chapter, I first provide a general overview of the English 121 program, the participants who took part in my study, and the types of data I gathered over the course of this project. I then discuss my methodological approach and the process of developing a set of context-specific research topics based on the unique ecology of the English 121 program.

The Expository Writing Program - An Overview

English 121, titled “Composition: Social Issues,” is a first-year service-learning composition course taught at the University of Washington at Seattle. The class is a component of the university’s Expository Writing Program (EWP), which is oriented towards introducing students to the various academic discourses of the university environment. Housed in the English department, first-year composition is taught through four types of courses. The course offered most per academic quarter by the EWP is English 131, “Composition: Expository,” which asks students to operate primarily as members of the university’s academic discourse community. As depicted on the EWP website, students produce complex arguments that matter “within the

academic context” while utilizing resources and materials that “focus on academic discourse from a variety of disciplines” (Department of English). English 109/110, designed specifically for first-generation college students and those needing additional writing support, follows the same pedagogical philosophy as English 131; the only difference is that it is a “stretch” version of 131 taught across two academic quarters instead of one. English 111, “Composition: Literature,” teaches first-year composition through primary literary texts and secondary sources. Finally, English 121 serves as the university’s only first-year service-learning writing course, one that offers students the opportunity to write “complex claims that matter in academic and *non-academic* contexts” (“Expository Writing Courses,” emphasis added). All EWP instructors at UW are required to teach English 131 exclusively during their first year; after that, they have the option of designing and facilitating one or more of the other three courses.

Despite their variations, all first-year EWP writing courses adhere to the same programmatic anchor. That is, regardless of which type of course a student is enrolled in, there are certain curricular features that all instructors must develop their course around. The most important detail that governs all first-year courses is a set of EWP outcomes, four writing objectives that outline the overall learning goals for all students taking these courses³:

- **Outcome 1:** To demonstrate an awareness of the strategies that writers use in different writing contexts.
- **Outcome 2:** To read, analyze, and synthesize complex texts and incorporate multiple kinds of evidence purposefully in order to generate and support writing.

³ See Appendix 1 for the full, comprehensive version of the EWP outcomes

- **Outcome 3:** To produce complex, analytic, persuasive arguments that matter in academic contexts.
- **Outcome 4:** To develop flexible strategies for revising, editing, and proofreading writing.

The relationship between the EWP outcomes and English 121 in particular will be examined more closely in later chapters, but for now, it is important to first understand the rationale behind the outcomes' goals.

The departmental outcomes mirror the Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition as designed by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), a national organization comprised of college and university-level writing administrators. As the CWPA notes, the outcomes emerged from research that supported the context-specific nature of writing pedagogy. According to the CWPA, “the process of learning to write in any medium is complex: it is both individual and social and demands continued practice and informed guidance” (CWPA). Both the EWP and the Outcomes Statement emphasize the diverse forms of academic writing students encounter beyond their first-year writing course; as the English 131 instructor orientation manual points out, “students rarely encounter the exact same writing situation twice and are often frustrated when how they’ve learned to write in one course does not easily translate into other courses” (“Chapter 2”).

The history of composition pedagogy at UW has also influenced the formation of the outcomes. Until 1968, students at the university were required to complete three full 10-week quarters of first-year composition. That year, the requirement was dropped completely, but returned in a slightly modified form in the 1980s. After that, students were required to take one general composition course (i.e., first-year EWP course) and two disciplinary-writing courses, or “W” courses. Initially, W-courses were relegated to departments and majors outside of English,

but by 1994, these disciplinary-specific writing courses were offered within the English department as well. Thus, it was possible for students at the university to complete their academic career without taking a writing course in another area of study outside of the English department. These revisions led to the EWP becoming synonymous with a catch-all writing program, providing the majority of writing instruction for many of the majors at the university.

Much like the WPA Outcomes statements, the EWP outcomes statement focuses primarily on developing first-year students' understanding of "rhetorical sensitivity" rather than the acquisition of fixed writing skills. That is, the program emphasizes a pedagogical approach that focuses on how elements like audience, purpose, and genre vary from context to context. Together, with the ability to develop and follow a line of inquiry, generate complex arguments, and use flexible re-writing strategies, it becomes clear that the EWP outcomes are specifically molded to help students develop writing habits that could be transferred across all disciplines. The word "habit" is especially important and emphasized in the EWP orientation manual. Students will not emerge from first-year EWP writing courses with a quantifiable set of disciplinary-based writing techniques that will allow them to write in any academic or non-academic context; that is an impossible feat. Instead, the EWP outcomes are designed to set students up to realize that written communication will always be influenced by context. First-year EWP courses are thus oriented around rhetorical analysis and provide the opportunity for students to think about and practice adapting their writing knowledge to a variety of situations they may encounter. Although unintentional, this orientation towards rhetorical flexibility is shared by ecocomposition courses, where "issues that directly assist students in becoming better producers of writing in a variety of writing environments should be the central focus,

encouraging students to recognize their experiences in all environments as affecting and being affected by their writing” (Dobrin and Weisser 580).

Another programmatic element that is shared across all first-year EWP courses is the implementation of an end-of-the-quarter portfolio. Individual assignments in EWP courses are not graded; rather, student writing is collected into an overall portfolio, which is graded holistically at the end of the course. Instructors use the four outcomes as a measuring stick, assessing how well students demonstrated each of the outcomes in their writing throughout the quarter, rather than any one isolated assignment or project. In addition to assignments, the portfolio contains a critical reflection component in which students self-critique and analyze their own writing in order to demonstrate how, when, and why they employed the four EWP outcomes during the quarter. The rationale behind a portfolio-based curriculum is to instill a perception of writing as a process and disrupt the students’ experience with classes in high school and secondary school, as well as the timed writing assignments they encounter on standardized testing, which often suggest that writing is a means to an end culminating in a letter or numeric grade. Because instructors give only feedback on individual assignments and grade the final portfolio holistically, students are forced to frequently re-visit and revise their work throughout the quarter. Writing therefore resembles a loop rather than a straight line with a concrete endpoint. In addition, the traditional approach of grading individual assignments does not capture the writing development that occurs as a student progresses through the course. In other words, a final grade averaged from low grades at the beginning of the course and high grades at the end of the course does not accurately reflect the student’s actual writing ability in the end. Thus, as the English 131 orientation manual makes clear, “by grading primarily on what a student can do at

the end of the quarter, we avoid penalizing them for what they weren't yet able to do at the start of the quarter" ("Chapter 9").

While the EWP outcomes and its portfolio-based model offer a solid foundation for instructors to build their syllabi around, instructors who teach English 121 must take into consideration an additional, external factor: the local community organizations their class are partnered with. Whereas English 109/110, English 111, and English 131 instructors are operating primarily within an academic context, English 121 instructors must account for the inclusion of various service-learning components. The EWP also provides English 121 instructors with an orientation manual that supplements and builds off the concepts established in the general English 131 manual. A closer examination of the language of the English 121 orientation manual reveals a conception of composition pedagogy that asks instructors to account for the various influences that lie beyond their classroom. The incorporation of the community partners into the curriculum is made apparent; the manual first situates the course within the public turn in composition, citing Thomas Deans, Ernest Boyer, and Paula Mathieu in order to construct the university—and the first-year composition classroom specifically—as social tools that play a key role in developing citizenship dispositions in students. To do so, the English 121 program considers the needs, values, and goals of the communities in which instructors and students work and learn. The manual frames the work that is done in English 121 as both *for* community organizations, through the production of material artifacts such as brochures and press releases, as well as *about* community organizations, through select readings that make explicit connections between the students' service and the assignments. This aspect is another detail that distinguishes English 121 from the other 100-level EWP courses. When designing and facilitating English 131, 111, or 109/110, instructors often have free reign in selecting the theme

of their course, as well as the readings and texts that support it⁴, as long as students are able to demonstrate the EWP outcomes through their writing. However, when it comes to selecting themes for English 121, instructors must consider a course theme that is able to be easily integrated with the objectives and goals of local community partners. Thus, the readings and topics that make up English 121 courses are often sociopolitical in nature, with assignments that ask students to compose in public genres. In addition, community organizations play a role in the assessment of students' overall academic performance. As a distinct feature of English 121, community organizations at the end of the academic quarter are asked to evaluate the students who served alongside them, based on details such as maintenance of schedule, contribution of work to the organization, dedication to the organization's mission, and fulfillment of the required minimum of 20 service hours. English 121 instructors are to consider the community organization's feedback in deciding their students' final grade for the class.

Another participant in the service-learning program at UW is the Carlson Leadership and Public Service Center. Described as an organization that “develops service-learning, community-based participatory research, and leadership opportunities for [University of Washington] students that sustain reciprocal partnerships, deepen learning and contribute to our greater community” (Carlson Leadership), the Carlson Center functions as the other major institutional influence on the design of an English 121 curriculum. When designing and teaching their course for the first time, English 121 instructors must meet with staff at the Carlson Center to discuss the overarching theme of their course. From there, the center reaches out to the community and connects instructors with service organizations that fit the instructor's theme. For example, an

⁴ While instructors have the option of selecting their own text, the EWP also encourages first-time instructors to utilize *Contexts for Inquiry*, the textbook written and published by the English department.

instructor who orients their curriculum around the issues of poverty may partner with local homeless shelters and food banks. Besides acting as a bridge between instructors and community partners, the Carlson Center plays an important role in helping students transition into their service-learning duties. During the first two weeks of every academic quarter, the center offers optional workshops that provide students with a general overview of service-learning concepts, suggestions on maintaining professionalism at the service site, and problem-solving strategies to common issues that emerge during the service-learning experience. While it is true that each service-learning course will ultimately vary from instructor to instructor, these Carlson Center-led workshops offer a foundation that students can use to establish an understanding of their role in both the community and the classroom.

It becomes clear that in the process of designing a service-learning composition course, the English 121 instructor must consider the institutional writing outcomes of the EWP, the voice and visibility of the community partners, and the involvement of the Carlson Center. Each English 121 course adheres to the same service-learning template: a first-year academic writing course that is partnered with both institutional and non-institutional organizations. However, similarities end there as each course ultimately varies in its theme, readings, and assignment types. Thus, given the highly-contextualized nature of each English 121 course, I drew on a grounded theory approach to my methodology and study design, focusing primarily on first selecting participants and gathering data on the overall English 121 program and then developing more specific research topics based on patterns that emerge organically from coding the collected information.

Participants

Given the nuanced and interconnected nature of the English 121 program, I utilized a combination of actor-network theory and contemporary research methodology on service-learning as guiding frameworks to determine the types of participants for this study. To study social interactions between multiple participants and the networks they create, Bruno Latour calls for a research approach that de-emphasizes the establishment of specific boundaries on the research site prior to collecting data: “[The researcher’s] task is no longer to impose some order, to limit the range of acceptable entities, to teach actors what they are, or to add some reflexivity to their blind practice” (12); instead, Latour suggests that in order to gain insight into a particular network, we must “follow the actors themselves, that is try to catch up with their often wild innovations in order to learn from them what the collective existence has become in their hands, *which methods they have elaborated to make it fit together*, which accounts could best define the new associations that they have been forced to establish” (12, emphasis added). Thus, my first step towards understanding the English 121 ecology was to identify the participating actors, then closely observe the various connections they create and the materials they generate. Of the four main participants in the program—instructors, students, Carlson Center, and community partners—I focused primarily on instructors and students, given their direct and consistent interaction with English 121 coursework and materials. Although both the Carlson Center and local community organization play an integral role in the overall service-learning program, time constraints prevented me from interviewing either organizations’ staff members.

In addition, my decision to focus on gathering data on instructors and students paralleled contemporary service-learning research approaches. As scholars emphasize, effective service-learning and community-based research relies on understanding faculty and their ability to draw connections between course subject matter and community issues and experiences (Eyler and

Giles, Gelmon et al.). While there has been extensive research on the training and preparation of faculty on service-learning pedagogy (Bringle and Hatcher “Curriculum”, “Implementing”), Gelmon and others argue that there has been little advancement in understanding the relationship *between* faculty and service-learning. This gap is where I situate my project: once instructors begin teaching service-learning courses, how do their perceptions and understandings of the pedagogy change and evolve? Gaining insight into students’ perceptions of service-learning pedagogy is equally important. First, gathering data on students provides a means for educators to respond to students’ questions about why they need to engage in this form of learning (Gelmon et al. 19), thereby forcing service-learning faculty and administrators to reflect on the rationale behind their syllabi and assignment design process. Second, according to Sherril Gelmon and her colleagues, there is a consistent problem with higher learning institutions increasing the number of community-based courses that are offered, yet not fully understanding the impact this type of pedagogy has on student learning (19). Thus, my decision for including students in my study was not only to gain insight into their writing development, but into their perception of the service work they engage in as well. In inviting students’ participation in my study, I see my work continuing to build on the scholarship of Alexander Astin and Linda Sax, who examined students’ reflections on their behaviors and thoughts while serving (“Impact”, “How Undergraduates”).

The participants in this study consisted of three English 121 instructors and 12 of their students. Kathy, Jessica, and Caroline⁵ agreed to be interviewed as well as provide their syllabi and assignment prompts during the Autumn 2015, Winter 2016, and Spring 2017 academic

⁵ Pseudonyms have been provided to protect the identity of all student and instructor participants.

quarters. The 12 first-year student participants consisted of three students in Kathy's Autumn quarter course, five students from Jessica's Autumn and Winter courses, and four students from Caroline's Autumn and Winter courses⁶. Altogether, the participants in my study included the following:

Jessica (instructor): Jessica was one of the instructors who was teaching English 121 for the first time. As a graduate student studying rhetoric and composition, Jessica noted that she was "super interested in different types of literacy" and saw English 121 as an opportunity for students to use their experience and observations in the community as a text to draw from. She also felt there was more rhetorical flexibility when it came to service-learning composition pedagogy: "This is something that I've been trying to work towards since I've [started teaching]: giving students more freedom, but still giving them the structure to scaffold to something more." The theme Jessica selected for her course was "multi-literacies," which explores "cultural literacies and thinking about other languages that students are bringing in." Prior to her first quarter of teaching, Jessica foresaw balancing time between composition-oriented content and service-learning content as the biggest challenge.

Caroline (instructor): Like Jessica, Caroline was also teaching English 121 for the first time during the 2015-2016 year. However, English 121 was not her first choice for a course; she had originally wanted to teach English 111. Coming from a literature background, Caroline admitted that she felt a bit nervous and ill-prepared to teach social issues. However, she said she warmed to the idea of teaching service-learning composition once she settled on a theme for her course: "I chose [the theme of] food partially because I am very interested in it and I've read a lot

⁶ Due to time constraints, neither instructors nor students were interviewed during the Spring Quarter.

about it since I am vegetarian. . . . Okay, I don't know how to teach [social issues], but I know about food. You know what I mean? So I think it's a nice way for me to feel a bit more confident.” When asked about what challenges she anticipated in her first quarter teaching English 121, Caroline again reiterated her lack of familiarity with service-learning, or how to present the subject of food in an academic context. She conceptualized Autumn Quarter as a laboratory. “This quarter, more than anything,” Caroline noted, “feels like I am ready to learn as much as [my students] are. I really don't feel like I'm teaching this quarter. I've picked readings the first time I've read them as well, and we're all just gonna sit and talk about it and see what we figure out.”

Kathy (instructor): Unlike Jessica and Caroline, Kathy was a returning English 121 instructor. Although her area of expertise involved literary studies, Kathy's desire to teach service-learning two years in a row stemmed from a personal interest in community engagement: “I've always had a heart for service and especially to communities that are not well represented, that are maybe underfunded for education. . . . And so [English 121] was totally in line with my own commitment goals.” This interest also guided her towards her course theme, which centered on educational equity. Having taught English 121 the year before, Kathy did not foresee any major pedagogical challenges; “I think I'm more relaxed now. I've always loved the class. . . . Like I said, it just matches my own feelings, persuasions. So I guess I'm just looking forward to enjoying it and feeling more relaxed because I'm a little more experienced.” Heading into this dissertation, my original plan was to interview only first-time service-learning instructors; however, the inclusion of Kathy alongside Jessica and Caroline provided me with a larger data set as well as insight into the overall service-learning context from the perspective of both first-time and veteran instructors.

Aaron (Kathy's student, Autumn 2015): Aaron was an international student from China. Prior to enrolling in English 121, he did not know exactly what service-learning was, but assumed "it was like tutoring." Although Aaron recognized the course theme to be educational equity, he did not see the relevance of the course material to the theme: "I think the topics are very diverse. . . [The] professor just let us write something that is related to our readings or teach [us] how to write. . .there really is no specific topic." During the quarter, Aaron served at a community center for Asian immigrants, where he was primarily a tutor in the after-school program for children; "when they are done with their homework I have to check [it], and then when they do a reading assignment, I have to read it [to them] or help them read it."

Josh (Kathy's student, Autumn 2015): Like Aaron, Josh was also an international student. Coming to UW from India, Josh first learned about service-learning from his roommate, who introduced him to the concept during the summer before Autumn Quarter. When it came time to register for classes, Josh selected English 121 specifically because it was a service-learning course. It was clear that he had a genuine interest in community engagement: "It's not just about going [to your organization] and doing your hours, it's more about actually learning something. . .you go and you learn something along with what you learned in the class. And you're able to apply one or the other." For his service, Josh worked with a K-12 outreach program, tutoring students in math and other subjects.

Connor (Kathy's student, Autumn 2015): Connor was an international student from China, but had spent a year in an American high school before coming to the UW; that was where he was first exposed to service-learning. During the Autumn Quarter, Connor tutored at the same community center as Aaron. While Connor saw a connection between the course readings and the education-based service he was doing, he had a tough time seeing how the

writing and composing skills he was developing contributed to his service work. In fact, knowledge seemed to move only in one direction – from the community organization to the classroom and not the other way around. “Maybe doing the service will help my writing, my research, but I think the writing has little to do with the service.”

Amy (Jessica’s student, Autumn 2015): Amy was a student who grew up in the United States. Like many of the other student participants, she had not heard of service-learning before enrolling in English 121. When asked how she would define service-learning now, Amy stated: Service learning. . . [is] kind of like learning concepts and ideas and new information in class and applying it to where you were volunteering at or in other parts of your life outside the classroom, I think.” She was also able to identify with Jessica’s course theme on multi-literacies: “I think she really focuses on communication as a form of literacy, whether it be written, verbal or whatever else kind there is.” For her service, Amy worked in the emergency department at a local hospital; “my primary role is to keep the stockroom stocked with supplies and then stocking all of the patient rooms. My secondary role is helping the visitors or patients with anything they need.”

Rufus (Jessica’s student, Autumn 2015): Rufus was another international student from China. One of the major differences he noticed between writing as it was taught in English 121 compared with his prior experiences in China was much more open-endedness and flexibility: “Our writing class tutor [taught] us to write papers for [passing standardized] tests, so it's like they have specific structures. . . But after taking this English writing class, it actually changed a little bit the way I write. . . it's more free to convey my ideas, but also [still] structured.” Rufus stated that he did not know what service-learning was until he enrolled and was introduced to the

concept on the first day of class. During the Autumn Quarter, Rufus worked as a tutor in a bilingual center, helping young students with Math and English.

Lucy (Jessica's student, Autumn 2015): Lucy, who was from China, saw English 121 as a gateway into US culture. As she stated, "I did not know too much about American culture; immigrants, black people, white people, different classes in America, how they lived and how they are being treated unequally. But after I read the readings, I got to know [much more] about American culture." Lucy also saw English 121 as an opportunity to practice her English, something that she admitted held her back from fully participating during class discussions: "In the first discussions, I just feel very shy. Many native speakers would just [state] their topics, and I just didn't speak. . . . In recent times, I feel a little bit more confident to say my view in the discussions." Despite being a different English 121 course and having different instructors, Lucy also served as a tutor at the same Asian community center as Connor and Aaron.

Kingston (Jessica's student, Winter 2016): Kingston was a student born and raised in the United States. The service situation involving Kingston was unlike any of the other student participants. When he and I met up at the midway point of the Winter Quarter to discuss this study and his overall English 121 experiences, he admitted: "I actually haven't volunteered yet, and the reason why is because there's just been lack of communication between [me and the community partner]." In addition, Kingston also confessed that due to Jessica's relaxed disposition as an instructor, it caused him to "become comfortable with being absent from class sometimes."

Laura (Jessica's student, Winter 2016): As an international student, Laura appreciated the "multi-literacy" theme that Jessica selected for her course. "I'm also an international student who doesn't use English as a first language, so I think the theme is making a comfortable

community to people who are not using English as their first language, and make them adjust to the environment.” Laura also saw a strong connection between the theme and her service, which involved mentoring and tutoring English Language Learners at a local community center. She applied many of the arguments on language and culture from the course readings to her service: “Before I talk or help the students in [the] organization, I really critically think about my own position. And I don't want to make any bias to them, so I think [the readings] definitely help me to support that community, I guess.”

Trinity (Caroline's student, Autumn 2015): Trinity was a domestic student in Caroline's Autumn English 121 course. Like many others, she was not aware of the service component until the first day of class; “actually I didn't see it when I signed up for the course. The first day I was like, ‘Oh, that's something I have to do. Okay, got it.’” However, Trinity considered this a blessing in disguise, as she claimed to not be “super interested in analyzing an entire novel” and was more interested in exploring social issues. Compared with other students who participated in this study, Trinity's service was much more labor intensive; she served at a UW-sponsored farm and was responsible for tasks such as pulling weeds and crop maintenance. As she put it, “The farm is kind of a funky volunteer opportunity compared to others because we're not really communicating with people in need. . . We're really just shoveling compost, and things like that.”

Courtney (Caroline's student, Autumn 2015): Courtney was a student who grew up in the United States. While she had a sense of what community-based learning was prior to taking English 121, it was there that she began to comprehend the difference between service-learning and volunteer work. As she put it, “Community service is just [when] you go do something and you gain experience from it, or whatever. But service learning is. . .you do the experience, but

you also learn more from it, and reflect on your actions in the experience, and your actions and interactions and the people who work around you. . . . So you're just more aware, I guess.”

During the quarter, Courtney served at a local homeless shelter, primarily in the kitchen and assisted in meal preparation.

Nan (Caroline’s student, Winter 2016): From a writing perspective, Nan, another domestic student, appreciated the diverse range of genres that she could utilize in English 121: “We're doing a blog post right now in class, which is great because I can kind of include my own voice in the writing and it gives me a lot of creative opportunities. . . .We [also] did a group project where everyone from our community organization got together and we talked about what we were learning and doing, and then presented that to the class.” For her, the writing was much more authentic and interesting as compared with past writing courses. Nan’s community partner was an organization that provides meals to people with chronic illness, where her responsibilities ranged from meal prep to administrative tasks.

Nathan (Caroline’s student, Winter 2016): Nathan was a domestic student in Caroline’s Winter English 121 course. To him, there was a deep symbiotic relationship to the critical thinking that occurred in the classroom and his work with a local homeless shelter. As Nathan put it, “It's really enlightening in the fact that a lot of people might just look at [this homeless shelter] one-dimensionally and think, ‘Oh, it's just like a homeless feeding program. It's nothing special.’ But really as I was writing and just looking at the rhetoric [of their mission statement] ‘Feeding the Community, Serving the Community, Creating the Community,’ . . .it's not just a homeless feeding program. It's really the community that comes together, all these people from different backgrounds, serving the community.” Thus, for Nathan, the writing component of English 121 was integral in distinguishing service-learning from volunteerism.

Research Design and Methods

As I am most interested in exploring how writing instructors negotiate and address the various demands of service-learning pedagogy in their courses, I draw heavily from teacher research for my methodological framing, which promotes an “inside out” view of epistemology that positions the instructor and the classroom as knowledge producers. Traditionally,

teachers are the objects of researchers’ investigations and then ultimately expected to be consumers and implements of their findings. Missing. . . are the voices of the teachers themselves, the questions that teachers ask, and the interpretive frame that teachers use to understand and improve their own classroom practices. (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 3)

Unlike some research methods, teacher research values instructor input and collaboration and views classroom interaction not as just potential results of a hypothesis testing, but rather the epistemological root from which all education-based theories originate. Scholars who advocate the use of teacher research argue that all pedagogical knowledge is “inside/outside” (Cochran-Smith and Lytle), a perception which positions instructors and learner as collaborators and experts of their local, specialized contexts. Thus, they are seen not as variables for researchers to test out theories and concepts, but rather as creators of knowledge who inform and revise the contemporary trends and directions of a field.

While this study cannot be categorized *purely* as teacher research—given that I am not conducting a study of my own classroom and syllabi—teacher research does however emphasize an approach to data collection and analysis that accounts for the diversity of learning situations and therefore proves useful for studying service-learning pedagogy. Paralleling similar ideologies from action research and participatory research, what is also distinct about teacher

research versus various forms of composition research is what Ruth Ray deems a “collaborative spirit,” not just between researcher and participant, but with an emphasis on the recursive relationship between theory and practice (183). Similarly, scholars like Marilyn Cochran-Smith and Susan Landy Lytle suggest that teacher research is ideal for inquiry that seeks to explore moments of disconnect between scholarship and praxis: “felt discrepancies between intention and reality, theory/research and practice” (12). As a methodological framework, teacher research recognizes the important influence of context on classroom pedagogy. As Anne Berthoff suggests, this approach recognizes not only new knowledge construction but also seeks out the interpretation of “the information one already has—what she calls REsearching” (qtd in Cochran-Smith and Lytle 24). This means that new, original findings could be derived from established pedagogical theories by investigating them in a brand new environment. Thus, a teacher research approach serves as an ideal lens for studying service-learning composition programs like English 121, where instructors are attempting to negotiate their prior pedagogical experiences within a new context.

Bob Fecho and his co-authors argue that the type of research questions that are best answered by teacher research are prompted by the examination of the micro relationships between teacher, student, and text within the larger macro system of classroom, school, and community (109). Thus, to capture these micro relationships, my data collection draws from several qualitative methods and approaches, such as interviews with both instructors and students, as well as analysis of select documents. According to researchers like David Shumer, whereas quantitative studies may help us understand the “what” questions related to service-learning, qualitative studies attempt to answer the “how” questions: how programs are set up, how they operate, and how students learn effectively in community-based learning environments

(36). Ultimately, a qualitative approach would grant insight into the pedagogical strategies English 121 instructors use to establish their classrooms, as well as how students react to said strategies.

Data Collection

Interviews

Interviews played a major part in my data collecting process⁷. Contemporary research on service-learning states that interviews with instructors provide insight on multiple levels; not only can they be used to learn more about individual instructors' views and attitudes towards their course design process, but interviews can also provide an opportunity for instructors to discuss and give feedback on the overarching program as a whole. (Gelmon et al). I interviewed each instructor individually three times: once before the beginning of Autumn Quarter, once between the Autumn and Winter Quarter, and once after the Winter Quarter. The timing of each interview was strategic. The pre-Autumn interview provided insight into how instructors—especially Jessica and Caroline who were teaching English 121 for the first time—conceptualized and defined service-learning pedagogy. In the first interview, my questions focused on instructors' preconceived notions of service-learning, as well as their reasoning for teaching the course. Second, I wanted instructors to reflect on their prior experiences teaching English 131 and the pedagogical strategies and assignments they transferred into their Autumn English 121 course. Finally, I asked instructors to make predictions about what their experiences teaching service-learning would be like. During the interview between the Autumn and Winter Quarter, I asked instructors to reflect on both the successes and challenges they faced during the

⁷ See Appendix 2 for a comprehensive list of the interview questions for both instructor and student participants.

previous quarter. We also revisited the predictions they made during the first interview and discussed what aspects of their course matched their predictions and what was different. Finally, instructors were asked to discuss the revisions they made to their course for the upcoming Winter Quarter. I employed a similar structure for the third and final interview, which occurred after the Winter Quarter. Instructors again were asked to reflect on the successes and challenges from their prior quarter and discuss any changes they planned to make in their pedagogy for the subsequent Spring Quarter.

Interviews with student participants were also crucial in gaining a comprehensive view of each English 121 course; I was interested in not only the instructors' perception of their own pedagogy, but also how it was received and interpreted by their students. Much like instructor interviews, selecting the appropriate time for an interview was also important. I met with each of the 12 students once during week six or seven of their respective quarter to ensure that they had spent enough time in their English 121 course and at their community partner and would be able to provide a comprehensive assessment of their service-learning experience. Student interview questions focused on two aspects of their English 121 experience. I began each interview with questions related to the classroom, specifically asking students to describe and define the genres they were reading and writing. In order to get a sense of how students were interpreting service-learning pedagogy, I also asked students to draw comparisons between the work they were doing in the English 121 classroom and their prior experiences in English and writing classes. Then, students were asked to describe the work they were doing at their community organizations. Finally, each interview concluded with questions that prompt students to draw connections between the classroom and the community.

For interviews with both instructors and students, I utilized a semi-structured technique. That is, rather than adhere strictly to a set of questions, I approached each interview like a conversation, at times breaking away from original questions and building off responses with spontaneous follow-up inquiries or comments. The open-ended nature of my interview process created an environment in which the interviewee naturally and organically discussed their classroom experiences and their service-related experiences, thus giving the data a much more “embedded” response. In addition, a major component of my interview process involved integrating student responses into my instructor interviews. Specifically, after the first pre-Autumn interview, the second and third interviews with each instructor involved discussions of what students said about their course design. In preparation for this activity, I anonymized students’ interview responses and aggregated them into a single document. The document was emailed to the instructor a couple of days before our scheduled interview so that they would have time to read and reflect on the feedback.

Institutional and Course Materials

In addition to interviews, I collected written material from both students and instructors. From a research standpoint, writing samples and course materials helped me triangulate and compare interview responses with the types of writing that emerged during the research. That is, in what ways do the produced texts support or nuance what instructors and students were saying about their English 121 experiences? At the beginning of each quarter, Kathy, Jessica, and Caroline provided me with their syllabi, formal and informal assignment prompts, and in-class writing activities. Although interviews with instructors concluded at the end of the Winter Quarter, I still collected course materials for the Spring Quarter in order to gain insight into the continued evolution of their pedagogy.

Other than material from the instructors, each of the 12 student participants sent me a copy of their final English 121 portfolio, containing all their formal writing assignments. To better understand students' experiences at their community organizations, I also collected all informal reflective writing such as journals, critical service logs, and URL links to their online service-learning blogs. Finally, each instructor also granted me "observer" status in their course's Canvas websites, giving me access to online discussion board posts and miscellaneous writing activities that the class completed during the academic year.

Understanding the ecology in which English 121 is situated also requires a historical perspective of the overall program. To gain an awareness of how past English 121 instructors designed and facilitated their service-learning courses, I collected data from the online archive of materials titled "English 121 Community Page" generated by current and past instructors. Altogether my data set of archived teaching resources consisted of course materials from instructors dating back to the 2010-2011 academic year. At the end of each academic year, first-time instructors were prompted by the English 121 faculty mentor to upload their "course portfolio," consisting of their syllabus, both formal and informal assignment prompts, logistical information about their community partners, and a brief end-of-term survey that asked them to reflect on their experiences teaching service-learning composition. The survey questions ranged from macro-level inquiry about the instructor's approach, such as how they prepared their students for service-learning, both logistically and conceptually, to specific questions regarding what they considered their most effective and ineffective writing assignments. Altogether I collected course portfolios from 14 past instructors:

Sally: 2010-2011; course theme: "Sustainability"

Aislinn: 2011-2012; course theme: "Thinking Critically About Poverty and Social Service"

Charlotte: 2011-2012; course theme: “Environmental Justice”

Stan: 2011-2012; course theme: “Finding Power”

Stephanie: 2011-2012; course theme: “Social Networking and Community”

Melissa: 2012-2013; course theme: “Language and Difference in Service Learning”

Robert: 2012-2013; course theme: “Class, Race, and Space”

Alisha: 2013-2014, 2014-2015; course theme: “Social Inequality in the U.S.”

Emily: 2013-2014; course theme: “Food and Community”

Lisa: 2013-2014; course theme: “Literacy Education in America”

Lyla: 2013-2014; course theme: “Holistic Approaches to Bridging the Achievement Gap”

Nathan: 2013-2014; course theme: “The Living City”

Ethan: 2014-2015; course theme: “Weather”

Jamie: 2014-2015; course theme: “Multi-Media Composition and Communication”

Aside from materials from past instructors, I also gathered orientation materials such as the English 121 instructor training manual and the resources used by the Carlson Center during their student orientation workshops. I used these latter materials to help me understand the language and discourses that institutional documents were using to construct the English 121 program.

Coding and Initial Analysis

Once participant interviews and institutional and course materials were collected, I utilized an “emergent design flexibility” analytical approach, in which the researcher starts out looking at one type of data for noticeable patterns, then as analysis continues, switches to another type of data to get a different perspective on the developing themes. As Kathryn Steinberg, Robert Bringle, and Matthew Williams note, “this iterative process might be repeated several times before the researcher creates a synthesis and interprets the data. Thus, [this] design of qualitative research is open-ended in nature” (19). Specifically, I began to initially code across interview transcripts, course material, and student writing, taking note of references to:

- EWP
- Other college courses, writing based
- Other college courses, non-writing based
- Prior courses, writing based
- Prior courses, non-writing based
- Community partner
- Carlson Center
- References to local community

The first round of coding was kept general and used primarily to make note of salient and interesting moments during interviews, course documents, and student writing. My goal was to apply additional levels of coding once the initial coding process revealed noticeable patterns and themes. In doing so, I wanted to prioritize context over using established or recognized heuristics. While quantitative and positivist-oriented studies are often lauded for their ability to produce generalizable findings and transferable practices, some have criticized the erasure of context when studying pedagogy- and education-based topics (see Mishler; Johaneck; Pine). Scholars argue that because context and pedagogy are so intertwined, the types of methodologies used for investigating classroom instruction must not be given precedence over the context in which they are being used. Mishler points out that “traditional research approaches, which have dominated social sciences and education, have largely ignored the importance of context” (qtd. in Pine 23). The stripping of context in order to find universal and replicable results leads to a misrepresentation of the learning that the researcher is observing in the first place. Therefore, I approached my study with a “contextualist” mindset, which shares similarities to ecocomposition. In *Composing Research: A Contextualist Research Paradigm for Rhetoric and Composition*, Cindy Johaneck argues that context should be identified as more than merely a place or location, but rather hold a flexible definition that is defined from “the moment a researcher wants to know something” (3). For Johaneck, the context ultimately controls the research methods implemented for the study. For instance, “two researchers in the same writing

center could pursue two very different questions, creating two different contexts in the same location” (3). To value generalizable findings and results without considering the situation in which the methods will be applied goes against the very thing that composition scholars claim is the most important aspect of rhetoric and writing: the rhetorical situation from which the discourse emerges.

My initial coding of interviews and materials revealed three components that play major roles in how instructors and students perceive and construct the English 121 environment: metagenres, reflection and space. In the subsequent three chapters, I discuss the relevant literature and scholarship that inform each of these elements, as well as an analysis of the findings that emerge through a more specific coding process. Thus, rather than present my results in a single chapter, the distinct characteristics of each element and their role within the larger English 121 ecology require that I discuss findings in three separate sections.

Chapter 3: Examining the Metagenres that Construct Service-Learning Composition Courses

In my opening chapter, I introduce the multiple forces that contribute to the development and continuation of composition taught through a service-learning model. The intersections that form between the composition classroom, the larger university institution, and the community partners all must be considered and weighed as composition instructors build their syllabi. On top of that, service-learning courses are also influenced by the instructors' prior pedagogical experiences, as well as the incomes that first-year students bring to the classroom. During my initial coding of data, instructors' discussions of how to negotiate these influences were often wrapped up in conversations about genres and assignments. Since service-learning courses require both students and instructors to work across multiple discourse communities, genres hold important stakes in the formation of relationships and classroom dispositions. This chapter will explore the genres that appear most frequently in English 121 as assignments, and the "metagenres" that form as a result of intersecting institutional and community-based objectives. In addition, how do genres operate on an ideological level to perpetuate certain actions and behaviors within the English 121 program? Thus, an investigation into the types of genres most often utilized by instructors as formal writing assignments may provide insight in how the multiple elements within the service-learning ecology – human and non-human, material and non-material – create a specialized discourse community that is positioned simultaneously between and within the academic institution and the local publics.

This chapter first discusses relevant scholarship on genre studies and the role that genres play in the formation and continuation of discourse communities. Then, by using grounded theory and a metagenre heuristic to investigate the varying formal assignment prompts that

instructors design and incorporate into their courses, I explore how service-learning pedagogy is conceived in similar and contrasting ways within the context of this specific writing program. Specifically, my findings uncover three metagenres that categorize the ways of “knowing” and “doing” in English 121: assignments that establish service-learning ideologies; assignments that are enacted in order to write for and with the community, and assignments that conceptualize genres as being rhetorical forces.

Composition as a Discourse Community

To better understand the complex nature of service-learning as its own discourse community, we must first review how discourse communities have been theorized and conceptualized by the field. Within composition studies, discourse communities function as an important component in understanding how individuals write and interact; they function as “the social and rhetorical environment within which cognitive habits, goals, assumptions, and values are shared by participants who employ common discourse strategies for communicating and practicing these cognitive habits, goals, assumptions, and values” (Bawarshi *Invention*, 5). Anne Beaufort shares a similar view, suggesting that discourse communities occupy a fitting middle ground for understanding how writing functions within a larger social context (“Operationalizing”). Exploring a discourse community thus pushes scholars to look beyond individual acts of writing and instead to examine the relationship between the different communicative practices and their role in forming and maintaining shared communal beliefs and views. This emphasis on identifying the shared ideologies of groups and organizations allows for an awareness of how different communities differ and overlap.

Much like how ecocomposition imagines writing as a system, discourse communities have also been conceptualized to be much more than a collective of individuals. Scholars like

James Porter and Beaufort push for the conceptualization of a discourse community as more comprehensive than simply authors and audiences. Porter in particular emphasizes the function of text and textual production within a discourse community, posing questions such as “to what extent is the writer’s product itself a part of a larger community process?” (“Intertextuality” 42). This question reveals an ecological framing of discourse communities: that the text produced and circulated by individual writers has the ability to influence the shaping of the overall community they are a part of. It should also be noted that discourse communities as a whole are part of a larger ecosystem as well; Porter argues that “discourse communities cannot be isolated any more than the writer can be isolated as an object of study from his social field. . .we need to remember that discourse communities overlap and are flexible and locally constituted” (qtd. in Dobrin and Weisser 587). In addition, they are dynamic in that they are constantly shifting, cross multiple boundaries, and may be ephemeral.

So, what is gained from the standpoint of composition research if we perceive discourse communities as multiple groups oriented around a common project or mutual interest? M. Jimmie Killingsworth also complicates discourse communities, positing that they operate on distinct levels. Individuals, at any time, stand between two kinds of communities: a local discourse community represented by “groups of readers and writers who habitually work together in companies, colleges, departments, neighborhoods, government agencies, or other groups defined by specific demographic features” (121) and a larger global discourse community, or “groups of writers and readers defined exclusively by a commitment to particular kinds of discourse practices and preferences, regardless of where and with whom they work” (121). In the case of English 121, the classroom serves as the local discourse community, where students and instructors work in close physical proximity with one another, progressing at the

same pace and engaging with the same assignments and readings. On the macro level, the English 121 classroom, the EWP program, the Carlson Center, and the community organizations all participate in the forming and circulation of a discourse molded by both community-based and academic practices. As both instructors and students participate in the English 121 curriculum, they will undoubtedly be “involved simultaneously in both local and global discourse communities and will feel challenged to favor one over the other” (114). Much of the tension can be attributed to the varying degrees of interaction and influence between the participants. For example, the required adherence of all English 121 courses to the EWP outcomes constructs a close relationship between the two components. Conversely, while the community partners play a key role in providing a physical site and theoretical lens for students to engage with, they are not required to provide input on the types of coursework that English 121 instructors create and implement. As a result, very few English 121 instructors collaboratively design a course with their community partners.

In the process of entering the service-learning discourse community, instructors may find that while there is consensus on overarching goals and ideologies, the various groups that influence the community may differ and conflict in their approaches and practice towards achieving said goals and expression of ideas. As a result, the service-learning model of learning represents a more accurate depiction of how a discourse community should be conceived: a dynamic system of individuals and organizations, rather than a misconceived singular, united domain. As Amy Devitt, Anis Bawarshi, and Mary Jo Reiff argue, “discourse communities may appear stable to advocates and critics assuming an imaginary consensus and a shared purpose that do not reflect real experience within communities. The concept of discourse communities as stable and utopian. . .conceals the language and the social practices that take place within it and

distracts researchers from examining how its internal workings may be recognized and studied” (541). Although the discourse community enacted around service-learning composition appears complicated and nuanced, it also offers a unique research site into how different groups come together and share a common set of values and beliefs, and more importantly, how they are formed through various discourse practices. Beaufort, in her article “Operationalizing the Concept of Discourse Community”, calls for the examination of multiple dimensions of writing and their relationship to community practices, such as the role of oral communication during acts of composing or the symbolic function of texts in negotiating social relationships. However, one of her suggestions stands out in its application to English 121: by investigating the types of assignments English 121 instructors incorporate into their curriculum, we may gain insight into how differing values placed upon the same genre may clash or vary across a discourse community. Scholars like Bruce Herzberg and Gerard Hauser have suggested that the language used and circulated within a discourse community plays a key role in forming and maintaining communal knowledge. Given the varying participants within the service-learning program at the University of Washington, it may be valuable for both compositions studies and service-learning research to examine what knowledges are highlighted and emphasized specifically through English 121 assignments. In the subsequent section, I discuss how genre theory, when integrated with a “metagenre” heuristic, offers a powerful tool for examining how English 121 instructors utilize various types of genres in their assignments to facilitate students’ ways of “doing” service-learning and the types of knowledge that are most prominent in a service-learning composition program.

Genres and Metagenres in Service-Learning

Many scholars have theorized the role that genres play in how discourse communities are constructed and maintained. From a linguistic standpoint, genres provide “access to the sites of language that make up communities, in all their complexity” (Bawarshi, in Devitt et al. 549), thereby revealing how participants communicate and interact within it. For outsiders who are interested in becoming insiders of a discourse community, access relies heavily on the ability to recognize, use, and respond appropriately to the community’s genre sets. Genre study is important especially in first-year service-learning composition courses like English 121: students are not only entering a brand new academic community, but also concurrently experiencing the discourse occurring at their service site. After observing how students struggle with assignments in introductory college courses, Lucille McCarthy advised instructors to “make explicit the interpretive and linguistic conventions in their communities” (262). Genre knowledge has also been emphasized by Beaufort as one of the domains of knowledge that expert writers draw upon during moments of composing. While she supports the notion that genres may shift and change in their usage and reception across varying discourse communities, she also views them as fairly stable conceptualizations that students need to understand and accept. As she states, “the ethnographer must look for anomalies, outliers, complexity, and resistances to norming. . . . But were writing not patterned and ordered to some degree. . . there would be little possibility for understanding between speaker and listener, or writer and reader” (523).

For Beaufort, teaching genres as set patterns or conventions provides stability and ultimately confidence as writers communicate in new communities. However, Carolyn Miller has argued that “genres change, evolve, and decay” (“Genre” 163), while Aviva Freedman suggests that the constantly-changing technological, political, and material influences on rhetorical contexts cause genres to hold a much more fluid and flexible form: “In the end, we

may never be able to specify or to articulate with assurance the rules for such genres, except possibly historically or in retrospect” (232). Therefore, composition instructors should frame genre’s role within discourse communities as being much more than linguistic categories or markers. Bawarshi points out that researchers challenge the traditional notion of genres as only categories or forms. “This container view of genre, which assumes that genres are only familiar communicative tools individuals use to achieve their communicative goals, overlooks the sociohistorical function of genres” (“Function” 339). Genres thereby also serve as social actions. First established by Miller and amplified by the likes of Charles Bazerman, Amy Devitt, and Bawarshi, scholars see genres as rhetorical actions or responses that individuals perform during recurring situations or events. By utilizing the same or similar genres consistently within particular situations, genres in turn construct rhetorical “moments,” where writers are able to predict the appropriate conventions and reactions. As a result, Bawarshi states, “genres are implicated in the way we experience and enact a great many of our discursive realities, functioning as such on an ideological level as well as on a rhetorical level” (“Function” 339).

This is a very ecocomposition-oriented perception. That is, genres are viewed as a major influence in any writing system, capable of constructing the site as well as the exigence for the writing task at hand. Building on Devitt, Bawarshi states that “to argue that genres help reproduce the very recurring situations to which they respond is to identify them as constitutive rather than merely regulative” (“Function” 340). As an example, he references the distinction between obituaries and eulogies in depicting death in society. In listing the biographical information and general details of the deceased individual, obituaries enact a context in which the individual’s passing is made “recognizable to others within the community” (“Function” 356). However, the textual conventions of the eulogy demonstrate a much more personal tone,

one that praises the deceased's achievements and in turn "celebrating the value of the individual-as-citizen" ("Function" 356). In their textual distinctions, the eulogy and obituary genre affect the way we construct and make meaning of an individual's passing in two very different ways, and in doing so, generates two noticeably different environments in which the subject of death is situated. From this example, we also gain a sense of how genres enable writers and readers to assume situational roles, based on social and cultural conventions. Genres thus are not only used as a response to situations; their use recursively creates the situation itself and "help[s] shape and maintain the ways we rhetorically know and act within these situations" ("Function" 339).

Genres also matter in the ecology of writing through their ability to construct not just the situation, but the author as well. In establishing the situations in which writing is enacted, genres in turn also affect the individuals who are performing the writing task: "communicants assume and enact various genre identities – ways of writing and speaking themselves into existence in particular situations" ("Function" 354). Depending on the situation and objective, the author disposition that individuals take up may vary and shift, leading to prioritizations of different attitudes and writing habits depending on the context at hand.

By examining genres, we gain a clearer understanding of how writing functions on an ecological level. The relationships that emerge demonstrate that genres play a key role in everything from textual form, to establishing setting, to forming writing dispositions. Therefore, as scholars like Devitt, Bawarshi, and Reiff suggest, understanding genre is particularly important to composition scholars and student writers as it grants access into how "'lived textuality' plays a role in the lived experience of a group" (542), such as how discourse communities like a service-learning program is structured and/or operates. Given its dual function as both a textual form and a rhetorical lens for examining the context surrounding a

writing task, multiple scholars have noted the various ways that genres can help us better understand discourse communities. In terms of composition pedagogy, explicit instruction on how genres construct and define communities is important to all participants, but especially outsiders who are attempting to enter into a new one, such as service-learning students and their community organizations. Thomas Deans poses the question: “If, I posited to students, we understand partner nonprofit agencies as discourse communities to which we apprentice ourselves, don’t we need to understand those contexts before stepping into them as writers?” (“Genre Analysis” 8). Yet, this context is not always easily accessible; Freedman, building on work done by Richard Freed and Glenn Broadhead, argues that “many of the cultural and institutional norms that shape and constrain the distinctive genres are invisible, in their normalcy, to the participants themselves” (231). However, she argues, by practicing the identification and writing of a community’s genre sets, students may “come to know and construe reality in specified ways, ways that [are] different from the ways in which they construe reality in other disciplines or in their everyday lives” (228). In other words, learning how to write and perform genre aids the process of not just becoming a member of a discourse community, but also configures new ways that individuals begin relating to *other* communities.

From a service-learning standpoint, enacting public writing and non-academic genres may help close the discursive distance between the academic classroom and the communities that lay beyond the campus, and perhaps “[reducing] their abstract, symbolic status, thereby making discourse communities more visible and accessible to ethnographic inquiry” (Devitt, Bawarshi, and Reiff 552). Examining the genres that appear within service-learning composition also helps researchers better understand service-learning as dynamic systems and how its participants communicate across multiple groups. Bawarshi argues that “as we move from one

sociohistorical environment to the next, we shift genre boundaries. . . . The ways we use language to perform certain social actions and identities and to enact certain social relations and identities change as we adjust from one genre-constituted environment to the next” (*Invention* 75).

However, as Porter and Beaufort suggested earlier, discourse communities are not perfect spheres distinct from one another, but an overlapping web of groups, individuals, and texts that are constantly shifting in their relationship to one another. Based on this dynamic conception, genres serve as a powerful tool for helping track how participant groups within a service-learning system not only utilize genre internally, but it may also provide insight into how communities relate and connect to others. As scholars have noted, there is often conflict when genres are enacted across boundaries. Devitt notes that “because genres represent their communities, they effect and make consequential the communities’ interests. But it is when genres encompass participants beyond a narrow community that the effects of those interest become most troublesome” (in Devitt et al. 543).

When composition is integrated with service-learning, genres serve as the main vehicle that instructors use to help students bridge their academic knowledge and experiences across academic and non-academic contexts. However, instructors may also use genres to mold and frame their students’ definitions of what service-learning is and the types of knowledge produced within the course. As David Jolliffe suggests, when instructors require students to produce writing in a particular genre, they are establishing “the scope and range of rhetorical activity they want the students to engage in and type of discourse community in which they want students to gain experience as writers” (96). Therefore, understanding the most popular genres that students are asked to compose in a service-learning classroom may shed light on how different instructors come to personally define service-learning pedagogy and “how students learn to ‘behave’ as

functioning, intellectual adults in the discourse communities they encounter in college and beyond it” (96). Genre scholars have also called for further study into how genres construct the public and how they function in the larger public domain. Bazerman calls for more investigation on how individuals write and compose their way into becoming engaged citizens (“Citizenship”), while Reiff and Bawarshi argue that “we can gain insight into public cultures by examining the rhetorical interactions that converge around public issues and that construct publics – that is by examining discursive artifacts such as public genres for the role they play in the performance of publics” (7). In the service-learning classroom, genres hold distinct value for their role in not only forming how students come to perceive the ideologies of the academic institution, but the classroom’s unique place on the border of the university and local publics. This means that genres also play a part in how students bring their service experiences back into the classroom, as well as in constructing a student-citizen identity.

Jolliffe argues that genres have the power to “shape and constrain knowledge work” (104). Thus, to better understand any of the types of knowledge that are cultivated and formed within a service-learning composition program – a discourse community that overlaps and stretches across both the academy and the local public – examining the genres of the assignments that are constructed and circulated within the classroom may be the key. In addition, assignments encapsulate much more than just what the instructor wants students to do in that immediate writing situation; they also provide a window into the overall disciplinary context – as a response to lectures, course texts, and even to the “implicit institutional values of a university where writing is elicited as part of a social contract committed to by students, instructors, the institution itself, and society at large” (Freedman 229). In the context of English 121 and the service-learning program at the University of Washington, the assignments designed and implemented in

service-learning composition courses serve as discursive artifacts of the types of knowledge that instructors perceive to be the most valuable for effective communication in both the local discourse community of the service-learning classroom and the global discourse community of the overall university and the surrounding communities. However, in the case of English 121, the uniqueness of its context informs the types of assignments that are created. The program itself isn't entirely confined to the academic, nor is it entirely embedded in the public. As a result, English 121 instructors often design assignments that call upon both academic and public discourses, sometimes amalgamating them together in order to achieve the wide range of objectives and goals placed upon the curriculum.

These hybrid genres, while hard to characterize, reveal an important aspect of teaching service-learning composition: the rhetorical situation of the writing task may be prioritized over the accuracy of replicating genre form. That is, instructors, when designing assignments, are more oriented towards thinking about the goal or objective they wish to achieve, rather than teaching the formal, textual conventions of the genres they are prescribing to their students. In addition to utilizing a wide range of both formal and hybrid genres, the multiple contexts and wide range of influences that construct each service-learning classroom means that simply identifying the types of assignments that are most frequently used in a service-learning environment offers little analytical insight into how instructors accomplish different writing goals. For example, different instructors may perceive the function of research papers differently within their course; some may be framed to help students understand academic discourse, while others may value it for getting students more familiar with the history of their community organization or neighborhood. While both instructors may teach the same textual features of the research paper genre to their students, they are performing dissimilar roles within each respective

instructors' curriculum and thereby constructing different rhetorical situations. If assignments are perceived differently and translated differently between different courses, then understanding the ways of knowing, doing, and writing that circulate and make up the service-learning discourse community may require a different heuristic other than categorizing service-learning assignment by their formal textual form. As Jolliffe states,

If faculty. . .hope their students will comprehend the course content, apply the course material and principles in valuable service projects. . .then faculty teaching [service-learning] courses might think in more sophisticated, more pedagogically focused ways about the genres they ask students to work in as they write about their service experiences and how those genres embody different kinds of learning. (96)

We may get a clearer sense of how English 121 instructors frame and define service-learning pedagogy in their classes by examining the overarching objective that they want students to achieve through their writing assignments. Therefore, it would be more effective to categorize the assignments using "metagenres," a system of organizing genres that "directs our attention to broader patterns of language as social action, similar *kinds* of typified responses to related recurrent situations" (Carter "Ways", 393). For example, in his study of various university departments at his home institution and their program outcomes, Michael Carter points to how presentations, newsletters, and lay summaries, while distinct in their composing process as well as their textual features, are all under the same metagenre umbrella for the zoology department, as they "take complex information related to zoology, understand it, and synthesize for non-experts who need to understand and act on the information" ("Ways" 412). Similarly, Christopher Basgier, in his examination of an art history professor and her curriculum, discusses how the professor aimed to find better ways of connecting disparate reading and

writing assignments by “emphasizing their common analytical practices and habits of mind” (“Extra-Disciplinary”). By connecting seemingly different kinds of genres to similar kinds of situations, metagenres provide “heuristic value for responding to situations we construe as similar and delimiting the range of responses we may have. . . . [M]etagenres is one way genres can become typified, as well as one way writers can recognize a situation as recurring” (“Extra-Disciplinary”).

For WAC-based courses like service-learning composition, metagenres offer an extremely fruitful heuristic for understanding the various functions that writing assignments may play. As Basgier suggests, metagenres can be extended beyond “disciplinary ways of knowing, doing, and writing to *any* set of linked activity systems, communities, or cultural context in which multiple genres perform similar actions” (“Extra-Disciplinary”). In addition, making metagenres explicit in the classroom serves as a powerful pedagogical tool for helping students see the connection between seemingly different types of genres. Basgier cites a study conducted by Bonnie Devet, in which students were asked to repurpose a business sales letter about a short story into literary analysis. Then, using a reflective writing section, students were able to see how both genres shared the same metagenre through “the use of analytical thinking, the need for persuasion, and the importance of stylistic choices” (qtd. in Basgier), despite difference in audience and writing conventions. For service-learning writing instructors like those teaching English 121, a framing of how certain disciplinary and extra-disciplinary writing assignments share common ways of creating and molding knowledge may help them negotiate the different and possibly conflicting objectives placed onto their curriculum. In the following section, I map out my approach to coding and analyzing English 121 instructors’ writing assignment prompts and the main metagenres that emerged in my findings.

Coding for Metagenres in English 121

Using data gathered from current and past English 121 instructors, this chapter will investigate the major metagenres found within the English 121 curriculum, and what they reveal about the types of knowledges and ways of knowing that service-learning instructors appear to value. More specifically, what are the formal and hybridized genres of the assignments that typify these metagenres? My approach focused primarily on examining the assignment prompts' language, as well as the way past instructors discussed their assignments in the end-of-term survey. First, I collected 139 assignments prompts from the past and current instructors and passed them through three levels of coding. The first level identified the assignment's purpose, as signaled by key words in the description that explained the writing task at hand. For example, assignment prompts in which students were asked to gather either primary or secondary data were tagged with "research". If students were asked to perform other tasks, such as reflection or synthesize various sources, the appropriate tags would be added as well. Given the multiple purposes that some ENG 121 assignments appeared to pursue, coding by descriptive keywords rather than simply the assignment's title was integral in making sure no assignment was mislabeled as the wrong genre. The second level of codes identified the text's audience, by examining who the instructor asked students to direct their writing towards. This level of coding provided me with more insight into the genre that the student was asked to compose, as well as the types of discourse that student were using in the service-learning classroom. In the third level of coding, I looked at each assignment prompt to see whether or not the instructor required students to incorporate some data or experience from their service site; this was done specifically to understand which types of assignments were utilized by instructors in order to bring the community into the classroom. These three levels of coding helped me generate a networked

understanding of how purpose, audience, and discourse community knowledge were being depicted in the various assignment types that service-learning instructors were using to structure their courses. Second, I examined how instructors reflected upon their assignments in the end-of-term survey, utilizing a grounded theory approach. As Adele Clarke notes, researchers using grounded theory first open code the data, looking for emerging patterns or phenomena. Then, “the analyst determines whether codes generated through one data course also appear elsewhere and elaborates on their properties” (557). Specifically, I looked at patterns in instructors’ rationale and attitudes in their responses to survey questions that asked about assignment design and facilitation. These survey reflections served as an important artifact in understanding the metagenres that govern English 121. By capturing the instructors’ thinking process behind assignment conceptions, as well as mapping out their (in)effectiveness within a service-learning environment, the reflections functioned as an ethnographic tool, or what Reiff would call a documentation of “the lived experience or behavior of a culture. . .and the way in which this behavior manifests itself rhetorically” (in Devitt et al. 554). By triangulating the information that emerged from the instructors’ reflection with the data gathered through my three levels of coding, I sought to have the metagenres emerge organically from the data rather than putting a preconceived heuristic in place.

Findings

Given that the EWP outcomes served as an anchor in all English 121 classes, my findings will not include the metagenre of academic discourse preparation. That is, because students in their final portfolios must be able use their writing as evidence to demonstrate they have understood and practiced the four EWP outcomes, instructors design assignments with first-year writing goals already in mind. However, coding assignment prompts and reading instructors’

reflections did reveal three metagenres that categorize the ways of knowing, doing, and writing that are unique to the service-learning environment. The first metagenre is made up of genres that are enacted with the purpose of helping students understand the ideologies that govern and structure the service-learning community. The second is composed of genres that are enacted with the purpose of helping students write *for* or *with* local community partners. The third metagenre consists of assignments that help instructors implement a “write-to-learn” pedagogical approach, specifically in teaching students about the relationship between genres. It should be noted that I am not suggesting these are the only metagenres that structure *all* service-learning composition programs. However, based on data analysis and the patterns that emerged, I believe these are the most common metagenres within the English 121 curriculum, as well as the most frequently-created genres.

Metagenre 1: Establishing the Ideologies that Govern Service-Learning

Four assignment types that are often created in the English 121 curriculum are the personal essay, the synthesis essay, the research paper, and the rhetorical analysis assignment. In the context of the four EWP outcomes, these vary in terms of which components of the outcomes they demonstrate. The personal essay is an assignment that English 121 instructors often use at the beginning of the quarter where students are asked to reflect on their previous experiences with service-learning, or discuss how their prior service-learning experiences compare with their current one. Through this assignment, students have the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to compose an argument about their experiences (demonstrating EWP outcome 3) and to utilize past experiences as evidence (demonstrating EWP outcome 2). Similarly, synthesis essays prompt students to put authors and their ideas in conversation with one another. Often, instructors require students to incorporate their own views into the conversation as well. Again,

this provides students with an opportunity to practice and demonstrate EWP outcome 2, or their ability to intertextualize texts together and use multiple pieces of evidence within a single assignment. Third, research papers prove to be one of the more versatile genres used by English 121 instructors to help students practice academic discourse (EWP outcome 2), the analysis of gathered data and evidence (EWP outcome 3), and the formulation of complex arguments (EWP outcome 3). Finally, rhetorical analysis assignments, which typically vary from instructor to instructor in terms of the texts being examined, provide students with the opportunity to explore the strategies that authors employ while composing in different writing contexts (EWP outcome 1).

Although they target different areas of the EWP outcomes, these genres within a service-learning context all fall under the metagenre of assignments that establish community ideologies and values. For many English 121 instructors, the writing assignments serve as scaffolds that help ease students into the service-learning experience. Prior to engaging with the community, students must first gain an understanding of the environment in which they are working, as well as recognize their service as distinct from volunteer work. Thus, one particular detail that emerges from the data is that service-learning instructors often emphasize the necessity for their students to develop a sense of critical awareness of social issues, as well as their own roles within it. Stan, an instructor who taught English 121 in the 2011-12 academic year, stated that “[English 121 is] structured around throwing students into unfamiliar frames of analysis – e.g. cultural studies, Foucault, Critical Race Theory, discourse analysis, rhetorical theory.” While students participating in English 121 often have experience volunteering and performing service in prior educational settings, the four types of writing that make up this particular metagenre may

help students see “the larger picture” – the ideologies at work in the various discourse communities they are engaging with throughout their service-learning experience.

In their personal essay, students are asked to reflect on their prior volunteer and service experiences and explain how they have contributed to their current relationship with service-learning. One instructor, Aislinn, incorporated guided questions into the assignment prompt itself, in order to help facilitate a critical lens:

To begin to analyze your motivations for engaging in community service, you should consider what influenced your feelings about serving. For example, do you feel responsible for those in need or guilty about your advantages? Have you been in the position of being in need yourself? What were you taught about community service, and how do you think this has shaped your attitudes towards it?

Although student experience is held at the center of the composing process in this assignment, they are still asked to put their own contributions into a larger social context. Aislinn was attempting to guide students into seeing their past work not as anecdotes, but rather evidence that can be used to make a larger claim regarding their assumed beliefs and views towards community engagement. The personal essay genre also simultaneously prepares students for academic inquiry; in her reflection, she stated that “[students] analyzing their own experience and motives for taking [English] 121 from the get-go sets up the continued treatment of service-learning as a text for analysis, and specifically one type of evidence students should draw on to make claims.” The experience-as-evidence component of the personal essay genre is important, as students are positioned to see themselves not only as individuals reporting on past events, but as someone whose values and beliefs are already part of a larger conversation.

Another type of assignment that asks students to insert themselves into a larger context are synthesis essays, which ask students to merge their personal experiences with the rest of the service-learning community. However, unlike personal essays, students are not only asked to make meaning out of their own experiences, but to also draw connections to course readings and the experiences of others, such as authors, researchers, and activists. In her course built around the theme of literacy education, Lisa designed a synthesis assignment that required students to specifically examine the arguments regarding family, environment, class, and literacy in Deborah Brandt's "Sponsors of Literacy" and Annette Lareau's *Unequal Childhoods*, then explain their personal stance on the topic. In doing so, a learning environment is created in which students perceive the work they are doing in the classroom as part of a larger ecosystem that holds stakes in not just an academic setting, but non-academic communities as well. Synthesis essays may also influence how students begin to recognize their own role and responsibilities within the service-learning ecology. In asking students to embed their incomes and experiences into the curriculum, they are pushed to conceptualize their definition of what it means to be a "student".

One instructor, Sally, explicitly requested students to embody an expert disposition after spending some time at their community organization. In an assignment she titled a "bibliographic essay", she asked students to make a claim regarding a particular issue that affected the community organization they were serving. Along with using secondary sources as support, Sally pushed students to articulate why the issue "matters to an 'outsider'—an academic audience who may not be familiar with your topic. To this end, use evidence from your personal experience in service-learning to convince us of the stakes of your issue." In doing so, students were encouraged to see their service-learning experiences as a type of expertise within the English 121 classroom - something that is capable of supporting an academic argument. This

cognitive shift from learner to expert is an integral way of “knowing” within the service-learning curriculum, and is typified not only through the synthesis essay genre, but as a later section will reveal, other genres as well.

Academic research-oriented assignments such as research papers and annotated bibliographies are also used to help develop a critical understanding of service. Often, these genres are utilized for a dual purpose: they allow instructors to highlight and emphasize academic writing strategies such as summary, quotation, synthesis, and gathering data; but in the context of a service-learning classroom, they also encourage students to examine the relationship between the work of the local community organizations and the larger, global issues that affect and influence said organizations. This duality echoes Christopher Thaiss and Terry Meyers Zawacki’s view when they argue that in WAC and WID courses, “it is important for students to connect what they are learning in school with either their outside experiences and/or ideas in the popular media and to write about these connections in a variety of forms” (qtd. in Basgier). In her course reflection, English 121 instructor Alisha specifically commented on the function of inquiry in helping students expand their thinking beyond the service-learning classroom: “Some students have really impressed me by expanding [the course theme] to a global focus during the research stage of the process, and we place community service organizations and grass roots social action campaigns within this framework to interrogate the benefits and drawbacks of various approaches to creating socio-economic justice.” Although instructors often use research-based assignments specifically to help students develop a critical understanding of the service work they are participating in, their decision to use these genres can also be inadvertently influenced by the community partners and the types of work they are doing in the community. For example, one instructor, Charlotte, noted how the environmental justice theme she picked for

her English 121 course did not lend itself to partnerships with community organization where students were given opportunities to write: “Much of the service work my students were doing was manual labor – a far stretch to link into writing. I designed the first sequence [of my curriculum] to give my students a way to look at the broader issues their work was engaged in.” Students composed a bibliographic essay⁸ in which they were asked to gather three to five sources on an environmental issue of their choice and examine their arguments in relation to one another. In her assignment prompt, Charlotte explicitly told students that they “should begin to get a sense of ‘the field’ – in other words, the research that has already been done on your topic and where your sources stand in relation to one another”. Thus, research-oriented genres give students the opportunity to investigate and then write about the communities they are engaging with, even if they do not have the opportunity to do so through their direct service.

While academic research genres in English 121 courses are called upon to establish an understanding of macro-level issues, rhetorical analysis assignments offer students the opportunity to better understand their more immediate local context. Often, service-learning instructors will design assignments that prompt students to rhetorically analyze the genres and artifacts that structure their community partner. Through this assignment type, English 121 students become oriented toward an “observer” disposition. As various scholars have noted, individuals cannot fully participate within a community until they have gained an understanding of the types of knowledges that enact it (Beaufort “Operationalizing”). Thus, before English 121 students can effectively participate alongside their community organization, instructors often

⁸ It is important to note how Charlotte and Sally both label their assignment as a “bibliographic essay”, yet highlight the genre’s conventions differently. Charlotte’s prompt specifically frames students as observers, noting that they are not making their own arguments of “conjecture, definition, quality, or policy”, but rather focusing on the kinds of arguments that are “pertinent to [their] field of service learning”. Meanwhile, Sally prompts students to insert their own personal experiences into the writing in order to articulate the stakes of the issue. This comparison demonstrates how similar genres can be used for different purposes, thereby fueling my argument that service-learning pedagogy is better understood through its metagenres rather than just its genres.

assign a rhetorical analysis assignment that allows them to gain an understanding of the context that surrounds and influences the organization. Specifically, English 121 instructors call upon genre analysis as a way of guiding students into directly engaging with their community organization on a material level. In total, 6 out of the 17 instructor participants developed a genre analysis assignment that asked students to find and examine a text from their service-learning organization. In investigating their assignment prompts, instructors framed the range of the text differently; one instructor named Stephanie specifically asked for a rhetorical analysis of the service-learning organizations' publicity material: physical texts like brochures and signage or digital text like websites and social media accounts. Stephanie wanted students to gain an understanding of the organization's public identity, explicitly asking for particular attention to be paid to "how they construct both the population they serve, and the population those materials are intended to reach." However, other instructors like Stan nuanced their definition of what a genre could be; in his prompt, for example, Stan suggested the analysis of "the design of a room, or even a memorable interaction (client-provider, your orientation, etc.)." In this instance, Stan promoted an ecological conceptualization of genre, maneuvering students to not only view genres as categories of textual form, but also as having the ability to shape and construct the context in which individuals engage one another.

For many English 121 instructors however, teaching service-learning through personal essays, synthesis, academic research, and rhetorical analysis is not sufficient. To fully embed oneself in the ecology of service-learning, students must also be given the opportunity to compose as insiders of the communities in which they serve. By assigning public-engaging genres and writing tasks, students are given the opportunity to write not only *about* the community they are entering, but *for* and *with* the community.

Metagenre 2: Writing for/with the Community

The other metagenre that governs English 121 courses is composed of multimodal and public-facing genres and assignments that encourage community-based writing. David Russell suggests that WAC and WID instructors need to push students into writing genres that “bring students into contact with the uses of facts and concepts in their (students’ and professors’ and professionals’) worlds” (qtd. in Jolliffe 103). Other instructors like Deans emphasize the necessity of non-academic genres in authentic civic engagement. Specifically, he suggests that the genres students use or are assigned

signal how [students] really are – as writers – with civic communities. . .if students in a service-learning course are indeed involved as writers in the activity systems of their community partners, those students, rather than sticking only to academic genres such as the essay and journal, should be appropriating the tools/genres that their community partners typically use. (“Genre Analysis” 10)

Thus, for various English 121 instructors, the writing that comes out of service-learning composition contains a materialistic element. That is, certain genres construct the writing that emerges from the service-learning classroom as a generative practice, capable of creating some type of actual effect in the communities that the students and their organizations are a part of. Given that many of the assignments asks students to write towards a non-academic audience, it is logical that instructors conceptualize the composing process across a variety of modes. Derek Owens suggests that as compositionists, writing instructors should aim to teach not just textual production, but rather the art of composing: “combining arranging, mixing, and assembling: constructing with words or images or sounds (or all three) in visual or physical space” (2). Many instructors took advantage of the inclusion of the public as an audience within their curriculum

and created various types of multimodal assignments, including public online blogs, grant proposals, and workplace memos. When students create texts that are both multimodal as well as community-engaging, they are working towards EWP outcome 1, which asks students to “demonstrate their ability to write for different audiences and contexts, both within and outside the university classroom.”

Another characteristic of the genres that typify this metagenre is the framing of assignments as having “real” exigence and “real” consequences. As Marilyn Cooper notes, “by focusing our attention on the real social context of writing, it enables us to see that writers not only analyze or invent audiences, they, more significantly, communicate with and know their audiences” (371). Similarly, Freedman suggests that the most important factor of the composing process is having intention - “an occasion and a need to mean: some kind of rhetorical exigence which will elicit performance” (238). For many service-learning instructors, like Sally who I mentioned earlier, the ability to draw on real-world social issues as reasons for composing also helps teaching towards EWP outcome 3, which asks students to articulate the stakes – or why their argument “matters.” Another instructor, Caroline, echoed in her reflection that she believed the non-academic genres validated for students the applicability of the department writing objectives: “I found that students could relate the outcomes to their assignments more, and since their assignments related to their [community partners] and to the “real world”, they saw the [EWP] outcomes as far more useful.” The concretization of exigence also allowed other instructors to emphasize how writing functions as an ecology by drawing students’ attentions towards the relationship between audience and text; Melissa noted that “because of their increased understanding of why their coursework matters, we have been able to talk more in-depth about articulating the stakes for different audiences. That is, the students comprehensively

learn to differentiate what the stakes look like for an academic audience, for a popular audience, for a client group, and for themselves.” These community-based and often multimodal assignments thereby fall under the metagenre of assignments for writing for/with the community, allowing students to fully embed themselves in the ecology of service-learning by giving them the opportunity to compose as insiders.

One popular assignment within this metagenre is the artifact creation project based on the needs of the community partner. As Kena Leon and Thomas Sura point out, these assignments are popular in many service-learning curricula, in which students “produce something for the community partner that will exist in external circulation: a public document that is rhetorically crafted for an audience apart from the community partner” (62). It should be noted, however, that many instructors use fieldwork and primary research assignments as antecedent genres to the organization artifact assignment. That is, to help students better understand the issues surrounding their community organization, numerous instructors first create an assignment in which students are asked to record observational notes during their time at their service site or to interview staff members. These assignments are crucial in ensuring that the subsequent artifact is relevant to the community partner’s needs. One instructor, Jamie, dedicated the entire second half of her course to the research and production of a multimodal artifact, which she outlined in her course syllabus in the following manner:

Sequence 1 is all about *writing about* your community partner. [Sequence 2] is all about *writing with* and *writing for*. . . . Here are the options for what you can do:

- 1) Create a proposal that details a plan for a new multimedia artifact or gives suggestions for changes for an existing multimedia artifact
- 2) Compose a multimedia text either for or with the community partner

3) Take action on UW's campus on behalf of your organization (*only* done with the permission of the organization)" (emphasis original)

Other instructors, like Lisa, also required an additional argument-based writing component attached to the artifact. Not only did she ask students to construct an artifact, but in the same assignment, they also had to "write a 3-4 page double-spaced letter to the director of your organization explaining why this artifact should be put to use. Base your claims in findings from both your field research and scholarly work you have read about literacy learning." Specifically, Lisa asked students to draw on findings from their field research as evidence to support their argument of why the organization should use the artifact and why it was a useful resource. The letter is another genre that some English 121 instructors use as a stand-alone assignment for community-based writing. In this particular activity, the students operate much more as advocates, using their rhetorical awareness to craft a letter that calls for some type of action directed towards a particular audience, ranging from newspaper editors, to politicians, to a funding organization.

However, findings reveal one glaring detail: while many assignments call for students to write *for* or *about* the community, very few require students to write *with* the community. In addition, for many of the artifact-creation assignments, the public audience is held in an imagined state; while instructors encourage students to share their work with their community partner, it is unclear how many actually do, and how many are put into actual circulation. Instead, the English 121 instructor often ends up being the primary (and only) audience. While Jamie suggested the option to her students, only one instructor specifically required students to work alongside their community partner. Alisha, one of the previously-mentioned instructors, designed a final project in which students, working as groups, were asked to create an artifact for

the service organization. Unlike other artifact-creation assignments, Alisha emphasized the inter-institutional collaborative element:

The approach and modes of composition you use for this project are entirely up to you, but speak to your service learning organization as soon as possible to see if there are ongoing or upcoming charities, projects, or social action initiatives you might be able to provide additional support for through this assignment. Every group's project will vary *depending on the willingness or ability of your service-learning organization to let you work with them on preexisting or upcoming charities, projects, or social action initiatives.* (emphasis added)

In her survey reflection, Alisha discussed specifically seeking out community partners that were willing to collaborate with students on pre-existing projects: “many have ongoing donation drives that work quite nicely, but others have requested the students do research on a project model the organization is considering adopting as part of their programming.” The inclusion of the community organization poses a potential logistical challenge to both instructors as well as staff, but rhetorically, this nuance grants a great amount of agency and power to the community partner within the academic classroom. By inviting community partners' input in the construction of the artifact, the local community thus plays a significant role in the meaning-making act, a responsibility once left solely to the students. In addition, this collaborative element also places the community's needs on more of an equal footing with EWP outcomes; students are not only writing towards the designated writing goals of the department, but must also uphold the needs and objectives of the service-learning organization. For many instructors, assignments in which students design artifacts are extremely valuable in developing students'

writing disposition; Jamie noted that it “allows them to be authors. . . . I really think their works shows that they expanded their views on literacy, writing, and their authority in creating texts.”

Despite the benefits of creating material for community partners, scholars have critiqued the authenticity and legitimacy of the produced artifacts. Leon and Sura use the term “elevation of deliverables” to describe the increasing pressure on service-learning programs to provide their community partners with some type of text or culminating project that represent the work students have engaged with all quarter or semester long. These deliverables “are the tangible embodiments of *intervention*. They are proof that we were here and that we did something” (63, original emphasis). Thus, there is a form of symbolic capital that comes with students producing an artifact. However, Leon and Sura argue that the forcing of material onto community organizations when they do not fit the needs of the community is counterproductive. “First, it emphasizes product over equally valued curriculum components like inquiry. Second, it severely limits the invention of possible ways students and teachers might engage productively with community partners” (62). Instead, Leon and Sura suggest that instructors ought to consider reconceptualizing the audiences that students are asked to write towards. Rather than directing their attention to a cloudy conceptualization of an external public audience, instructors and students should turn their attention towards the community partner themselves. As Leon and Sura frame it, “Instead of students working to make their intervention visible to the community partner’s audiences, what if students worked all semester to make visible the infrastructure that supports the community partner’s rhetorical work?” (64). In examining the genres that English 121 instructors utilize within this metagenre of community-based writing, one particular type of assignment — the group presentation — prioritizes the analysis and representation of a service-learning organization over the construction of a material artifact. For instructors, the presentation

genre functions on multiple levels of community engagement. Often, the groups are organized by students who are all serving at the same community partner.

The collaborative component of this genre is important in perpetuating certain ideologies of the service-learning community. Jamie, for example, made it clear to her students in her presentation assignment prompt that “social change usually happens when a group of people works together to create change, and as such, you will work in groups to practice this collaboration that you will likely partake in whenever trying to instigate change.” Thus, by having students work together to conduct fieldwork and gather information relevant to the community organization, instructors attempt to move students away from an “I can individually change the world” mantra. In terms of textual production, students are prompted to investigate the rhetorical situation in which their community organization is embedded, addressing the organization's purpose, the populations it serves, and the social issues that it attempts to tackle. Then, students disperse that information in the form of a multimodal presentation to the rest of their English 121 classmates. As supporting evidence, students are encouraged to interview staff members, as well as examine the discursive resources that are already circulating within the service-learning organization, such as social media accounts, flyers, and other material artifacts. Often, there are multiple audiences that each student must consider when completing the assignment. Some instructors, such as Caroline, also required students to write a reflection directed towards the instructor that outlined each group member’s individual roles within the inquiry process. Others like Alisha required students to create and pose two critical questions that would facilitate discussions on the relationship between their community organization and the broader course theme. The inclusion of both the instructor and peers into the audience, as well as varying writing tasks, thus forces students to conceptualize the presentation genre as a

multifaceted, ecological process, negotiating between various rhetorical strategies in order to complete the assignment. In contrast to some public-facing artifacts that never reach an actual audience, students are engaging with fellow classmates, who are service-learning participants themselves, a discourse community that they already have some familiarity engaging with. As a result, the involvement of an actual, recognizable audience helps students gain a clearer sense of the exigence for composing. This amalgamation of different audiences into a single writing task is a popular approach to creating assignments in the English 121 program. Specifically, these “hybrid” genres typify a third metagenre, which promotes a “writing to learn” approach to understanding the genre systems that make up service-learning pedagogy.

Metagenre 3: Assignments that Frame Genre as Rhetorical

Although many of the assignments in English 121 can be characterized as non-academic genres, they are still supplemented with components that anchor them to the EWP outcomes. In his study of a 200-level general education course title “Museum Appreciation,” Basgier noted that while the professor designed assignments that required students to write like museum curators or produce press releases, many also contained features that asked students to articulate the visual memory of a particular art piece or to create a fictional dialogue between museum artifacts. Specifically, the professor added these elements so students would have the opportunity to foster a personal level of engagement with the course material. These assignments were what Basgier deemed as “extra-disciplinary,” meaning that “they were genres that professionals in museums studies are not likely to produce as part of their work” (“Extra-disciplinary”). A similar pattern emerged in the assignments that instructors were creating for English 121 in the form of what I call “genre-engaging” assignments. These assignments prompt students to compose a wide variety of different genres, but they also require an analysis of the students’ design/writing

choices through a reflective component. A major reason for the reflective component can be attributed to making sure students have the opportunity to practice EWP outcome 1, which states that student writing should accurately represent a wide range of genres, and employ the style, tone, and conventions appropriate to the particular writing situation. In addition, EWP outcome 1 calls for writers to be able to articulate his or her writing choices. When teaching genre, this level of analysis and approach is important to an authentic reading and comprehension of how the genre is used, raising students' awareness of the "relevant features at an unconscious level" (Freedman 244). Similarly, reflecting upon one's writing choices when composing within a new genre can also help students understand "how and why to shape and reshape their writing for different audiences, purposes, forms, and contexts" ("Extra-disciplinary"). However, these assignments serve another purpose in the service-learning composition curriculum. As a metagenre, they help students come to know genres as more than just textual categories that they encounter during their service-learning experience, but rather rhetorical actions that affect and are affected by the environment in which it is enacted.

In the context of service-learning pedagogy, these reflective supplements in the metagenre characterize a writing-to-learn approach; in genre reconceptualization assignments, students are not only being exposed to new genres, but they are learning *about* genres (Chapman 473), exploring the rhetorical situation that surrounds a particular style of writing. Many instructors like Caroline prompt students to focus on articulating the rationale behind their writing choices. In one of her assignments, students were asked to transform a text currently used at their community organization and re-create it into another genre — a website page, a flyer, a graphic, a letter, etc. — for a section of the organization's audience. Afterwards, students had to compose a "Writer's Memo" that explained and assessed their writing process:

- Why did you make the choices you made (genre, diction, layout)?
- How were your choices specific to your audience?
- How did you take on the writer-persona of your service project?

Although reflective writing is effective in helping students learn about the textual features of a genre in this assignment, students ultimately are doing their analysis in a vacuum, examining the relationship between two genres that may never interact outside of the artificial context of the assignment itself. The scope of influence is also limited to only the audience and the author.

One instructor in particular, however, challenged students to understand how genres function within a larger ecology. In her English 121 curriculum, Jessica designed a “research genre folio,” an assignment that scaffolded up to a group artifact design project. In the research genre folio, the students collaboratively had to create and assemble a system of research-oriented documents: an annotated bibliography, a draft of interview questions for the community partner, a release form, and a group contract that outlined the roles and responsibility of each member. While the research genre folio operated as an effective assignment in preparing Jessica’s students for successful community engagement, the component that helped students best rationalize and understand the ecological aspect of their writing was the reflective “heads up statement,” which encouraged students to examine not just the conventions of the research-oriented genres in and of themselves, but their purposes within the overall rhetorical situation. In her prompt, Jessica reminded students that conventions “are not exactly rules, but things that people have learned to expect and produce in certain situation.” From there, she posed the following questions:

- How have you used, adapted, or recreated conventions of these research genres?
- How do these genres work together (or not) to accomplish your purposes in this writing situation?

- Who do the genres interact with and in what different ways?

These questions move students from discussing the genres' textual patterns in the research folio, to thinking about how the genres help mold the situation in which students are composing and conducting research within. By asking students about potential variations to the genres, they are driven to consider not only their own agency in making particular writing choices, but how research within service-learning may be distinct from research in other settings.

As this chapter demonstrated, constructing a service-learning program using a metagenre heuristic may help instructors draw connections and similarities between seemingly disconnected assignments. Basgier suggests that instructors teaching WAC-oriented courses “can use metagenre’s coordinating characteristics to make explicit otherwise tacit knowledge about individual genres’ salient rhetorical features and the larger inter-generic connections across the classroom genre system” (“Extra-disciplinary”). In addition, while each of the three metagenres discussed in this chapter are distinct in their role within the English 121 program, they all contain some facet of reflection. In the context of service-learning composition pedagogy, reflection holds significant weight in helping students understand the work they are doing alongside their community partners. However, as we will examine closer in the following chapter, reflection can also act as an administrative tool, working “behind the scenes” to help instructors and faculty better mold the overarching service-learning program.

Chapter 4: The Function of Reflection within the Service-Learning Ecology

The significance of reflective writing in the composition classroom has been well researched and documented. Yet, it is a highly complex pedagogical tool. Reflection has been singled out for its ability to help students by providing space for documenting and describing their learning (see McClam et al., Molee et al.). It has also been championed for its ability to problem solve and generate new knowledge. Robert Bringle and Julie Hatcher suggest that effective reflection allows students to “discover the value of dialogue, embrace the importance of perplexity in the learning process, and develop the ability to make meaning of personal experience” (184). Facilitating reflection, however, is no simple feat, especially for service-learning composition instructors; the highly dynamic nature of service-learning pedagogy suggests that reflection in this unique environment warrants continuous examination, as nuances on its implementation and effectiveness will constantly emerge. Sarah Ash, Patti Clayton, and Maxine Atkinson suggests that despite the recognition of its significance, “quality reflection is perhaps the most challenging component of service-learning, stemming in part from the difficulty of developing and implementing both effective structures to guide it and meaningful strategies to evaluate and deepen its associated learning outcomes” (50). Similarly, scholars like Rona Karasik point out that instructors face the constant challenge of determining which methods and activities work best in helping students achieve a deep and critical understanding of their of service-learning experiences. She notes that “to date, no one reflective form appears to be superior in the literature. Rather, each approach has its benefits and drawbacks. It would make sense, therefore, that faculty consider selecting a reflection format that is compatible with their teaching approach” (80).

An in-depth examination of reflective writing may also reveal its role in creating and establishing service-learning composition as an ecology and not just as a type of course. Scholars like David Cooper suggest that reflective thinking has become a major subject within writing pedagogy due to its hybrid disposition as both a process and a product; it is “not only an organic component in the learning cycle, it is simultaneously the very ground from which knowledge and belief spring” (52). Thus, reflection matters not only in the formation of produced text, but also because it can behave as a metaphorical space where students are given the opportunity to solve problems, articulate views, and work across difference. Thus, my work in this chapter contributes to current on-going conversations about reflective practices in service-learning composition by examining the most popular modes of reflection specific to the English 121 program. How are they being enacted and facilitated, and what types of responses do they prompt?

In the following sections, I discuss the research surrounding reflection in the writing classroom, as well as its influence on service-learning composition. In doing so, I hope to outline some of its major discursive features and its implications on service-learning pedagogy for not only students, but also instructors. Second, this chapter will investigate some of the major characteristics of reflection when it is employed in English 121. Specifically, findings reveal that 1) reflection, in order to help students integrate their service experiences with classroom experiences, requires careful prompting and scaffolding; 2) reflection can be conducted collaboratively, in order to better help identify the values of the service-learning discourse community; and 3) that reflective writing plays an integral part in integrating emotions and personal writing into the academic classroom.

A Brief Overview of Reflection in Composition Studies

Much of the theory that grounds the reflective practices utilized in the college writing classroom stems from the work of theorist Donald Schön. Although his seminal 1983 text *The Reflective Practitioner* primarily examines the learning processes of professionals in fields such as engineering and management, his notions of how reflection functions within one's learning process carried over extensively into education. Schön argues that practitioners in any discipline may improve their work if they were to continually self-assess their actions, rather than simply performing them without question or thought. The ability to articulate one's knowledge makes it "visible" and prevents the development of tacit knowledge. As Schön states, "through reflection, [the practitioner] can surface and criticize the tacit understandings that have grown up around the repetitive experiences of a specialized practice, and can make new sense of the situations of uncertainty or uniqueness which he may allow himself to experience" (61). Thus, reflection not only prevents learning from remaining in an inexpressible and implicit state, but it also grants individuals the opportunity to see their practice in a new light.

In his work, Schön discusses two forms of reflection: reflection-*in*-action and reflection-*on*-action. The first occurs when practitioners react and assess in real-time; the reflective act is ephemeral and in the moment. Here, the individual "becomes a researcher. . . . He is not dependent on the categories or established theory and technique, but constructs a new theory of the unique case" (68). The other practice is one that has been picked up and developed extensively by the field of composition. As hinted in the name, reflection-*on*-action occurs after a particular event: "We reflect on action, thinking back on what we have done in order to discover how our knowing-*in*-action may have contributed to an unexpected outcome" (26). During reflection-*on*-action, individuals explore what was unique and unexpected about the situation,

and in doing so produce new knowledge by considering future actions in similar scenarios. Within the writing classroom, reflection-on-action often manifests itself in post-assignment writer's memos and end-of-term reflective essays. By reviewing one's work, discovering patterns, and using these patterns to help guide action in future contexts, reflection is imagined by Schön to be a rhetorical act. Most importantly, both forms of reflection are understood as a recursive and cyclical action: whether it is the "revisiting" and "reinterpretation" of practice (Schön; Burnham and Jackson) or the "making and remaking" of theory (Yancey "Seeing"), the learning process for all individuals demands a habit of reflection that is continual and recurring. The cyclical nature of reflection is crucial in creating a marriage of theory and practice, which relies on "a theorizing of practice based on practice, a means of extending and differentiating practice, and then of theorizing anew" (Yancey *Reflection*, 7).

More recently, composition scholars have conceptualized Schön's theories of reflection as rhetorical and have examined reflection specifically within writing studies. Kathleen Blake Yancey's work depicts reflection as a multifaceted and interconnected process. Reflection is described as a narrative of learning, which "involves multiple contexts, isn't easy, can't be neatly summarized, [and] isn't always satisfying because it can bring different knowledges and belief systems into conflict" (*Reflection* 91). In other words, reflection is neither linear nor simple, but more like a web. Though she never explicitly references ecomposition, Yancey has suggested the use of ecology as a metaphor for understanding reflection ("Defining" 319). Her book *Reflection in the Writing Classroom* extends the notion of reflection as a recursive and continual process - as a pedagogical strand that is weaved throughout a curriculum, and can emerge in a writing classroom "during, between, and following composition tasks" (Silver 168). Reflection can also be viewed as socially oriented because instructors are often asked to participate

alongside students. Yancey notes that “if we want students to be reflective, we will have to invite them to be so, [and] may need to reflect *with* them” (*Reflection* 53, emphasis added). This conception closely mirrors Marilyn Cooper’s ecological model in which the social activity of writing is envisioned as a dynamic interlocking system of writers (368). Scholars argue that in order to be effective, reflective writing practices require precise and thoughtful scaffolding and prompting on the part of the instructors (see Yancey; Dubinsky et al.; Ingram; Pigza; Conway). However, this is not a uni-directional task: “asking [students] to express what they’ve learned provides a formal and structured occasion to figure [out their takeaways], allows us [the instructors] to learn from them, provides us with an opportunity to reply” (Yancey *Reflection*, 57). That is, the facilitation and guidance of reflection helps both the instructor and the student learn more about the coursework they are engaging with, establishing a dialogue where both parties contribute towards the act of meaning making.

As composition scholars, we must remember to acknowledge and investigate how reflection functions throughout the learning environment and not simply in the development of students as writers. While it is a powerful tool in developing students’ abilities to compose and think critically, reflection also plays a key role in administration and curriculum development. The instructor as a “reflective practitioner” is a well-supported argument in pedagogical theory (see Freire; Hillocks; Popham et al.) where the teacher is described as someone who “engages in the same critical reflection that she expects from her students - thereby improving her thinking and action relative to the work of generating, deepening, and documenting student learning. . .” (Ash and Clayton 28). Much like how students are expected to generate new knowledge and awareness of both course content and theory, it is through reflection that instructors also come to know, review, understand, and enhance their practice (Yancey *Reflection*; Grimmer).

Specifically, it is argued that successful teaching practices require continual revision based on classroom experience and theoretical knowledge. During reflection on one's pedagogy, theory and practice are not considered separate components; instead "theory *is* practice, a practice of a particular kind, and practice is always theoretical" (Zebroski 15).

The networked conception of reflection described above further strengthens the metaphor of writing as an ecological system. As Popham and her colleagues suggest:

By encouraging reflection from/to administrator to/from teachers and to/from first-year students, we show that all of us are in constant states of learning, critically engaging our world and the structures around us. We develop programs constantly fluid and changing according to changing needs, by using the knowledge of our field to develop our practices. (20)

In addition to setting up engagement between faculty and students, reflection is also considered a social practice that prompts participants to make connections between contexts and communities. Yancey characterizes reflection as having the potential to be communally oriented; it is described as being located within the community, as well as having the ability to connect one context to another, thereby bringing "such contexts together for a fuller, richer meaning" ("Defining" 318). Like other aspects of ecomposition, reflective writing is thus an activity that not only involves and affects writers, but "the total relations of discourse both to its organic and inorganic environment" (Dobrin 20).

The role that reflection plays in helping students bridge differences serves an especially powerful purpose within the context of service-learning composition. As the literature reveals, both the quantity and types of reflection that students engage with in service-learning courses are

crucial to their knowledge acquisition (see Molee et al.; Eyler et al.; Hatcher and Bringle; Meyers). Chris Burnham and Rebecca Jackson, echoing John Dewey, remind us that “learning and growth reside in reflection, in our attempts to make meaning from various, often competing theories, practices, experiences, and perspectives” (159). Yancey parallels this argument, suggesting that as writing instructors, we should not form a binary perception of our course as a “debate or choice between the academic and the personal” but rather a progression from the unfamiliar to the familiar (*Reflection* 127). This depiction of reflection resonates strongly in service-learning pedagogy, where both the instructor and students must navigate through and inhabit various locations and communities. For students, this movement—both in the cognitive sense as well as the literal sense—often generates feelings of doubt, hesitation, or tension. It is during these moments of uncertainty that reflection can be most helpful. Reflective writing within service-learning should demonstrate reciprocity and link students’ experiences within the community to classroom and departmental learning goals. Thus, reflection is also perceived as a critical act, which has been nuanced by multiple scholars.

Critical reflection, a movement between observation and conscious-raising analysis of social issues (Anson), also provides students with the opportunity to become critics of themselves and their personal ideologies (see Pigza; Bringle and Hatcher; Karasik; Meyers), *generates* learning through confronting bias and contrasting theory with practice, *deepens* learning by synthesizing multiple perspectives, and *documents* learning through material texts open to evaluation (Ash and Clayton 27, original emphasis). This process is essential to community-based writing and must be explicitly prompted. Barbara Jacoby argues that “service-learning is based on the pedagogical principle that learning and development do not necessarily occur as a result of experience itself but as a result of reflection explicitly designed to foster

learning and development” (4). Similarly, Thomas Kolenko and his co-authors, building on Freire’s notion of action-reflection⁹, warn of the dangers of experiential learning without critical thinking: “This becomes doing without learning. It is not enough to just experience, to just do, or to just act, Learning by doing must be performed in combination with critical reflection on experience” (135). The rhetorical nature of reflection, especially within a service-learning context, is again emphasized. Students cannot simply serve but must understand why they serve and how that service fits into their own learning as well as the needs of the communities at large. Thus, reflection is not simply an aid to service-learning, it *is* the learning. Reflection makes the pedagogy.

Much like critical reflection’s definition(s), the scholarship on service-learning and composition has also projected a number of varying but parallel pedagogical strategies for fostering critical reflection. Bringle and Hatcher suggest that effective reflection should be grounded in five principles: it must 1) link service with course content; 2) be structured in terms of descriptions, expectations, and assessment criteria; 3) occur at regular intervals throughout the course; 4) evoke instructor feedback so as to help students improve critical analyses; and 5) allow for inward examination so students may explore, clarify, and revise their values (“Reflection” 182). Similarly, Janet Eyler, Dwight Giles, and Angela Schmiede argue that reflection within community service-learning courses should be guided by the “Four Cs of Reflection”: continuous, connected, challenging, and contextualized. Finally, the DEAL (Describe, Examine, Articulate Learning) model is a 3-step heuristic that instructors can implement using a series of prompts that guides students towards forms of reflective writing that

⁹ In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire argues that action and reflection are interconnected components within critical pedagogy. Each one is reliant on one the other: “if one is sacrificed-even in part-the other immediately suffers” (75). The result is an “unauthentic” (sic) form of learning.

“express and explore their individual learning in the context of academic enhancement, personal development, and civic engagement” (Ash, Clayton, and Atkinson, qtd in Molee et al. 241). Students begin by describing their service experience objectively, examine those experiences while using the course outcomes as an analytical lens, and then articulate their learning by responding to four prompts: What did I learn? How did I learn it? Why does it matter? What will I do in light of it? Although each of these pedagogical strategies is nuanced in its own way, all of them aid in the conceptualization of reflection as a vehicle for learning. Reflection is thus imagined as being multidirectional as well as embedded within the writing curriculum, allowing for students to look ahead towards future goals, casting backwards to see prior experiences, and connecting concurrent projects in order to discover what has been learned (*Yancey Reflection*).

While theory on reflection within service-learning composition pedagogy discusses how learning *should* transpire, we must examine reflection “on the ground” as it occurs within a genuine context. In the following sections, I investigate the various modes of reflection that occur within English 121 on both the classroom side as well as the instructor side. Through interviews with both students and instructors, as well as looking at course documents and student writing, I hope to get a clearer understanding of how reflection functions within service-learning. I also aim to examine the ways in which the findings parallel the scholarship as well as complicate it. Before presenting my findings, I describe the coding approach I took in the course of analyzing the reflective writing of students in three English 121 classes, as well as the reflections of current and past English 121 instructors.

Coding for Reflection in English 121

To code for reflection, I parsed my data into two categories. First, I examined reflection in relations to instructors: how did instructors discuss and conceptualize the role of reflection in

their course, and how did they design assignments and activities to facilitate reflective writing? In addition, I analyzed institutional documents to understand the types of reflection that instructors themselves were asked to complete. Second, I focused on the student experience, coding interviews and their writing (particularly their service-oriented journals and final portfolio reflections) for moments that reveal how they were interpreting the reflective tasks that their instructors designed, and the most common takeaways from their time serving at their community organization. In the course of examining the interviews with instructors and students and putting them in conversation with their produced text, I began to understand how reflection functions throughout the entire service-learning environment: how reflective practices are conceived by instructors, implemented in the curriculum, initiated in the classroom, and then taken up by students. In addition, by analyzing end-of-term surveys from former English 121 instructors, I was able to gain an understanding of the several ways that reflection has been imagined and facilitated in English 121, as well as a meta-awareness of how reflection itself functions outside of the classroom in terms of instructor training.

Findings

An overarching theme that governs nearly all the reflective activities found in the English 121 program is the utilization of reflection in helping students develop a disposition that is unique to the service-learning community — one that is cultivated from their experiences both inside and outside of the classroom. This development is crucial; as Yancey notes, “in many ways a writing course is an exercise in identity formation, and growth in identity is one sign that the course is working” (*Reflection* 143). While the definition of a “working” curriculum may differ from setting to setting, my findings indicate that reflective writing in all three instructors’ classes have played a major role in providing students with a space to share their ideas and

integrate multiple aspects of their academic and service experiences. In short, reflective writing has helped students make sense of their roles and responsibilities in both the classroom and beyond it.

One reflective task that is purposefully designed to construct students' writerly dispositions is the English 121 end-of-quarter portfolio. Assigned toward the end of every 100-level composition course at the University of Washington, the portfolio is designed to be both an archive of each student's produced writing as well as a space for them to reflect on their learning over the duration of the academic quarter. In her case study of ePortfolios, Christina Russell McDonald noted that portfolios made "each stage of the process a significant product" and thus, acted as vehicles *for* learning and *of* learning, simultaneously (218, original emphasis). A completed English 121 portfolio includes all writing assignments from the quarter, four of which must be revised based on the instructor's feedback. In addition, the portfolio contains a critical reflection component in which the student explains how the four revised assignments, when examined holistically, demonstrate the four EWP outcomes. To do so, students must narrate their composing process, as well as reference specific moments within their own writing as evidence. Thus, the portfolio is an artifact that "represents and affirms, rather than speculates and unravels" (Tucker 38). Similarly, Kimberly Emmons argues that "asking students to participate in their own evaluation. . .has fostered the development of discursive strategies for demonstrating growth and improvement" (44). For example, Rufus, who was in Jessica's fall class, reflects upon a writing moment in which he successfully utilizes multiple sources in constructing an argument:

The forth (*sic*) [outcome] point which asking (*sic*) writer to have the ability to utilize multiple kinds of evidence gathered from different sources to support ideas. The short assignment 2 is a perfect instance to show this point. In this paper, to compare the

difference between the definition of ‘success’ in dictionary and in people’s minds, I quote words I found in Oxford Dictionary: “this word has two main explanations: 1. The accomplishment of an aim or purpose; 2. The attainment of popularity or profit” (SA2, 1). In the rest of the paper, I spend most of my time quoting and analyzing words I received by survey, in order to find what the word “success” means for most people. Such as “Some says “a goal that everyone in life strives for in little and big ways” . . .

This configuration of the final portfolio also grants students like Rufus a significant amount of agency within the curriculum. Not only are they given an opportunity to select the assignments they want to use to depict what they’ve learned as writers, they are also invited to serve as tour guides of their individual academic journeys, pointing out notable moments of successful learning.

In addition, the portfolio functions ecologically, putting English 121’s formal assignments and reflection directly in relationship with one another so that a final portfolio cannot be evaluated or considered complete unless both components are interacting with one another. As Schön notes, “we may reflect on action, thinking back to what we have done to discover how our knowing-in-action may have contributed to an unexpected outcome” (26). Building off Schön, McDonald notes that the portfolio assignment emphasizes the iterative and recursive nature of reflective writing; in the process of creating a portfolio, students are revising and constantly reframing their past writings, viewed as the “artifacts of their learning” (218). Per Nedra Reynolds and Rich Rice, assignments like the critical reflection requirement found in English 121 and other EWP courses are crucial in guiding students to see the portfolio as more than just a scrapbook of collected writing pieces, but a resource that involves inquiry and generates new knowledge about their writing. The knowledge is generated through a continual

process of interruption; students critique their writing, then determine how to effectively formulate an argument that frames their work as accomplishing one of the departmental outcomes. In other words, “the *thinking* becomes *rhetorical*” (Yancey *Reflection 72*, original emphasis). It is through this repeated interaction between texts that a student constructs a writerly identity. This type of reflection is what Yancey categorizes as constructive reflection, where

a writer is directed to consider the effect on him or her of multiple composing experiences. . .As it takes place, of course, and as response to composing are provided, such reflection has a shaping effect; it thus contributes to the development of a writer’s identity, based in the *multiple texts* composed by the writer, in the *multiple kinds of text* composed by the writer, and the *multiple contexts* those text have participated in.

(*Reflection 14*, original emphasis)

By asking English 121 students to construct a writing portfolio, their self-perception as an author emerges from the ecology of the course itself. The disposition that is developed comes directly from how they choose to position themselves in relationship to the text they produce. Students must be able to decide what parts of their writing experience “matter” and reflect on why they matter. Even the formal assignments not selected to be part of the final four to be evaluated are integral; as students decide which of their assignments to reflect upon, they in turn exclude and cut out other aspects of their identity, much like how a sculptor cuts away parts of the clay in order to form the final figure.

The English 121 portfolio closes with a final reflection, in which students are given the opportunity to discuss their writing development on a larger, big-picture scale. In looking at the departmental language surrounding the final portfolio, students are given freedom in what they

can reflect upon, but are recommended to describe their longitudinal development (“Summarize how your writing within the entire portfolio represents the progress that you have made throughout the quarter”), their metacognitive awareness (“Discuss how your portfolio as a whole displays thorough and thoughtful awareness of your own writing processes, habits, and strategies”) or the forward-reaching implications of their acquired writing skills (“Discuss how you see the work you've done this quarter translating to other situations, either in or out of school”). Nan, one of Caroline’s students during the Winter Quarter, examines her transformed perception of writing by contrasting it with another discipline:

Writing deviates from the math and sciences in the sense that there is no one answer to a problem. In writing, the answer to a problem is not concrete and this has allowed me to develop my metacognitive skills. I have had to critically think about what I am doing wrong. Once I identify the problem, I have to come up with a creative solution to fix it. There is no specific sentence that I have to write, but the point of writing is to effectively inform your audience. Writing focuses on the *how*. It's about *how* you convey what you have to say, and *how* it affects the audience. I hope to leave a lasting impact on my audience although describing certain topics can be quite dry. . .

Overall, this course has been another opportunity for me to grow as a student. Every moment of my life will be an opportunity to learn more and I hope to take advantage of it! During this time, I have strengthened my analysis by being more concise and inquisitive, and I have organized my paragraphs better by integrating ideas from multiple sources into short but detailed paragraphs.

Nan's excerpt embraces the "multidirectional" aspect of reflective writing. She looks backwards to the writing skills she has gained from English 121, but also examines her knowledge in a concurrent fashion by comparing the disciplinary differences of writing and math and science.

The inclusion of a final reflection transforms the English 121 portfolio from an artifact that documents the process of learning into one that also presents an outward-facing "product": the identity that is formed as a result of participating in the writing course. It evokes what Yancey calls reflection-in-presentation. This reflective performance is meant to be public facing, depicting an identity of the writer that is intended for an external audience, who in the case of the portfolio, is the instructor. As Glenda Conway argues, evaluating portfolios goes beyond only looking at the various writing skills students have demonstrated; it also involves examining the "students' selves, based in large part on the ways they construct themselves in their cover letters" (87), and then presenting that self in an outward-facing way. By reading final reflections, instructors come to gain a clearer sense of how different students see themselves through the beliefs and values they emphasize, the types of discourse they utilize, and the connections they construct between the various material and immaterial elements of their environment. For these students enrolled in a first-year writing course like English 121, a reflection-oriented portfolio represents a key gateway into the academic community, in that "asking students to reflect both on the conventions of a particular discourse and on their own performances within those parameters offers them a place from which to explore the possibilities and consequences of community membership" (Emmons 59).

In addition to the critical and final reflection of the portfolio, each instructor also included service-based reflective practices throughout their curriculum. For many instructors, service-based reflective tasks hold dual purposes. The first benefit is that it grants instructors

more insight into the community partners and their positions in relation to their own courses.

Given that one English 121 course is often paired with multiple community organizations, with a different number of students serving at each site, it can be difficult for instructors to develop a close relationship with each community partner. This communication gap between instructors and community partners was a concern for some instructors. In our interview, Caroline stated:

As a new instructor, I felt like I didn't know anything about the service sites at all. . . it would have been a nice space to sit down maybe with someone at the Carlson Center, and say, "Here are your five things. Here is the basic info that you need to know about them," just because I felt like I really didn't [know anything].

This gap between English 121 instructors and community organizations was realized by students as well. When asked to explain the purpose of reflective writing assignments in her course, Trinity said "they're our participation. . . I think a part of it is to show that we have been volunteering." Thus, via their students' reflections, instructors have an opportunity to observe and "check in" on the relationships that students are developing with their community organizations and the people they are serving; it provides an additional bridge to communities beyond the campus. In her end-of-term survey, one instructor, Melissa, highlighted the critical logs in her curriculum because they give her "a sense of how the students are feeling about their volunteer work on a weekly basis even if they don't come to me." Therefore, the reflections serve an important function for not only bringing the service experience into the classroom so that students can complete assignments and synthesize with readings; they also act as a window so that instructors can examine what is happening at the sites themselves.

Second, the service-based reflections help students develop an academic disposition that is equally influenced by their experiences working with and alongside their community

organizations. In the final portfolio, Kathy assigns an additional reflective essay titled “My Service” in which she asks students to critically reflect upon and articulate their experiences working at their community organizations, many of which are after-school programs. By requiring an additional reflective writing piece in her English 121 portfolio, Kathy wanted to emphasize and frame civic engagement as important as the EWP outcomes. During our initial interview, she stated: “I keep looking at more strategies to fully incorporate [students’] service and to make them feel validated for the time and commitment that they’ve spent. So I try to bring in. . . that emphasis or validation of their service, reflection on their service.” Her “My Service” prompt read:

Did your own experience add new dimensions to your perception of education equity and our strivings to achieve it? You may consider the following:

- What has been most significant, most striking to you? A particular conversation, interaction, or observation? Or, in what specific area(s) have you experienced personal growth?
- How have your expectations been met or challenged? What is surprising? Different?
- What advice would you give future tutors/mentors as a result of your experience?

The language Kathy uses here specifically guides students into giving a summary of what they gained through their service experience, while also describing the sequence of the changes and interruptions that led to the formation of their new identity. While the “My Service” assignment began as a single-spaced, paragraph-long reflection in the Autumn Quarter, it was extended to two pages by the Winter and Spring. In describing her rationale for changing the length, Kathy states, “I wanted them to know, ‘Okay, this is important, this is a huge part of this class.’”

In her English 121 class, Caroline began the Autumn Quarter with the plan to implement a series of service logs. Students were given five reflective prompts throughout the quarter and were required to complete a minimum of three. Similar to Kathy's "My Service" assignment, the instructor served as the primary reader of the log; Caroline made it explicit in her syllabus that she was the audience to which the students should be directing their writing towards. In addition, students were invited to break away from academic discourse and compose the logs in an informal style. The five assignment prompts revolved around the themes of "accessibility", "sustainability", "personal", "local", and "global" and each required students to first describe moments during their service experience, then, reflect on how that experience related to the course theme of food and community. This approach to reflection mirrors that of Manuel Correia and Robert Bleicher's study of service-learning reflections and students' tendencies to draw connections to themselves, similar settings, and to the world around them. Through these five themes, Caroline attempts to not only to make reflection visible, but also to help students move their reflective practices from mere description toward new knowledge creation.

However, during our interview between Autumn and Winter Quarter, Caroline mentioned that she had decided to revise her service logs into an electronic blog. One reason for the change was her desire to help students develop their genre and audience awareness, one of the primary EWP outcomes. Caroline felt that the use of an electronic blog granted students more flexibility in terms of multimodality, thus expanding their abilities to reflect and take more ownership with regard to the identity they wish to develop. Unlike her previous service logs, Caroline emphasized a much more personal, inner-oriented reflection style for the blog posts. She stated, "I was really pitching as like, 'This is your space, and your informal space'. . . I had some students who really went with the [blogging] thing. And really went with like, 'Here are my

thoughts. Here's a picture of me at the farm.” Caroline also stated that her Autumn Quarter students’ logs seemed “weak” due to a lack of critical thinking: “I knew the most important thing for those [service logs] was making them think about what they were doing. Especially because by the end of the quarter so many of my students were like, ‘We're just chopping food, every day I go in, and I chop onions, everyday.’ And they were getting really frustrated. . . There's only so many times you can say, ‘But don't you see how it's helping the greater good?’” To combat this issue, Caroline also planned to revise her reflection prompts so that students are required to intertextualize the ideas and arguments discussed in course readings and put them in conversation with their own personal experiences. In turn, by negotiating and integrating an academic disposition with their informal journaling self, Caroline’s blogs occupied a space where students work to develop an identity that is unique and exclusive to the service-learning experience: one that is influenced by what they encounter in the classroom as well as what they encounter at their community organization. The integrative feature of course text into students’ reflections dramatically changed their perception of their time in English 121, a detail we will examine closer in later sections of this chapter.

Like Caroline, Jessica also included an electronic blog component into her service-learning course in which students were asked to reflect upon and integrate their classroom and community experiences. However, whereas Caroline chose to highlight the personal element of blogging, Jessica utilized blogs specifically to help emphasize the public-facing characteristic of reflection-in-presentation. As Yancey reiterates, while all writing is personal to some degree, reflection-in-presentation is still “necessarily social: audience-oriented in very specific ways that remove it from the sphere of the exclusively personal (if there is such a thing)” (*Reflection* 93). Similarly, in her blog activity, students are required to make an entry each week, examining the

extent to which their observations parallel or challenge course readings. Jessica also prompts students to keep their service organizations in mind as they update the blog, asking students to consider in what ways their writing can be “about,” “with,” and “for” their community.

However, what stands out about Jessica’s blog assignments is that students are specifically asked to direct their reflection towards a specific external audience. As her prompt states:

Who is the audience for your blog and how have you strategically created your blog for this audience? (Don’t choose your ENGL 121 instructor!) Why does this audience need to know the information you are presenting? What specific composition choices did you make based on your audience?

As a result, her students created blogs that not only included self-reflection, but also artifacts that were clearly directed at a public audience. For example, one student constructed a list of frequently asked questions that benefitted future students volunteering at her community organization while another student embedded a video made by the students she tutored in her after-school program. Although the blogs are ultimately kept private and accessible only by Jessica¹⁰, the formation of a public audience offers students an opportunity to practice various forms of writing and composing other than journaling and blogging. This deliberate shift from a personal blog to one that hybridizes personal and public entries is important; as scholars like Emmons warns, the lack of socially-based reflection may lead to a limited understanding of how writing functions as an ecology: “by rewarding internally focused reflection, our assignments miss the chance to direct students towards a wider view of writing as participation in the work of

¹⁰ Although the construction of a public-facing blog does offer students an opportunity to practice rhetorical awareness, there are potential issues that arise when service-learning students are writing for an imaginary audience. See the prior chapter for an extended discussion of this issue.

particular communities” (44). By having her students explicitly identify and address an intended audience, Jessica is attempting to open her students’ reflections up to multiple audiences, multiple contexts, and multiple forms of composition.

While it is apparent that reflection plays a key role in connecting coursework, service, and personal experiences, reflective practices within the service-learning environment also requires careful scaffolding and prompting on the part of the instructor. Otherwise, students may not be able to integrate these three components together into one all-inclusive disposition. The next section examines how writing teachers can and should take scaffolding into consideration as they work to develop their reflection assignments.

Scaffolding Reflection

The use of prompts and framing in facilitating reflection is crucial in helping students consider their service-learning experience beyond a personal, individual perspective (see Anson, Dubinsky). As Bringle and Hatcher argue, reflective journals that lack structure and guidance often devolve into mere logs of activities rather than practices that help students examine their service in light of course objectives (“Research” 180). There has been a call by scholars in the field for more attention towards developing and facilitating reflective prompts. Emmons, for example, argues that “our attention as theorists have been focused on prompting the *habit* of reflection in our students rather than on questioning its mechanism” (47). While cultivating reflective practice and a habit of mind is important, equal attention must be given to proper scaffolding and prompting techniques, especially in community-based writing. J. Beth Mabry argues that service-learning functions as effective pedagogy when students are given frequent reflection time in class, as well as continuous reflective writing opportunities. In her analysis of portfolio cover letters, Rachel Ihara argues that the field has shifted towards viewing reflection

from something that “students should be able to do intuitively and on their own to an understanding of reflection as socially situated” (223-224) and a skill that requires practice and refinement. Ren Hullender and his co-researchers call for “rigorous reflective prompts that encourage students to analyze the need for service, to critically explore the causes of the issue surrounding the service and how to address the issue in a structural and systemic way (61). Thus, within service-learning pedagogy, discussions of reflective prompts mirror that of a flashlight, helping students scan across their service experience for moments worthy of closer examination.

However, without recurring guidance and scaffolding opportunities, students can struggle to make connections between their coursework and their service experience. This was particularly noticeable in Kathy’s course. Although her final portfolio assignment included a “My Service” reflective essay, Kathy had very little reflective writing opportunities that provided scaffolding for her students. In her course, most of the service-based reflection outside of the “My Service” essay was relegated to weekly in-class discussions, during which students took turns briefly sharing their service experiences verbally with one another. Kathy did assign a mid-quarter reflection activity; however, instead of a formal assignment, the reflection was conducted as a low-stakes discussion board conversation on Canvas, the class website. In addition to infrequent writing opportunities, Kathy’s reflection prompts asked students to focus on describing service, rather than investigating the underlying issues. In the “My Service” reflection prompt posted earlier, she asks students to describe on what has been “surprising”, “challenging”, or “different”, rather than explore *why* they felt those moments warranted those feelings.

Finally, the creation of two separate reflections-in-presentation – the writing-oriented final reflection and one service-based “My Service” essay – resulted in students conjuring two

separate identities. Kathy's students often saw their service experience as a separate element from their classroom experience. During our interview, her student Aaron stated: "I think that the service is too easy and narrow, to help primary [school] children to finish their homework. . . I don't think I can learn something from it. Maybe patience? But it's not related to our class."

When pressed to explain what he meant by the service experience being narrow, Aaron responded in this way: "Because in my service I only have to teach or tutor primary school students, but [my assignments] are about gender difference and educational opportunity." In the conclusion to his final reflection, Aaron writes:

Besides learning knowledge from the lectures, doing the community service is also a unique experience for me. Since I chose to serve in [site name redacted], it was so much fun to spend time with those kids. Tutoring their homework, helping them to finish their reading assignment, and supporting them to have a wonderful Halloween party, I also learned many things from those children.

The reflection ends there. Aaron does not go into detail about what he learned, nor does he make any connections between the service and the "knowledge from the lectures." Rather, his work at the community center was interpreted as a "feel good" experience. We see the same disconnect mentioned in Connor's interview, another one of Kathy's students:

Interviewer: But in terms of the writing you're doing in the class, you feel like it's a little bit. . . It doesn't really help with anything at the [service site]?

Connor: Yeah, at least for me.

Interviewer: Okay. Why do you think that is? Do you think that is because of the topics, or do you think that is the. . . ?

Connor: Maybe the type of service. We just tutor the kids [to] do math problems, or go to the computer lab and see if they're doing their reading. It's more like volunteering, it's more like a service. It's not something academic.

Connor's final point, "It's not something academic," further reveals a perception similar to Aaron's: there is a distinct difference between the work that takes place within the classroom and the service site: the classroom is where he goes to learn, and the service organization is where he goes to volunteer. However, near the end of his time in English 121, Connor appears to understand the intentions behind service-learning and how it relates to the composition classroom. In his "My Service" reflection, Connor writes:

It is ubiquitously believed that community service is about volunteers helping people who need help or who are, to some extent, in disadvantage. Regarding my serving experience, I, however, found that service is remarkably mutual, interactive, bilateral, or even multilateral. . .In addition, it is this program that inspired and helped me to write in this writing class. Specifically, the surveys and interviews I did regarding the organization and community really contributed to my research and writing. Service learning, to me, is not all about serving but learning. In this process, we met with, talked to, shared with, and learned from each other. I served, experienced, learned, thought, and benefited. I cherish the time that we worked with the kids at [site name redacted] and will carry the precious life experience with me as I move forward. It is what we learned from different people and different places makes us who we are.

Throughout this excerpted reflection, Connor specifically discusses his tutoring responsibilities with his community organization, which provided a multitude of services to the area's Asian immigrant population. However, while Connor makes it clear that he learned something from

doing service, it is somewhat romanticized and localized: “I also profoundly learned the real point of serving or volunteering from this organization and program members. Their professionalism and enthusiasm made me believe in the bright part of the humanity.”

Although there is nothing wrong with gaining a sense of fulfillment from doing service, scholars like Adam Davis warn of dangers in only understanding service as “good” and not analyzing some of the larger, macro issues that warrant service in the first place. In his reflection, Connor makes no reference to any institutional or systemic issues that were made visible by his community engagement, nor does he intertextualize his hands-on tutoring experience with any of the course readings on equity and education. This issue has been previously identified by Bruce Herzberg, who points out that “if our students regard social problems as chiefly or only personal. . .then they will not search beyond the personal for a systemic explanation” (“Community” 309). Thus, Connor’s experience with service-learning both differs and yet still mirrors Aaron’s takeaway. While Connor saw the reason for his service—and even made brief connections between his service and his writing development—his critical awareness of social issues still appears to be underdeveloped.

If one of our pedagogical goals is to help students understand the issues that underlie their community work, service-learning teachers have to discourage students from conceiving of reflective writing as a “place for idle contemplation or the passive recording of feelings, moods, or new experiences but as a place to actively explore difficult problems” (Anson 172). J. Elizabeth Clark views reflection as the essential pedagogical practice that allows students to draw connections between the various knowledges they encounter: “It’s in the reflective assignment that new kinds of knowledge and connections can be made. Reflection encourages students to embrace a holistic, integrative approach to considering how these varying pieces of

their education, represented in artifacts, come together to support their goals” (161). It’s clear, then, that the prompts English 121 instructors use for reflective writing assignments must explicitly encourage students to integrate ideas and arguments from course readings with their service experiences. In her Winter Quarter blog assignment, Caroline required students to compose a post every week. Her prompts varied from week to week and covered a range of experiences, thus highlighting the necessity of recursion and rhythm that effective connection-forming reflection relies upon. Instead of asking for a focus on description or recording, the blog instead functions as a “hub” within her pedagogy, allowing students to examine their overall service-learning experience from a variety of perspectives. For example, in week one, students are asked to write from a personal stance, examining their past experiences with service-learning, while in week seven, they are asked to discuss their current and past experiences with food, the course theme. In doing so, Caroline prompts her students to evoke different identities given the writing situation. As Ann Feldmann argues, “students find out who they are by writing in particular situations; there is not a single stable self that they will find by excavating memory and reporting on the dig” (111).

This self-exploration function of reflection is evoked even more when students read their service personal experiences through a critical lens. Caroline’s students throughout the quarter are also prompted to use course texts as a frame of analysis. For example, her prompt for week two blog entries states:

Respond to [Joel] Westheimer and [Adam] Davis's conceptions of service based on your previous service experiences. Do you identify with one of Westheimer's types of citizens, or Davis's reasons for serving? Do you have your own reasons for serving? *Describing at*

least one previous service experience, reflect on how these two readings have influenced the way you think about why you, personally, serve. (emphasis added)

Nan, Caroline's student that was mentioned earlier, reflected upon a past volunteer experience from high school, this time using the text as a lens of self-critique:

As lame as it sounds, I had to stay [and volunteer] so I could get my hours for National Honors Society. . .The extrinsic motivation kept us going. In English 121, we addressed people just like me. . . . At the end of the [Davis] article I evaluated my own service. I realized that while I liked helping people, service was not something that I naturally gravitated to. After much thought, I realized that community service spanned beyond [site name redacted] and the local food bank.

As Bill Tucker argues, "simply reviewing or recollecting texts or experiences will result only in a summary, but deliberating on one or a few of them brings the writer closer to true reflection" (41). Unlike Connor, Nan was able to use Davis' argument regarding the complexity of service and locate her own problematic beliefs and attitudes, as well as move her community work beyond a localized context. In this situation, the synthesis with course readings helped Nan adopt a critical take of her own position within the service-learning environment. In addition, the blog offered an opportunity for reflection-in-presentation that enacted multiple identities within multiple contexts. Students like Nan now had to reflect upon how their English 121-oriented disposition complicated their prior identities.

Like Caroline, Jessica also implemented a blog component in her classroom. In her prompt, she asked students to create an entry every week, consisting of "some kind of primary source observations. . .that stood out to you for some reason that week," as well as "connections

to secondary sources (to either course readings or other sources of information) that assist your inquiry process into specific issues.” However, one distinct feature of her blog assignment was that much like how the final portfolio collected and documented all of a student’s writing across the particular quarter, it also functioned as a space for students to create a record of their service experiences. Unlike Caroline’s blog assignment, Jessica made the blog a formal writing assignment in her course rather than a supplemental component. She stated in her interview: “students are gonna be building [it] over time as their major assignment. So, they’re building it as little pieces and then have a chance to go back and create more of a cohesive narrative throughout it, at different points. But that’s where I see a lot of the reflection analysis coming together, based on their observations.” This construction of a major writing assignment as an ongoing task rather than the traditional format of turning in a final written product serves to highlight the iterative nature of reflection. Jessica attempted to depict reflection as something that is dynamic and moving; this particular assignment is not conceived as a finalized product but a process-in-motion.

Furthermore, for the final writing assignment of the quarter, Jessica created a group assignment in which students work together to interview a staff member at their community organization in order to identify a project or artifact that would contribute towards the organization’s goals. However, in the final assignment prompt, she also urges her students to utilize the topics they discussed in their blogs as a beginning point of inquiry. This is a powerful framing of reflection as a pedagogical tool. By using their blog posts to help in the development of their final project, students are asked to bridge the gap between what they know and what they can do. Also in this model of reflection, Jessica employs a structure that closely resembles the learning cycle as theorized by David Kolb. The blog portion encapsulates the first half of the

cycle, in which learners move from having a concrete experience, to reflecting on the experience from multiple perspectives. By asking students to revisit their service-learning experiences within the context of a final project, Jessica enacts the second half of the learning cycle, which calls for students to create concepts and strategies derived from their blog reflections, followed by its potential application in the form of a service-learning artifact.

The integration of prior experiences, present service, and course texts within Jessica and Caroline's blog assignment likens reflection to a water wheel within the English 121 classroom. As one of Jessica's students, Amy puts it:

What we learn at our service learning site, we can bring back to the classroom and then we discuss it and then [Jessica] brings in more ideas about what we talked about and what we learned. And then we can also bring that back to the service learning site. So it's just constant learning and just being. . . Yeah, it's just a lot of reflection, I think.

Amy's reference to the idea of reflection prompting "constant learning" reveals the cyclical construction of reflection as it is occurring regularly throughout the course. This recursive approach to reflection is where, scholars argue, true learning occurs; the student "immerses herself in the social context as a participant in a community of practice" (Feldmann 102) rather than only reflecting after their experience.

The reflective practices in English 121 also exist as a socially-situated, collaborative invention. In other words, not only can reflection be framed as an individually-oriented process/product, scholars also suggest that reflection is a communal process (McDonald; Reid). Feldmann argues that "what makes learning happen is quite the opposite; it is participation in social knowledge-making contexts whether [individuals] are in the classroom or in the

community” (116). Reflection is not simply about focusing on one’s own experiences and interpretation, but as Yancey suggests, also requires reply and engagement. Reflection, in particular reflection-in-presentation, can therefore be conceived as an ecological act; it engages not only those who are doing the reflecting, but their audiences as well. This is especially useful in a service-learning context such as English 121, where students are often sharing their service-learning experiences with both their peers as well as the instructor. In addition, reflection also plays an important role in pedagogical development. For instructors teaching service-learning for the first time, reflection contains an archival function, helping map out the boundaries and practices of the community. Through an ecological understanding of reflection, we may begin to understand how reflective writing and classroom practices contribute toward a co-constructed framing of service-learning, in which the knowledge that is produced by reflection benefits all those participating in the community.

Reflection as a Collaborative Act

By participating in reflective activities, both new English 121 instructors and their students were able to build a relationship with one another as well as with other members of the service-learning discourse community. In English 121, the seeds of collaborative reflection were often planted through activities like in-class discussions. The kairotic nature of these in-class discussions offered students a new, different mode of reflection. As Karasik notes, while reflective writing like journals and logs allow students to work at a pace and within a private space they are comfortable with, “the immediacy of the moment may be lost and the potential for any shared learning that comes from the discussion may or may not be possible” (80). All three instructors who were interviewed discussed carving out time in their lesson plans for students to informally discuss and share out their experiences at the service organizations. Upon initial

observations, these assignments were fairly low-stakes; in the interviews, instructors as well as students interpreted these in-class reflections as opportunities to share out anecdotes of their experiences at their community organization and to compare the type of work they were doing.

As Kathy mentioned:

I asked students to talk about some of their strongest experiences, or like either in the best experience, or the most interesting experience, or like these moments that just seemed different to them for some reason. I know that was a good time for students to share, they were engaging in each other's shared experiences.

Other instructors also noted the benefits of in-class discussions, especially in terms of helping students recognize and acknowledge the challenges and discomfort that some may encounter during service-learning. Scholars like Ashley Holmes recognize the challenges that instructors face when their curriculum extends beyond the walls of their classroom: “the messiness of engaging with public groups outside of the classroom means that we, as teachers, often have little control over the kind of response students receive or the kinds of experiences they have in community-based contexts” (59). Holmes calls this aspect of community-based pedagogy a “productive tension” and deliberates on how instructors might be able to re-direct these emotion-filled moments into opportunities for productive learning. In her end-of-term survey, Charlotte stated that “having my students talk about service learning in every class helped. . . .They were able to joke about it a bit and to see other people also nodding about their discomfort, and often that was enough to keep them engaged.” These open in-class moments of reflection function as a security blanket, helping validate students’ experiences and giving them an opportunity to co-construct a shared understanding of the service-learning experience, even if

students served with different community partners. Another instructor, Stephanie, noted that the importance of using reflection to productively address service-learning related challenges.

Often times, naming the particular problem goes a long way toward solving it. . .Once we've identified the problem and I've given the student a chance to talk it through, we develop a plan together. Students who are uncomfortable walking alone downtown might go together – one can study in a nearby coffee shop while the other volunteers, and then they can swap places.

It is important to note that Stephanie emphasized the collaborative work between herself and her students in order to solve the issues that arise, thereby participating in the reflection and creation of knowledge alongside her students.

Like Stephanie, Kathy employed reflection to help students gain insight into the values and practices of the community partners they were working alongside, but she took a much more student-centered approach. Specifically, she created a panel of past students to share their experiences with her current students. She recalled prompting her English 121 students: “Bring in your questions. . .what are your expectations? What do you think you're going to find when you go out in the field? And so they had that in mind and had questions prepared for the former students. That went really well. I'm planning on doing that every quarter.” Her current students were thus asked to reach forward with their reflective thinking while her former students connected with them via their reflection onto their prior service experiences. This process thus transformed the unfamiliar into the familiar. As she describes it, Kathy's goal was to help students gain a clearer sense of what service-learning entails by providing them with an “on-the-ground” view, rather than the abstracted theoretical construct as put forth by course readings:

One of the reasons for the panels is try to get them to articulate their expectation, and to let [the new students] know, right off the bat, that not all of them are going to have positive experiences, 'cause I found that they all go in, . . .with an attitude of, “This is going to be really good, and maybe I'm going to change the world,” that it's going to be real positive, and they're really altruistic and really very hopeful, and so just to be able let them know that, it's going to be different among you. You guys are going to have different experiences, [and] hopefully you'll all grow through these experiences.

Through a student-centered panel and the conversations that emerge, students may also begin to see how collaborative reflection can operate as a problem-solving resource. It echoes Peter Grimmett's notion that a central objective to reflective practices is the act of identifying an issue, then designing and assessing a response to said issue. “Reflection, thus, engages practitioners in a ‘conversation’ with the problematic situation. Past experiences are brought to bear on the situation . . . problems are set, the situation reframed, and problem-solving actions are generated” (9). In other words, not only does collaborative reflection between students produce tangible solutions, but more importantly, the solutions generated have much more direct application to the local English 121 experience, as compared with course texts and the service-learning literature that frame the curriculum. Also, in the course of coming together to discuss their experiences, students enact what Susan Jarratt and her colleagues call “pedagogical memory.” As they claim, “remembering is an act of participation, a place of oneself in a story in a particular way” (49). In this way, the panel enacts real-time community bridging and building. Rather than having current students simply read testimony or written reflection, Kathy establishes a dialogue that gives current students an opportunity to directly interact with and react to past students' experiences while providing them with an invitation to be part of the

service-learning discourse community. In addition, during this socially-oriented reflection, past experiences are not simply conceptualized as memories, but as resources that teach something to those that wield them. In this instance, reflection allowed Kathy's students to create an on-going archive of service-learning related knowledge, which will help those serving at community organizations for the first time.

Reflection performs a similar role outside of the classroom for the English 121 instructor. As I explained in the chapter 2, first-time instructors are required to upload their "course portfolio" to the catalyst website at the end of the academic year, consisting of materials like their syllabus and assignment prompts, as well as a brief survey that asks them to reflect on their experience teaching service-learning. The survey covers a wide array of topics, ranging from how instructors went about preparing students prior to the beginning of quarter, to drawing connections to instructors' prior pedagogical experiences teaching English 131. In addition, instructors are also asked to discuss specific moments in their course, identifying assignments that went well and why, as well as assignments that did not end up achieving what the instructors had originally hoped for and why. Thus, instructors not only describe their teaching philosophy or the individual aspects of their curriculum, they must also analyze both its achievements and shortcomings. Together, the course portfolio and the end-of-term survey help the English 121 program establish an expansive institutional history and a clear guide for new instructors of what types of pedagogy succeed and fail in this local learning environment. As Jessica pointed out in her interview:

I would say that reading some of the texts that the former 121 teachers put onto the catalyst site as things that they were assigning for their students, that was really helpful and that was confidence boosting because I could see the kinds of things that they were

using or assigning to students to use to analyze things. I was like, “Oh, I can do that. I know how to get students to have class discussions and stuff like that.”

Thus, the English 121 program simultaneously develops an archive of materials alongside a pedagogical culture anchored by instructors acting as reflective practitioners.

Many scholars have advocated for WPAs to build more of a culture of reflective practice within their departments, in which instructors use critical reflection to revise and update their pedagogy based on their constantly evolving experiences with students (see Reid; Richards). However, much like the classroom, reflection from a departmental perspective also requires instructors to reflect intermittently instead of simply at the end of their tenure. “Focusing on *changing* instead of, or at least as much as, *change*, may benefit teachers, administrators, and programs as a whole by encouraging the kind of reflective practice that we see central to scholarship and practice in composition” (Reid 11). As E. Shelley Reid and other scholars like Betty Bamberg note, this culture must be established and facilitated closely by the governing department; otherwise, given the logistical and schedule demands placed on the instructors (many of whom are graduate students, who serve as the primary workforce behind English 121), reflection is unlikely to occur organically. A benefit of asking instructors to regularly reflect on their own pedagogy is that it transforms the practice from being conceived as a reflection-in-presentation that instructors produce for others, to an inward-facing action that promotes self-development. Kathy, Jessica, and Caroline all praised the three-part interviews they took part in, stating that it helped them think through their own courses and what changes to implement in the subsequent academic quarter. This finding parallels a similar finding by Reid, who noted that “instructors who have changed curricula strongly articulate their sense that the *changing* itself, regardless of the curriculum, has been a significant benefit” (20, original emphasis). Another

benefit of asking English 121 instructors to compose their reflective writing throughout the academic year rather than only during the end-of-term survey is that future instructors may gain insight into the overall process of developing effective curricula and assignments. Reflection ultimately would be conceptualized as a much more significant ecological force; not only would new instructors come to understand the limits of the environment they were operating within, but reflective writing that is continuous for the entire year would provide clarity into how those limits came to be formed.

As I noted earlier in this section, collaborative reflection can often be utilized to identify and address the issues and challenges that arise during students' time at their community organization. Despite this, students often still conceive of reflective writing as a *personal* space – a medium that affords them the opportunity to experiment with varying forms of composition, as well as acknowledge emotionally-driven forms of writing that do not align with departmental writing goals. As instructors, we must recognize the significance of this personal reflective space for students' overall development as both writers and members of the larger service-learning community.

Personal Reflection and Its Implications for Service-Learning Composition

When we ask students to reflect on their service-learning experiences, it is difficult to imagine how students can avoid embedding personal perspectives and emotions into their writing. Reflective thinking inherently involves “a willingness to endure a condition of mental unrest and disturbance” (Dewey 13). Reflection is especially important within a service-learning environment not only because it communicates “the expectation that students connect fieldwork and coursework, but. . .also encourages students to reach inward to bridge these experiences with their own lives” (Meyers 377). That is to say, the very act of reflection requires students to

compose from a private place. This was an important element for many English 121 instructors. As I noted earlier, Caroline highlighted the personal nature of blogs in her coursework; in one of our interviews, she stated, “I think having students treat their learning and their writing as a personal reflection process is important to me, and I feel like the blog really facilitated that.” However, as findings in this chapter have demonstrated thus far, reflection also can transform inward-directed writing into growth for students, both as writers as well as citizens. Similarly, research conducted by Ash and Clayton suggest that “most instructors use service-learning to help their students engage with the content of the course. . . while also learning about citizenship and about *themselves as individuals*” (30, emphasis added). During reflection, students are given the chance to critically examine their own assumptions alongside new perspectives, which ideally supports the development of new skills and attitudes. As Yancey notes, even reflection-in-presentation, which is meant to project a certain identity outwards, “simply makes the personal more obvious” (*Reflection* 94).

Personal writing, especially in a service-learning course like English 121, transforms students by providing them with the opportunity to critically engage their own ideologies. By entering new communities, students may encounter beliefs, values, and worldviews much different than their own and as Kolenko et al. point out “students often believe they know themselves and their values, until those beliefs are tested in new situations” (136). In the course of using service-based reflective activities, students get to interrogate the new situations they are placed into and, through writing, make sense of their own personal stake in the issues they encounter. This is significant, especially given the multicultural environment that both English 121 instructors and their students are operating within. Jonathan Alexander and Jacqueline Rhodes argue that when we provide them with an avenue for free expression, “students from

diverse backgrounds can communicate to us, to one another, and to themselves their different truths” and thus write powerfully from their experiences (433). In the English 121 curriculum, the service-based blogs in Jessica and Caroline’s classes provide a medium for students to express their personal writing in two ways. First, the open, informal parameters placed on the blogs allow students to demonstrate a wide and diverse range of composition, Second, when students are given the opportunity to reflect on their service, they not only describe highly personal and emotional moments, but these emotions often serve as a catalyst for identifying and addressing issues that arise at their community organizations.

In both Jessica’s and Caroline’s English 121 curricula, they encouraged students to develop a multimodal blog, using not just words to convey their service-learning experiences, but images and videos that are in some ways also meaningful and pertinent to their argument. As a result, students included a wide selection of artifacts and genres into their reflections. Some were gathered locally, such as photographs taken at the organizations that captured the students and the populations they serve as well as materials produced directly by the community partners. Students also broke away from traditional diary-like entries and included conversations and dialogue that occurred during their service, thereby giving readers a more direct perspective of the interactions they encountered. Scholars like Sara Burnett champion the blending of traditionally academic and non-academic multimodal genres in writing pedagogy, as it lifts “privileged barriers so students can access and respond to texts with greater ease, flexibility, and authority” (11). As instructors, we cannot assume to know what incomes our students carry with them into the service experience; by opening the composing process, instructors grant students the agency to decide how they wish to represent themselves, the people they serve, and the communities they join. Burnett adds, “if a student can relate to text(s) on a personal level and can

speak with a voice of authority on a subject matter. . .at the very least, the student is critically thinking, reflecting, and responding authentically” (12).

This open multimodal approach to reflection encourages a more genuine representation of student writing instead of forcing students to adhere strictly to academic discourse. Just as important, neither Jessica nor Caroline graded their students’ blogs; while students were required to maintain one throughout the quarter, both instructors only periodically commented on student entries rather than assigning a formal number or letter grade. Consequently, the students perceived their reflective writing as a laboratory, a place to experiment with various modes of composition openly and freely. As Nan put it: “[The blogs are] great because I can kind of include my own voice in the writing and it gives me a lot of creative opportunities, and I can kind of use images, or whatever I want to expand on my blog posts.” By allowing students to reflect in whatever discourse they are most comfortable using, Caroline and Jessica created a space in their curriculum in which students could express personal thoughts and moments with impunity.

As the quarter progressed and students became more situated at their service organization, the need for service-based reflective writing like the blogs became more and more apparent. Students consistently utilized the blog to address certain service-learning experiences that fell outside of the EWP outcomes; that is, students often reflected upon and analyzed emotionally-charged moments that came up during their service that were not applicable to the formal assignments within their English 121 course. The students’ gravitation towards the service-learning blogs as the medium for emotional writing is unsurprising; echoing Aristotle’s discussion of pathos in *Rhetoric*, Craig Smith and Michael Hyde posit that the intensity of emotion directly correlates to the proximity of the objects of stimulation. “For example,” they

note, “the closer what one fears is in time and space, the more intensely one experiences that fear; the more remote the object of the fear, the less intense is the experience of fear” (450). As a writing component of the course, students were required to complete blog entries at a faster pace than formal assignments. The recurring nature of the blogs thus kept students tethered closely to their community organizations and in turn preserved the emotions that students felt. Smith and Hyde suggest that authors are able to “‘move’ the listener to more or less intensely felt states of mind by bringing the objects of emotions closer or removing them from the listener’s temporal/spatial field of perception” (451). This argument mirrors the embedding of multimodal artifacts into the blogs; by using photographs and moving images alongside transcribed dialogues and conversations to depict their experiences, Caroline and Jessica’s students were attempting to bring their audiences as close as possible into the community organization itself, inviting them to experience the same emotions they themselves felt.

In the view of many composition instructors, it is important that students are provided with opportunities to include their emotions and feelings in their arguments and writing. Yet, the place of emotion within rhetoric and composition pedagogy has been consistently devalued and overshadowed. As Lauren Micciche argues: “by suggesting that pathos can be singled out and understood separately from ethos and logos, and in opposition to rationality, we underestimate its role in forming judgments that become the basis for the beliefs and values through which our lives have meaning and our actions gain force” (169). Christy Wenger echoes this criticism of composition attempting to separate reason and emotion, suggesting that “where there is reasoning and analysis, there is emotion” (51). Teaching rhetoric while highlighting appeals to credibility and logic and downplaying the significance of emotions ultimately results in an incomplete or oversimplified understanding of argumentation and rhetorical action. Some have

also criticized emotionally-charged reflection for obscuring the social realities of community issues (Emmons), while others perceive it as an illusory of genuine learning and growth (Yancey; Feldmann; Hullender et al.). Student discussions of feeling altruistic or “feeling good” about the work they have done are viewed as problematic in that they become petitions for grades, a hyperbolic text filled with confessions and the construction of a false narrative of growth and change simply because students know that is what instructors want to hear. Given that neither Jessica nor Caroline assigned grades for individual blogs, it’s likely that their students did not feel the pressure of discussing only happy, positive reflections. The absence of grades thus shifted the learning dynamic between teacher and student; the instructor became another member of the audience, someone who was there to listen to the student about their experiences rather than critique or assess the content of the reflection.

After examining the personal and emotional writing that English 121 students composed in their service-based reflections, it is evident that positive feelings of civic pride are not the only emotions evoked. Students often discussed challenging interactions that occur between them and the populations they worked with. For many of the English 121 students who served at after-school youth programs, for instance, attempts at disciplining and establishing relationships with their tutees often created feelings of frustration and anxiety. However, as their reflections revealed, these negative emotions often served as exigence to solving a specific problem. Similar to the in-class discussion time and student-led panel, the service-based reflections provided a space for students to channel their emotions into strategies for providing more effective service. Josh, a student in Kathy’s Autumn Quarter class, reflected upon the difficulties of tutoring young students and the solution he came up with:

The very next week I was having trouble with one particular child who wasn't enjoying long division Mathematics. She knew it well, she just didn't enjoy doing it. So. . .I was like "Okay, fine, you teach it to me." Because what I read from [one of our course readings], it's about every student having a different way of learning, a different style of wanting to learn or wanting to do something.

Here, Josh reflects upon a challenging situation with a student. Rather than simply describing the issue and moving on, he applied concepts from the course readings and used them to address the problem he was having. While emotions helped Josh identify and address an issue, his solution is still limited to somewhat localized thinking. That is, Josh only addressed the individual problem of how to help this one tutee better understand math. A question now emerges: What are some ways instructors can support students' personal reflections in a way that helps them move beyond an application of emotion to a single local issue and toward addressing issues on a much larger scale?

The presence of emotion especially within community-based writing is vital to the overall learning that occurs. As Smith and Hyde put it, "individual, the public, and human emotion go hand in hand" (449). That is, emotion is necessary for social change and inspiring public action. According to George Marcus, "politics often begin with the pursuit of some local interest or grievance. . .which to become political, demands specific emotional support, courage to confront those often more powerful whom one decides to oppose, or sympathy that attracts one to join someone else's fight" (45). When students can conceptualize our emotions as social rather than personal, they may be able to start developing an accountability and sense of responsibility for how social policy and other communal issues affect other people's lives. In addition, when students are working closely with members of different cultures, races, and classes, the emotions

that emerge function as a catalyst that may help students better understand the larger, macro-level implications of their work. In his blog, Rufus described a standout moment during his work at his community organization:

A volunteer from Seattle food bank gave us a speech, talking about how [the] food bank works. There wasn't anything like that in China. It's a really significant program. Give free foods to those homeless people every week. I wish I can bring this to my country cause there are also a lots (*sic*) of people need help there.

Anyway, after that, we started to clean the food storage. Find those which [are] past its best before date, throw them out, and move those fresh foods to another room. It's a lot of work. But everyone was glad to be a part of that. We finished very soon. That's probably the power of masses, I guess.

In this excerpt, Rufus reveals feelings of empathy and solidarity not just with the people he worked alongside and served at his community center, but also people in his home country. The emotions that emerged during this specific situation helped him form a connection between his service-learning experiences and his memories, specifically noticing a potential solution to issues of poverty and hunger in China. Towards the end, Rufus made a note of the “power of the masses,” hinting at a burgeoning understanding of the public’s role in social action.

For service-learning instructors, these are the personal writing moments that demand our attention. Ultimately, Jessica did not end up leaving feedback on this specific blog post, thereby missing an opportunity to help Rufus re-direct his emotions into a topic worth examining further through the class’s more formal assignments. One possible prompting question might have been, “What emotions or feelings did you experience at this moment?” This question would have

encouraged the student to explicitly articulate and recognize the emotions that he was invoking. A possible follow-up question would have been: “Were there other times during your service this quarter that you felt the same emotions? If so, when?” This would have helped Rufus draw connections to other service-learning related moments when he felt similar sentiments. Finally, the instructor could have asked the question: “Did this moment reveal a larger social issue you may want to explore further?” In this way, the instructor could have prompted Rufus to transform his perception of the moment from an isolated incident to an example of a larger sociopolitical issue. By creating specific guided questions, instructors can use emotional writing to help students make connections beyond the local context that could lead to the investigation of macro-level issues as well (Deans *Writing*; Emmons). This approach also parallels Christine Prebel’s discussion of a “pedagogy of discomfort,” which can help an instructor frame uncomfortable and challenging emotions as learning strategies in the writing classroom rather than something that needs to be suppressed.

The function of reflection within service-learning composition is a complicated, multifaceted pedagogical resource. As this chapter demonstrated, reflective practices are integral to helping both students and instructors bridge classroom concepts with the work they do at their community organizations. But effective reflection also requires careful guidance on the part of the instructor, whether in terms of scaffolding, creating opportunities for collaborative reflection between students, or guiding emotional writing towards productive inquiry. Reflection indeed functions as a powerful metaphorical space for effective writing and composing. As the next chapter demonstrates, however, reflection is not the only productive resource with spatial qualities in the service-learning paradigm.

Chapter 5: The Pedagogical Role of Physical Space(s) and Kairos within Service-Learning

Being new to Seattle, I had no clue which places were rich and poor. I remember taking bus 48 for the first time and riding it to my service site. The transition was literally so clear. As the bus came closer to my service site and went deeper into South Seattle, I saw how racially divided it was and how the area was less affluent. What we read about in class and discussed clicked. I realized how service was complex and how all those readings about literacy, education and service could apply to my life. The quote we read in class, “reading the word and reading the world” from one of the readings made sense.¹¹

Brandon, a former student in my English 121 class, wrote the above excerpt as part of his final reflection. His observation, though brief, demonstrates a powerful moment of transformative learning. Although the conception of physical spaces as social products was not a predetermined topic of the class, our overall course theme did explore the role of literacy education beyond the confines of the college classroom in untraditional spaces like prisons and community centers. My intention was to introduce and expose students to the intersection of education and race, class, and power; yet, conversations and classroom discussions often inevitably included observations regarding the physical locations of community partners and the communities that students engaged with.

Brandon’s quote and the data I collected from the English 121 program reveal an important component of composition pedagogy that warrants more attention: the implications

¹¹ Though Brandon was not one of my original participants, I personally reached out to him and asked if I could use his writing in this chapter. He has given permission for the quote to be used.

and effects of physical space on service-learning. As a field, composition and rhetoric has actively called for instructors to design writing pedagogy that incorporates space and place into students' composing process. As Christopher Keller and Christian Weisser suggest, however, studying physical space involves both the examination of locations and the activities they encourage, but more importantly also emphasizes "how those places and activities constantly shift and move in relations to one another" (5). Thus, there may not be a more fitting site for spatial rhetoric and place-based writing development than service-learning composition, given that students and instructors move across and between multiple physical locations, utilizing varying discourses and modes of communication. Because both the campus and the communities that surround it are encoded with ideologies of space and time, the direct physical engagement and guided reflection that service-learning pedagogy offers allow students to unpack and analyze such ideologies and their implications (see Letter and Livingston). Often, the most visible components of any service-learning program are the human participants: instructors, students, staff members, and the populations that pass through the community organizations. Yet, the non-human elements—abstract factors like *kairos* and movement—must be given equal attention. Thus, successful service-learning requires a more nuanced understanding of the pedagogy as a whole, beyond just acknowledging the significance of space. Rather, what is needed is an ecological conceptualization of rhetoric that values and accounts for not just the participants and locations, but also the activity that occurs between, within, and amongst them. That is, when designing, teaching, and assessing service-learning programs, instructors must not only consider the physical location(s) in which their pedagogy occurs, but how these physical spaces enact (and are acted upon) by other contextual factors such as time, actors, and material resources.

In this chapter, I provide a brief overview on rhetorical ecology, Actor-Network Theory, ecomposition, and kairos that when applied to service-learning pedagogy, can better help us recognize its unique interconnected and webbed structure, comprising of both human and non-human elements. Then, I highlight how past and current English 121 instructors address the influence of time and space within their courses, analyzing specific assignment sequences that emphasize physical space and kairos as part of learning how to write and compose. Finally, through interviews and reflective writing, I explore how students conceptualize the role of space within their personal service experiences to address issues of placelessness.

The Rhetorical Situation: Locating Exigence

The exploration of service-learning composition pedagogy as an ecology must first begin with Lloyd Bitzer's landmark text "The Rhetorical Situation" published in 1968. In his essay, Bitzer argues that all discourse functions as response to a deliberate situation; that is, there is an inherent relationship between the situation and rhetorical discourse that emerges, "just as a question must exist as a necessary condition of an answer" (6). Bitzer identifies the rhetorical situation as comprised of various constituents: the *audience*, individuals capable of being influenced by discourse; the *constraints*, described as the "persons, events, objects, and relations" (8) that can inhibit and influence decision or action. For Bitzer however, the most important component of any rhetorical situation is the *exigence*: the initial motivation that elicits the rhetor to respond. Of the three, the exigence is the governing constituent functioning as the organizing principle that "specifies the audience to be addressed and the change to be effected" (7). Interestingly, Bitzer also conceptualizes exigence as something that is lacking or deficient, an "imperfection marked by urgency. . . a defect, an obstacle" (6). Thus, all rhetorical action—verbal, textual, and physical—is a response that aims to repair or reinstate social order. In this conceptualization of rhetoric, the rhetorical situation presupposes any and all discourse. This

dynamic interconnectivity of exigence, audience, and constraints operates as “the very ground of rhetorical activity, whether that activity is primitive and productive of a simple utterance or artistic and productive of the Gettysburg Address” (5). The rhetor is thereby evoked and called forth by the rhetorical situation.

However, critics such as Richard Vatz have noted the lack of agency prescribed to the rhetor in Bitzer’s imagining of discourse. In his 1973 text “The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation,” Vatz argues that it is in fact the rhetor and rhetorical discourse that define and produce the situation. In his response to Bitzer, Vatz suggests that it is not that the situation controls the rhetorical space but that “the rhetoric controls the situational response” (159). He goes on to suggest that exigencies do not exist objectively and external to the rhetor, but rather are created through the rhetor’s utterances. In doing so, Vatz’s interpretation of rhetoric imbues great agency and power upon those who produce discourse. It is the rhetor that constructs the meaning and salience of a particular situation or event. Additionally, this conceptualization not only positions the rhetor as an autonomous subject, but positions them as the essential constituent of the meaning-making process. As Vatz states, “to view rhetoric as a creation of reality. . . rather than a reflector of reality clearly increases the rhetor’s moral responsibility. . . he must assume responsibility for the salience he has *created*” (158, original emphasis).

The deliberation over the source of exigency stemming from the situation or the rhetor creates a chicken-or-the-egg paradox. To move towards a more productive paradigm, Barbara Biesecker calls for a complete re-thinking of rhetorical (re)production and the involved subjects. Drawing on the Derridian notion of *différance* and deconstruction, Biesecker challenges the binary notion that discourse emerges from either “an objectively identifiable and discrete situation or an interpreting and intending subject” (121), noting that if we are to believe that

rhetoric has the ability to influence the audience and change their beliefs and values, then it is contradictory to discuss and imagine the audience as static, fixed subjects that exist outside the context of the rhetorical situation. Rather, the identities of subjects—both rhetor and audience—are fluid and dynamic, and rhetoric functions to “produce and reproduce the identities of subjects and constructs and reconstructs linkages between them” (126). Biesecker’s argument is a destabilizing one; the conversation on rhetoric shifts from a question of where exigence originates and toward examining the process of how rhetoric and discourse (re)create the relationship between the constituents of a given situation. This destabilizing framework also highlights the contextual nature of rhetoric, as Biesecker notes that both the rhetorical situation and the rhetor presented in Bitzer and Vatz’s rhetorical model are “underwritten by a series of historically produced displacements” (121). Thus, any discussion of the production of discourse must expand beyond the framing of “situation presupposing rhetor” (or vice versa) in a vacuum and acknowledge the influence of time and space on said production.

Biesecker’s notion of rhetoric thus reconceptualizes the paradigm from a linear model to one that is much more complex and interconnects a dynamic network of rhetor, audience, and exigence that also accounts for history and context. This framing of rhetorical activity and discourse is shared and nuanced by many other social theorists and disciplines, as we will see in the following sections. To note: this review of Bitzer, Vatz, and Biesecker is by no means a comprehensive guide to understanding rhetoric as an ecological and networked entity; to develop a fuller picture, the focus must therefore necessarily shift to scholarship on actor-network theory that can help inform and more accurately represent the type of work that creates and emerges from service-learning composition.

Actor-Network Theory

Service-learning composition, then, is also informed by Actor-Network Theory (ANT), another networked understanding of how constituents act on and respond to one another. In his path breaking 2007 work *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*, Latour defines and explores the social configuration that all participants—referred to as actants—are embedded within a network. But an actant is always part of multiple networks. ANT imagines actants as entangled and entwined simultaneously with numerous networks, such that it is difficult to trace exigence to any singular source. In addition, actor networks are unstable and dynamic; groups are constantly being formed and reformed. ANT also highlights some important characteristics of actants that must be considered. First, within Latour's network paradigm, "agency is no longer the sole preserve of humans" (Rickert 24). Non-human and material objects are also viewed as being capable of producing rhetoric. Building on Michel Callon, Clay Spinuzzi posits that ANT is a concept in which "text such as e-mails, technologies such as switches, humans such as technicians, and money in all forms put each other in motion, mediate each other, and transform each other" (40). Even immaterial concepts hold weight within networks. For example, Spinuzzi points out that genres, by stabilizing the production and interpretation of discourse, "impart some measure of stability. . .to the networks in which they circulate" (17). However, as much as they hold a network together, genres can also be hybridized and modified, consequently maintaining the dynamic nature of the network. In addition, the fact that all genres serve as antecedents to other genres demonstrate the intermediary and proliferating nature of non-human actants.

Scholars like Latour, Spinnuzi, and Daniel Brouwer that investigate and work with networks have also shown interest in studying not only the individual actants within networks, but the activity that occurs as a result of the interconnectivity. Much like Biesecker's call for the

closer examination of the process by which discourse enacts rhetoric, Spinuzzi argues that “what interests me is not the network so much as the *net work*: the ways in which assemblage is enacted, maintained, extended, and transformed; the ways in which knowledge work is strategically and tactically performed in a heavily network organization” (16). Interactions within an actor network, however, are also complex and layered, stretching across history, time and space. Latour uses the lecturer within a university classroom as an example:

What is acting at the same moment in any place is coming from many other places, many distant materials, and many faraway actors. If we wanted to project on a standard geographical map the connections established between a lecture hall and all the places that are acting in it at the same time, we would have to draw bushy arrows in order to include, for instance, the forest out of which the desk is coming, the management office in charge of classroom planning, the workshop that printed the schedule that has helped us find the room, the janitor that tends the place, and so on. (200)

ANT and its interconnected framing of actors, objects, locations, and activity has been utilized by a number of scholars in the writing and rhetoric field (see S. Holmes, Rickert, Shipka). Its application to service-learning is especially observable. Joe Follman points out that “because of [service-learning’s] clear link with social practices, sociological perspectives can help illuminate how service-learning is established, produced, and sustained at the school and school system levels” (2). Most service-learning paradigms also closely mirror the dynamic nature of actor networks. In many service-learning programs, for example English 121, the instructors, students, and community partners shift from academic quarter to quarter. Given the constant forming and re-forming of relationships, Latour would argue that accurately understanding and facilitating service-learning programs requires following the “actors’ own

ways and . . . the traces left behind by their activity of forming and dismantling groups” (29).

Another reason why ANT may inform our understanding of service-learning is the recognition of the agency and rhetorical force exhibited by non-human objects: “a school’s size, location, hierarchy. . . even its landscape and climate can all have significant impacts on the design, activities, success, or failure of [service-learning] programs” (Follman 6).

However, despite championing the application of ANT to service-learning, Follman argues that there is a recognizable hierarchy of importance between the human and non-human elements in any network. Follman states that there are key individuals that are fundamental to any service-learning program’s success or failure, and that “the importance of human agent is not sufficiently recognized in ANT as it relates to social systems like [service-learning]” (7). As the next section demonstrates, contemporary scholarship on ecocomposition and spatial rhetoric challenges this position, suggesting that the role of non-human objects within any service-learning program is just as important if not *more* important than its human counterparts.

Ecocomposition and the Significance of Space

The perception of the non-human and the material as capable of rhetoric is not new. The idea that physical space is a meaning-making force has been long-standing thought within rhetorical theory. One of the earliest relationships established between rhetoric and space can be traced back to Cicero and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. It was in this text that the five canons of rhetoric - inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, pronuntiatio - were first defined. One particular canon, memoria (“memory”) inspired a rhetorical technique that asked rhetors to utilize their relationship to physical objects as a way of enhancing their rhetorical effectiveness. The method of loci, a mnemonic technique, asked orators to draw connections between their memory and physical space and objects. The concept was first introduced in a story in Cicero’s *De Oratore*

about the poet Simonides. Simonides was invited to a dinner party and while stepping out, the roof of the house collapsed, killing the dinner guests. Friends of the deceased wanted to bury the bodies, but were unable to distinguish the crushed forms. As the story goes, “Simonides was enabled by his recollection of the place in which each of them had been reclining at table to identify them for separate interment” (467). The method of loci became a way for orators to remember their speech by associating different parts of the speech with distinct areas of a familiar architectural space. The speaker would imagine various objects that symbolized a particular topic (e.g., an olive branch to represent peace) placed around a house or building (e.g., the doorway of the common area). Thus, to recall the speech, the rhetor needed to only imagine traveling through the building in a pre-determined path, encountering each symbolic object. When a speaker mentally “encountered” the olive branch in the common area, he would be reminded to speak about bringing peace to the common man. The method of loci demonstrates the traces in classical rhetoric of utilizing an individual’s understanding of space and physical objects as a means of knowledge formation.

While the significance of physical space has been historically acknowledged, contemporary rhetorical scholars have turned their attention towards the formation and construction of spaces as social products. That is, space is conceptualized not only as a static location that individuals move through or inhabit, but rather an invention that perpetuates a reciprocal relationship with action and discourse. Michel De Certeau spoke of the significance of interacting with actual physical space—like the streets of a city—as a meaning-making experience. In Certeau’s view, the exploration of a physical space parallels the process of composing a piece of writing: “The walking of passers-by offers a series of turns (tours) and detours that can be compared to ‘turns of phrase’ or ‘stylistic figures’” (161). The exploration of city streets varies

from pedestrian to pedestrian, much as writing styles can vary between authors. A traveler may even choose to navigate the city in a way that it was not intended for, such as running in the wrong direction down a one-way street. Thus, the city, regardless of how it is planned out, ceases to exist as a place of meaning until navigated by the people that make up the space.

Other theorists such as Henri Lefebvre, Edward Soja, and Doreen Massey suggest that all spaces are inherently social in and of themselves, drawing more emphasis toward the idea that spaces are “constructed out of interrelations, as the simultaneous coexistence of social interrelationships and interactions at all spatial scales, from the most local level to the most global” (Massey 155). In addition, Lefebvre argues that space should not be viewed as a singular, preexisting entity but rather “as inextricably intertwined with the social relations that surround and constitute it” (Lesh 452). Echoing Lefebvre’s work, Edward Soja argues that “all social relations remain abstractions until they are concretized in space” (xiv). Space is therefore a dynamic conception, constantly affecting and being affected by the relations formed with it by other individuals, groups, and objects. An example of this conceptualization in action is given by Glynda Hull and Michael Angelo James in describing their local community technology center:

. . . located in a renovated Victorian that used to be a convent. . . in the heart of the West Oakland neighborhood known as the “lower bottoms, is a place. Our collective use of that place – through our curriculum and our social relationships, our pedagogy and our participants, and our vision of border crossing and multimedia making – turns that place into a lived space.” (77)

Theories of space as dynamic and interactive thus help researchers and scholars move away from observing only the physical materiality of a particular location and instead shifts the focus toward the socially constructed “place” that emerges via a complex process of interactions.

The socialization of physical space has garnered significant attention in composition and writing studies. Scholars like Nedra Reynolds draw special attention to the way that spaces and places are socially produced specifically through language and discourse. Pointing to the popularity of spatial metaphors in composition studies like “frontiers” and “borderlands”, Reynolds argues that our understanding of space is a fusion of the real and the imagined: “As they exist in our memories, in our daily lives, in our rooms or our imaginations, places and spaces are a swirling combination of metaphor and materiality. We carry this swirl of spatialities—some perceived, some conceived, some lived—around with us in every encounter with a place. . .” (175). Writing is thus inherently spatial, and contemporary scholars like Charles Lesh and especially ecocompositionists like Derek Owens and Christian Weisser call for more attention to how the process and products of writing, as well as writing research, all contribute to the social production of space.

If spaces are socially constructed through a dynamic amalgamation of discourse and language, then they cannot be conceived as simply “neutral” containers (Lefebvre *Production*, 94). Instead, Lefebvre argues that the spaces we inhabit are “political and ideological. [They are] a product literally filled with ideologies” (“Reflections” 31). Kevin Ball, echoing this argument, points out that viewing spaces as “only an arena for debate limits its potential as a site of knowledge and meaning for individual members” (180). Therefore, any inquiry into how physical spaces factor into the (re)production of discourse also requires a critical eye towards the production and circulation of knowledge and power. This is especially important for student writers in the college environment. Ball argues that “the field of composition has yet to imagine a theory of writing instruction that fully imagines the implications of the linkages between space, knowledge, and power of composition students within the intellectual work of the classroom”

(168). Similarly, Reynolds argues that “surroundings do have an effect on learning or attitudes towards learning, and material spaces have a political edge. In short, *where* writing instruction takes place has everything to do with *how*” it takes place (“Imagined” 20).

For many writing scholars, students’ perceptions of space matter greatly in their overall development as writers and learners. Both Ball and Johnathan Mauk have pointed to a crisis of placeless-ness that affects first-year students entering the university environment. Some experience a sense of disconnect towards their majors and academic departments, where academic spaces are not viewed as “an integral part of their intellectual geography” (Mauk 369). Others feel a need to erase their past dispositions; “it is this sense of starting over, starting anew with nothing, no one, and no place behind them that robs students of an awareness of spatiality. Students assume that their hometowns. . .are places they have left (in the past) to attend the university (which represents the present), with their careers (the future) lying promisingly before them” (Ball 172). Then there are those students who feel a sense of displacement due to a perceived hierarchy of space in which the university is perceived to be an arbiter of power and knowledge and all other communities are somehow below it. As a result, students undervalue the types of discourse and knowledge that can be produced in non-academic communities. Therefore, as scholars like Mauk suggest, we must complicate and expand our definitions of academic spaces beyond the boundaries of the university campus. Rather than framing the academic community as a singular, isolated location that students must cross into, “it is time for academia to embody and become embodied in the new spaces of academic life” (Mauk 386). That is, students (and instructors alike) ought to re-imagine the locations outside of the classroom and campus as capable spaces for composition pedagogy as well. Writing classrooms exist wherever and whenever students can carry out practices of writing.

The importance of place-based writing has been a major point of emphasis in the ecocomposition approach to composition pedagogy. Patricia Webb Boyd states that “no longer do we see writing as a ‘fixed’ task; rather, ecocomposition and place-based studies encourage us to study the complex ecological systems in which writing is constructed and reconstructed as well as to study how writing constructs and reconstructs those systems” (303). Within the university context, ecocomposition examines 1) the place that composition as a discipline occupies within the larger institution, along with how 2) writing instructors incorporate the study of physical space into their coursework. Much like how the dynamic networked structure of service-learning offers a site for the research and application of ANT and ecological theories of rhetoric, it is in public-facing rhetorical pedagogy where an ecological understanding of writing is most apt. As my findings in prior chapters reveal, much of the writing assignments that service-learning instructors create are connected in some way with the local community or students’ partner organizations. Students are often asked to produce textual artifacts for their community organization or conduct research that delves into the history of their local communities. These types of assignments support Nathaniel Rivers and Ryan Weber’s claim that “one single text or exigence cannot exist apart from its ecology any more than an animal or plant species can. . .rhetorical acts are dynamic, on-going, and open to influence” (194). Even if the assignments never truly reach the public, the simulation of an audience beyond the instructor helps students practice a mode of discourse that is designed to circulate and contribute towards a larger public. It is this conceptualization of writing as being a perpetuating and dynamic entity that ultimately construct the publics that we as citizens inhabit and move through. Scholars like Michael Warner conceive of publics as having ongoing life, maintained by a continuous dissemination of discourse that define and redefine its structure and identity. In addition, they are

not brought into existence through any singular rhetorical action, but through discourses that challenge, support, and reference one another. Within community-based pedagogy like service-learning, writing instructors position publics not as pre-existing static entities, but as ecosystems molded via continuous discourse and that students have the ability to influence with their own rhetoric.

Various theorists and scholars have noted that an awareness of how locations “matter” in terms of discourse and rhetoric cannot occur solely within the four walls of a classroom, with instructors and students discussing hypotheticals. Boyd suggests that “if we are going to study social relationships, we need to make sure we look beyond our usual sites of study” (291). In addition, there is a danger to discussing the theoreticals of geographic locations instead of physically traveling and engaging with them. Reynolds argues that spaces, when left “imagined” hide material consequences (*Geographies* 27), while Hull and James note that community-based academic work helps “move beyond depictions of local neighborhoods that only romanticize or demonize [and] towards understandings that build on historical, social, and spatial analyses” (88). Through community engagement, students mark their locations of learning, “making them visible, valuable, and viable within the intellectual work of the classroom” (Ball 185). Expanding the academic learning space into the community is also integral to students gaining critical understanding of social issues, a key objective to service-learning pedagogy.

In order to do this, service-learning composition instructors must design courses that recognize neighborhoods and community organizations as not merely sites of service or work but living texts – complete with their own history. As Ball argues, “a critical pedagogy must begin with the fundamental of students beginning to ‘see’ and imagine their communities as sites and sources of meaning making for their education within the university community” (184). The

“seeing” that Ball describes requires that students consistently visit the community organizations, travel through local neighborhoods, and work directly with staff members and/or the populations that utilize the organizations. When students re-enter the writing classroom, assignments and discussion help students reflect critically, thereby creating connections between their service experiences and certain social issues, power dynamics, and ideally – space. By physically traveling into local communities and directly serving and working alongside populations outside of the university context, Ball believes that students “are better prepared to become advocates of those communities, moving beyond description or affirmation to assertion: using writing to speak within, about, and for those communities” (169), a viewpoint that closely mirrors Deans and the “writing for/with/about communities” objective that frames service-learning composition pedagogy.

Service-learning and its ability to move students outside of the traditional classroom space has also played a significant role in modifying the flow of knowledge between the instructor and teacher. Since instructors are incapable of serving alongside every one of their students at every community organization, they must relinquish some classroom authority and rely on their students and their writing to get a sense of the local communities; as a result, students have some agency over the trajectory of the course, as well as their own learning. Follman notes that “in the [service-learning] context, teachers transform from deliverers of content to facilitators of learning. Students are transformed from passive and unempowered recipients of knowledge to active designers of projects and learning” (10). Ball parallels this argument, suggesting that the direct contact and the service students conduct alongside their community partners influences their overall learner disposition; “as a result of their fieldwork within local communities, students—the true “workers of the composition classroom—develop a

voice both as writers and as unique individuals” (185). It is this voice that helps students construct the relationship between their writing knowledge and service experiences in the composition classroom; they are then able to use what they have learned about rhetoric and discourse to bring an authentic representation of their community organization back into the university context.

The Importance of Kairos

While physical space functions as an important element within the rhetorical ecology, composition pedagogy must acknowledge the significance of kairos as well. That is, instead of examining the relationships between the nodes of the rhetorical network in a universal context, the importance of timing and how arguments are influenced by the opportune moment must also be considered as a component within the ecology of rhetoric. Historically, kairos has been described as a governing concept with roots in Sophistic, Platonic, and Ciceronian rhetoric very similar to Bitzer’s view of exigence and Vatz’s view of the rhetor; it has also been described as the controlling principle of rhetoric, determining both its creation and aim (Carter “Stasis”, Kinneavy). Kairos, which is difficult to concretize, is described as an invitation to rhetorical action (Carter “Stasis”, 106), as well as a “‘sense of urgency’ embodied within a particular time” (Poulakos 29, qtd. Carter “Stasis”, 106). Although the ancient Greeks had two concepts for time, it should be noted that kairos is distinct from chronos. While chronos refers to time in a chronological and sequential manner, kairos is “interpretive, situational, and thus ‘subjective’” (Benedikt 226). That is, there is an inherent sense of awareness that comes with kairos, where the rhetor recognizes a particular moment or situation as being distinct from others. Carolyn Miller states that kairos “[constructs] an opening in the here and now, in order to achieve something there and then” (“Opportunity” 83). This awareness is important, especially when considering

the underlying ethics or morality of an argument. As Benedikt argues, “what this means is that the right action at the wrong time is not kairic. Neither is the wrong action at the right time kairic. An action that is morally right at the present moment may not be so in the next” (227). The development of kairotic awareness relies on the rhetor to also develop a body of skills and knowledge in regard to a topic or issue. As an example, Benedikt refers to oyster farmers whose fishing and cultivating skills have led them to know exactly when to harvest and when to allow pearls to continue growing in size. Thus, “a sense of kairos depends on sufficient degree of *self-knowledge* to be able to assess the situational context in the first place” (230, original emphasis).

Scholars like James Kinneavy have especially called for the emphasis of kairos in composition pedagogy. Kinneavy directly locates kairos within the rhetorical ecology, describing it as “the appropriateness of the discourse to the particular circumstances of the time, place, speaker and audience involved” (84). Kairos captures the situational context of all language and discourse, thereby making it an important concept to be emphasized in writing courses. Its incorporation into the classroom helps combat the inauthentic process of inquiry and writing scenarios that some argue plague composition as a whole: “With thesis thus pre-determined, research is approached as primarily a process by which to identify and accumulate material to match the pre-determined positions” (Foster “Revisited”). Instead, exposing students to the intricacy of kairos as a rhetorical force means that the “right” argument becomes a complicated and nuanced point of introspection. Helen Foster reiterates that kairos allows students to develop “an awareness of the existence of multiple positions, situated specifically but differently along a continuum of value, each of which speaks from a situated ethic. . .” (“Revisited”). Students move away from analyzing whether positions are simply right or wrong to opening their thinking up to evaluating the relationship between argument and context, rather than just the argument itself.

In ancient Greece, rhetoric was situated within the community – a skill taught to citizens so that they could solve communal conflicts and contribute to the benefits of a greater society. Kairos, as a concept, helps individuals understand the social foundations of rhetoric. Kinneavy notes that Pythagoras “gave further complexity to the concept of kairos, linking it closely with the basis of all virtue, particularly justice, and consequently with civic education” (81). As a point of emphasis within a composition curriculum, kairos helps students develop an understanding of not just how to apply their rhetoric, but *when* to do so. Specifically, an understanding of kairos can help students “better identify a response appropriate to moments of opportunity in their own lives” (Nelson 60), as well as the sociopolitical issues that frame the communities they are a part of. Therefore, any composition pedagogy that highlights the versatility of rhetoric cannot be limited to only departmental jargon or the discourse of the university. Rather, instructors must find avenues that allow students to communicate and engage with larger a public context as well – the context that students occupy the majority of their day-to-day lives. Kinneavy, emphasizing the significance of kairos in composition pedagogy, suggests that there is a need to “devise a college composition program that will have ethical, epistemological, rhetorical, aesthetic, and political dimensions involving something like a notion of contemporary practical relevance to the young men and women of today” (93). Although he never explicitly names service-learning composition as a potential paradigm, its unique position within the university—overlapping and intersecting with multiple local spaces and communities—provides writing instructors with a genuine opportunity to introduce and facilitate kairos as a rhetorical concept. What’s more, Kinneavy argues that the most important aspect of teaching kairotically is that students have a “realistic audience, apart from the teacher” (103). By designing assignments that prompt students to research the community or write with government

officials as their audience or interview the staff members they serve alongside, service-learning provides instructors the opportunity to develop a curriculum that is dynamic and flexible.

Students ultimately will get to work in a spontaneous environment that allows them to utilize their understanding of *kairos* in a truly authentic fashion.

Kairos and Space

While composition as a field has explored the functions of time and space as separate constituents within the rhetorical ecology, there has been significant attention dedicated towards how time and space operate *together* as a rhetorical force. Contemporary scholars have emphasized the significance of “space-time,” a hermeneutic that examines how time and space intersect as a means of understanding the “material and social processes of the production of culture, language, and history” (Mutnick 41). As Lesh echoes, space-time “alerts us to not only attend to the *when* or the *where*, but to the *when and where*” (450, original emphasis). Adding to the definition of space-time is the spatial conceptualization of *kairos*, which not only defines the concept in relations to timeliness, but in terms of spatiality as well. As a rhetorical force, Thomas Rickert argues that *kairos* is more than just an opportune moment in time for the execution of a particular action, but it also contains a spatial dimension. The opportune moment depends on executing a particular action at the right time *and* at the right space. In thinking about *kairos* spatially, Rickert suggests that it “moves us from a subjectivity of semiautonomous willing agents to something like subjectivity as condensations of probabilities realized in movement, materialized in space, and invented in place” (97). In other words, *kairos* without the recognition and acknowledgement of space leads to too much emphasis put on the rhetor and their own ability to control and determine the “right” timing and not enough awareness about what the situation or context actually affords. The subject should not be perceived as an independent,

autonomous being, wielding kairos as a rhetorical tool whenever they please. Instead, kairos is conceptualized by Rickert as a distributed entity that “encompasses all elements composing the situation” (86). Through his conceptualization of kairos, Rickert pushes for a rhetorical model where rhetors, non-human objects, locations, and immaterial constituents like exigence are not merely nodes that are connected within a network, but rather components that are all *dependent* on one another and rhetoric emerges from the interconnectivity. Subjectivity, rather than granted to a single component, is dispersed throughout the web itself and kairos “is not simply the grasping of an opportunity that opens up for a rhetor; instead the blurring of the interacting elements demonstrates a rhetor to be enmeshed with kairos and hence indistinguishable from it” (83).

Let us use a basketball player taking a shot in the middle of a game as an example. The traditional conceptualization of kairos—seizing the right opportunity—credits the player with all the agency; he or she has control of the basketball, determines the precise moment when they are unguarded, and concludes that was the most appropriate time to take the shot. Rickert’s version of kairos would involve the player, his/her teammates, the opposing players, the court, the current score, the fans, and the team’s current win-loss record all together. The decision to shoot the basketball at that precise moment is not just the player’s decision; if the player is unguarded but at a different location on the court, or maybe if the team is currently down by 2 points with only 5 seconds left to go, then it is entirely possible that the “right moment” to shoot the ball would have never emerged. Thus, Rickert’s notion of kairos takes much of the agency away from the individual and attributes it to the entire ecology that makes up the context.

Rickert’s vision of kairos further helps develop a lens through which to explore the rhetorical ecology that is service-learning composition pedagogy. While composition has taken

up an ecological model of writing, Rivers and Weber argue that the concept has not yet “fully migrated to pedagogies of public rhetoric” (189). Building from Margeret Syverson’s criticism, they argue that public rhetoric pedagogy is too “atomistic,” often misrepresenting the complexity of any writing environment by “focusing on individual writers, individual texts, isolated acts, processes, or artifacts” (8, qtd in Rivers and Weber 189). To assign students disconnected writing assignments or even separating the rhetorical situation into distinct elements like rhetor, audience, or context risks oversimplifying the understanding of rhetoric as an ecological force. Based on the various physical locations that make up service-learning and their influence on instructors and students, a major point of investigation in this chapter is: how do current English 121 instructors employ an ecological model of rhetoric and writing in their courses? More specifically, what types of service-learning assignments and coursework disperse subjectivity throughout the rhetorical ecology, pushing students to engage with both material components like physical space and immaterial components like kairos?

Coding for Time and Space in English 121

For this chapter, I approached my data set through a lens of analysis that focuses on the ways in which instructors present an ecological conceptualization of rhetorical and writing pedagogy. In terms of instructors, I coded interviews for explicit references to the various locations and organizations that made up the English 121 experience and how instructors perceived their relationship to those spaces. Then, in looking at their assignments and syllabi, I examined whether or not instructors acknowledged the rhetoric of space within their pedagogy and if so, how they were incorporated into writing tasks. In addition, I also paid attention to how instructors addressed logistical issues, thereby granting me insight into the role of kairos in their courses. I employed a different coding approach for students, given that their service-learning

experience required much more travel between and through differing spaces. While coding students' reflections and writing, I focused on their recognition of space as a meaning-making force, paying particular attention to how they were discussing the physical characteristics of their service experiences and the communities they served at their sites.

Findings reveal that emphasizing space and time is crucial for service-learning pedagogy, but ultimately can be challenging and complicated for composition instructors. However, when implemented effectively, students gain a more in-depth and nuanced understanding of their service work, and can also help students develop a stronger sense of agency and authority at their community organizations.

Teaching Spatially and Kairotically in English 121

Institutionally, English 121 as a program attempts to attune instructors to the complicated process of teaching kairotically, especially for first-time service-learning instructors. In the orientation manual, instructors are made aware of the difference between teaching composition when it is isolated within the university campus and community-based writing. The manual specifically points out how conflicting schedules with partners may force instructors to modify their academic calendar:

Community-based work may affect the timing of assignments in 121, particularly assignments relying on sustained experience at community sites, experience which may not be sufficient until late in the quarter. Because this may make it difficult to devote the final class sessions of the quarter entirely to revision. . .English 121 teachers may want to assign completed versions of some sections of the portfolio earlier in the quarter. (2015-16 *Introduction to English 121*)

Typically, instructors teaching general expository courses like English 131 will have complete control over the pacing and facilitation of their assignments, followed by revision work and final portfolio construction during the last two weeks of the academic quarter. However, given the unpredictable nature of community work, English 121 instructors are instead advised to split their portfolio into multiple components, with students completing different sections of it as the quarter progresses. The orientation manual also warns instructors of challenges that might develop when deciding which community organizations to partner with:

. . .For example, it might be important to have a smaller number of organizations, each willing to take on several of your students, so your students can work in site-base groups for discussion, presentation and writing projects in your class. This is definitely possible, but might not work if you want very much for your students to volunteer at [organization name redacted], because this organization only takes one or two students each quarter.

(2015-16 Introduction to English 121)

Thus, from the moment of orientation, the English 121 program attempts to frame service-learning pedagogy in a networked and decentralized structure. Instead of students and community partners yielding to the schedule of the academic institution, there is concession on the part of the department to modify their curriculum structure in order to fit the schedules as well as the physical capacity of the community organizations.

One noticeable example of how English 121 establishes an ecological understanding of rhetoric can be seen in the reciprocal relationship between service work and course content that many English 121 instructors stressed in their pedagogy. For many of them, the interconnectivity between the activity occurring within the classroom space and the work that students were doing at their community organizations was central to the course's overall success. Kathy articulated

that the physical nature of students traveling to community organizations and working alongside after school programs was a necessary conduit for students to effectively experience her educational equity theme.

[There is] enrichment of actually being able to go out there and see what's happening. To some of my students, it was a huge thing. They could hear about it and learn about it from the textbook. . .but when they're actually there in the field and they see the obstacles that some of the students that they're tutoring have, the things that they're dealing with, then they come back and go, "There's not equity in education, I get it."

For other instructors, however, the relationship between text and service was reversed. Nathan, who developed an environmental-themed service-learning course, noted that classroom content helped students comprehend and rationalize the nature-oriented work they were doing, even if it seemed unrelated to actual service.

Most commonly, students have a hard time seeing the "value" in the work that they do in parks and on trails, since it doesn't strike them as serving people in the same way that working at a food bank or tutoring math does. With that in mind, we have a couple of conversations (one based on the Davis [reading], one later based on a critical log entry) about how environmental service work impacts the community, and talk about the various "levels" on which it can be said to either help or not help (ecology, society, personally, etc.)

In examining these reflections, exigence for writing comes from neither just the classroom nor just student service, but the dynamic interaction between the two spaces. In truly ecological fashion, rhetoric as a meaning-making force is not isolated to a single point of exigence, it comes from the activity of synthesizing classroom and community. Then there are

instructors like Charlotte who conceptualized English 121 not as a network of interlocked locations, but as a site where various communities are blended together; that is, service-learning served as the perfect opportunity to teach rhetoric and communication that broke down the conceived barriers between academic and non-academic spaces. The writing that emerges from the course cannot be isolated to one space or the other, but to an aggregation of influences. When reflecting on the affordances of English 121 that were not available to her in English 131, Charlotte observed that she could, through her course, make an argument that

attention to language, writing, and academic context is not separate from “the real world” but academic contexts do shape social interactions for better and worse. There is still work to be done to ensure that writing assignments and scaffolding support the connection between ‘academic’ and ‘real world’ (or demonstrate that the divide is nonsensical).

Establishing this learning environment is no easy feat. The acknowledgement and coordination of multiple schedules across multiple physical spaces was a challenge that numerous instructors acknowledged in their interviews and end-of-year reflections. Prior to her first quarter teaching service-learning, I asked Caroline about the major differences she predicted in teaching English 121 as compared with English 131. She responded, “I think last year my focus was really on students engaging with their writing, and this year it will be not only engaging with their writing, but engaging with their service.” For Caroline, integrating her writing pedagogy with the logistics of civic engagement was the key to a successful quarter. Yet, a major barrier to successful integration in the service-learning program at the University of Washington is the limiting structure of working in a 10-week academic quarter. As documented by scholars like Elizabeth Tryon and John Eby, short-term service-learning can create logistical difficulties and

produce feelings of tension and uneasiness for all parties involved. It can also function as a barrier for students in terms of entering their community organization as a credible insider. As Josh, one of Kathy's students verifies in his final portfolio reflection, "although I have been working with [organization redacted] since the beginning of the school year, it was not until this winter quarter that I really felt connected to my service. *I think a lot of that has to do with just the sense of time and how it takes longer than one quarter to form relations with the students*" (emphasis added). Thus, in order to develop an effective curriculum in a short academic term, many instructors had to teach "kairotically," finding effective ways of syncing their curriculum with their students' service schedules. Kathy noted that during the winter quarter, she had to delay the implementation of her service reflection assignment, as "some of [the students] were jumping into their service week five, and some of them actually week six. One student was week seven, so I pushed back that final service reflection as far as I can." Caroline indicated a similar problem in her first quarter:

I asked students to write a personal essay called "Why I Serve." It was a great way to get them personally invested in the idea of service-learning, but since they had not yet chosen their community partners (or at least hadn't had an orientation yet) they couldn't do much to apply their previous experiences toward the current situation.

When designing courses, instructors also have to consider the schedules of their individual students. Instructors Jessica and Jamie both discussed challenges that came with finding time in the classroom for writing development, while still balancing time for student service as well as their midterm and exam schedule. As a solution, instructors often reduced the amount of course readings and instead treated service as a text, a source for research and inquiry for students. Based on these findings, service-learning—comprised of the time and labor that

students dedicate outside of class time—is manifested in a material form *within* every course. It occupies a tangible space in the English 121 ecology; the community organizations and the time students dedicate to them have significant influence on the overall structure of the course.

In order to mitigate scheduling and timing issues, instructors often construct certain components of their course specifically to address logistical challenges. As Sally indicated in her end-of-year reflection, “I was able to head off a lot of issues simply because I was teaching in a CIC (computer-integrated classroom) . . .so I got everyone on the EXPO site¹² and forced them to sign up, show me their confirmation, and email their organization to arrange an orientation.” Other instructors conceptualized their writing assignments to simultaneously help students write toward the EWP outcomes as well as engage with their community. This practice is nothing new; as the findings in chapter three reveal, English 121 instructors often create writing prompts that accomplish multiple purposes. However, Jessica’s first assignment is intended to not only help students practice reflection and genre awareness, but to also establish contact with their community partner and set up an orientation time. Her prompt reads:

After you register with your service learning organization and receive confirmation from the Carlson Center, write an email to your supervisor. Your purpose is to introduce yourself and arrange to attend an orientation session at the organization. In your email, you should:

1. Introduce yourself to your volunteering supervisor.
2. Request to set up or attend an orientation at your service learning organization.
3. Use style and tone that are appropriate for this particular writing situation.
4. Strategically use or adapt email conventions from your own experience or examples.

¹² EXPO is the UW-affiliated website that English 121 students log on to in order to select and register with the community partner they wish to work with.

Upon completing the email, students were asked to reflect on their writing process, specifically analyzing the email genre for its purpose, audience, and textual conventions. In doing so, Jessica created an assignment that gave students the opportunity to practice outcome 1 of the EWP outcomes, but also ensured that students began their service on time so that subsequent service-oriented writing assignments could be facilitated without issue.

Other logistical challenges commonly mentioned by instructors result from the geographic locations of their community partners, specifically in regard to movement and travel between campus and service site. Instructors reported that students often felt uncomfortable or unprepared to use Seattle's public transportation in getting to and from their community organization. As one instructor Lyla reflected:

Transportation difficulties are also common. I take the bus everywhere and I pretty much have for my whole life and sometimes I forget that most of these kids live on campus and have never been on a city bus before. One of my students actually told me last quarter that public transportation is a form of welfare and city buses are for poor people and she didn't feel comfortable "accessing that type of resource" . . . [Another] one of my students took the 43 [bus] instead of the 48 one day and apparently that was "the scariest" day of her life as she wandered down Broadway by herself.

Addressing issues of transportation required English 121 instructors to embody a larger administrator disposition during the initial weeks of the quarter, as well as in-depth collaboration between instructors and students.

After listening to her students' safety concerns, Lyla stated that she now "will pull up the trip planner and show them their exact bus route for every single site. We talk about what to do if they get lost. . .the more you can do to familiarize students with the routes and the system, the

easier it is for them.” Nathan, who also brought up transportation issues in his end-of-term reflection, instead puts the onus of transportation logistics on his students: “My second quarter, I made sure to have students meet each other before starting and organize carpools, since that was one of the single biggest complaints from my fall quarter students.” Ecocompositionists have also conceptualized methods of transforming movement and travel into potential teaching moments. As Julie Drew points out, we as instructors “must realize that students pass through, and only pause briefly within, classrooms; they dwell within and visit various locations, locations whose politics and discourse conventions both construct and identify them” (60). However, Lyla’s excerpt complicates Drew’s argument in that it is not only fixed locations that are politicized; movement and the act of “passing through” are as well. That is, similar to Spinuzzi’s interest in the activities that emerge between the nodes of a network, the transportation act itself contains rhetoric and is thus also worthy of further analysis and inquiry. Drew pushes for the abolition of thinking about learning environments in a neat, structured way, instead suggesting the classroom should be “within the pedagogical, rather than locate the pedagogical within the classroom” (61). By drawing students’ attention toward moments of discomfort as they physically move between communities, instructors are able to emphasize and drive home the concept that all physical locations—stationary or in motion—are socially-constructed products, embedded in sociopolitical issues such as race, class, gender, and identity.

In examining the most common logistical challenges facing English 121, there are also issues that mirror the spatial-oriented conceptualization of *kairos* as discussed by Rickert. That is, there were some situations in which the effectiveness of a course relied on timing *and* location. Both Caroline and Charlotte mentioned how the availability of one of their community partners—a university-sponsored farm—was dictated by a seasonal schedule. The cold winter

season meant that the farm closed and thus prevented students from being able to serve there. In this case, we see how the trajectory of the course was affected not just by the physical location of the community partner or their schedule, but the blending of both.

When it comes managing logistical issues—whether in relations to time or place or both—first-time instructors and students alike must recognize that service-learning composition is a different environment than traditional college writing courses. Both must recognize that the various human and non-human elements of the program can (and often do) influence curriculum development and facilitation. As Nathan states, “[English] 121 essentially forced me to design a class based around materials that easily connected to service and social experiences, and forced me to examine my practical pedagogy a bit more carefully.” Assignments and course readings no longer exist within the vacuum of the classroom or even the university but instead must be in negotiation with differing timelines and locations. Under these circumstances, writing as an action and process becomes much less author-driven and much more situated within the service-learning network itself.

Understanding Space through English 121 Assignments

Many of the assignment prompts collected as part of the data set attempted to situate rhetorical exigence within a social setting, asking students to write for, with, or about the communities they are engaging with through service-learning. However, instructors often present a limited view of the rhetorical situation, asking students to focus primarily on audience awareness. For example, one assignment prompt in Emily’s class asks students to critique the rhetoric of a food-related text, making a complex claim “about the social or cultural underpinnings of [the] text, including the implications of those underpinnings.” Emily goes on to advise her students: “**Analyze** your text(s) to learn about the **social context in which it occurs**—

the specific **audience** it is targeting, *how* that **audience** is being targeted and *why*, and the goals/values of the **text's creators**" (original emphasis). While Emily stresses to her students the need to investigate the context in which the food text is situated, she only mentions the human components, asking students to consider the author's and audiences' values and attitudes, but disregards other elements that may structure the rhetorical situation surrounding the food-related text, such as the history of the text, the culture in which it is embedded, or the materiality of the text itself. Similar language is also found in Sally's second assignment of the quarter. Students are asked to translate a text from their service-learning site, "this can be a brochure, a website, or any other written or visual text," and write a paragraph that summarizes the argument of the text for "someone who is at least five years younger than you are. This can be anyone—a younger cousin or sibling, for example—but be sure to have an *actual, specific person* in mind" (emphasis original). Again, while this assignment may teach students about recognizing the relationship between tone and language in relation to a specific audience, it still restricts in-depth rhetorical analysis. For one, students are asked to translate a service-learning artifact into a summary paragraph, but depending on the situational context and exigence for writing, a paragraph may not be the most appropriate genre for communication. Thus, Sally inadvertently limits the rhetorical range of the assignment, despite the prompt stating that students had full agency in determining the audience.

The most ecologically-oriented English 121 assignments are those that not only ask students to demonstrate audience awareness, but an awareness of the larger environment as well. In her spring quarter course, Jessica created an assignment that asked students to work in groups to create and deliver a multimodal presentation about their community partner. However, Jessica specifically designated a kairotic moment that students had to consider while completing the

assignment: an on-campus informational event at UW known as Dawg Daze. As her prompt states:

Dawg Daze is a way for new students to get a lot of information in a short amount of time about different opportunities for getting involved in different groups and services on or near campus. It's also an opportunity for many campus-affiliated groups and organizations to recruit new members, customers, or other types of participants. With the other members of your service organization, you will be giving a presentation to incoming UW students who have signed up for ENGL 121 about why they should choose to serve at your particular service learning organization. (Be aware that community investors may also be attending this session!)

Although students did not actually present their presentation at Dawg Daze, there are still a wide array of factors that must be considered in order for the assignment to be completed accurately. Not only must students create a presentation appropriate for a college-aged audience, the situation also dictates a specific purpose: educating the rest of the UW community about their organization, as well as recruiting future volunteers. The kairos of Dawg Daze will also impact the composition process; students must create an engaging presentation that catches the attention of Dawg Daze participants, most of whom typically move throughout the entire space, staying only briefly at each table. These details, when combined together, present students with a much fuller understanding of how rhetoric is often dictated by a situational context that encompasses much more than just the human audience element.

To emphasize the role of context in writing, other English 121 instructors ground their service-learning course in the city of Seattle itself. As I explained in chapter four, Caroline created a five-part critical log in her food-themed curriculum that asked students to frame their

service-learning experience via themes of “accessibility,” “sustainability,” “personal,” “local,” and “global.” These critical logs attempt to connect students’ service-learning experience with a wide variety of aspects in the overall ecology. For each entry, students are asked to observe and describe a particular event that occurred during their time at their community organization:

Describe what you did, who you interacted with, conversations you had, and any other details about what happened while you were working for your service organization.

Include details. Explain your thoughts and impressions about what you experienced.

What were you feeling? Was the overall experience positive, negative, or a little bit of both, and *why*? (original emphasis)

Caroline’s prompts invite students to simultaneously describe the rhetorical elements (e.g., other individuals, physical activities, resources utilized) that appeared during their community engagement work, as well as reflect upon their feelings and moments that emerged as those moments unfolded. By tracing their reactions back to a specific time and place, students can better understand how their service is capable of producing rhetorical action. After the description section, each critical prompt also calls for students to analyze how each experience intersects with one of the five themes. For example, the “local” prompt states:

In 1-2 paragraphs, answer the following prompt: How does your service experience, and/or your service site as a whole, connect you to the social/food issues in Seattle? What issues are city-specific? How does your service experience help you better understand/connect to the city of Seattle? What local issues are you encountering or do you still want to learn about?

An examination of how one’s service is related to local and global histories is necessary in order for students to practice and develop a habit of critical analysis. Through the logs,

students can see how the conditions around Seattle influence or are influenced by macro-level issues, or how common service-learning topics such as race, poverty, or growth are reflected at the neighborhood or community level. What's more, student responses to the "personal," "local," and "global" critical logs revealed strong recognition of space and time as rhetorical forces. In her "personal" critical log, Trinity expresses the following:

My service relates to me personally by teaching me the importance of farming, even when living in a large city such as Seattle. Coming from a small town with a lot of land, farming was much more common and I didn't think about the implications of sustainability. I don't think that I have a strong personal stake in farming, but I do care about keeping urban areas sustainable. Especially on a large campus, it's important to supply our own foods rather than simply relying on large food corporations to supply processed foods to students.

The opportunity for Trinity to evoke memories allows her to draw a connection between Seattle and her hometown via their differing geographies. Through this recognition of difference, she was able to identify larger social issues – the importance of food sustainability within urban environments.

As Trinity continued to investigate the Seattle geography in her subsequent "local" critical log, she was able to further analyze the interrelationship between physical urban space and food production:

The first time I saw the farm location at Mercer Court, I was amazed by how much the farm was growing in such a limited space. . . The farm here helps to provide foods to a large urban campus that generally receives food from large food corporations and rarely

has local fresh produce. My service helps me better understand the process and time that goes into a farm to table experience.

Through Caroline's critical reflections, the community organization where her students serve become much more complex; as students describe and reflect upon them and intertextualize their experiences with personal, local, and global issues, they transform from simple backdrops to complicated entities that are comprised of what Rickert calls "an affective, circulating, and evolving series of encounters" (44).

Another instructor, Robert, whose course theme was "Class, Race, and Space," utilized Seattle-specific readings to help students gain an understanding of the history of Seattle as a city and location: "Excerpts from Timothy Gibson's *Securing the Spectacular City* and Coll Thrush's *Native Seattle* help historicize and contextualize some of the more extreme poverty some students will be exposed to, especially around the downtown shelters." The benefit of this pedagogical decision is two-fold. Like Caroline's critical logs, focusing on Seattle as a physical space that all students inhabit or pass through regularly allow students to localize the effects and consequences of the work their community partners are doing. In addition, the Seattle-based readings provided a logistical advantage. Given the length of the academic quarter, it would be difficult for students to learn the historical and material conditions of Seattle by physically traveling through the city. Thus, the readings introduce students to the situational context in which the course and their community organizations are grounded.

One final standout course came from Ethan, who developed a service-learning course investigating the role of weather in social issues. For Ethan, the key was to get students out into the physical communities as part of the research and inquiry process; specifically, various assignments call for students to explore the University District, the neighborhood surrounding

the UW campus. As he states, “I’ve typically tried assigning students in my EWP classes that gets them moving, but [in English 121] that’s encouraged. Thinking of assignments that might have students really and experientially move through and interact with their community is pretty powerful.” By selecting a neighborhood in close proximity to the campus itself, Ethan ensures that students are capable of accessing the physical space without personal vehicles or public transportation. In the second assignment of his curriculum, students must compose a workplace memo to the staff at their community organization explaining the relevance of a public document titled the “U District Design Framework” (UDF). Distributed by the city of Seattle, the UDF is a guide that aims to inform residents and business owners in the neighborhood about zoning and design guidelines, city investments, developing private development and community projects. Then, in the first major writing assignment for his class, Ethan prompts students to “draw from [their] analysis of the U District Design Framework to develop and argue a complex claim evaluating the relationship you see within it between the U District community and its environment (particularly in the context of climate change).” In the assignment prompt details, he specifically instructs students to address three components:

1. “The U District community”: Take some notes on how a few sections of the [UDF] seem to use words like “community” or its synonyms. Do you get the sense in the planning document of a neighborhood community? Of many smaller communities? *How does this sense from the planning document compare to the sense of community you’ve experienced as a student and as a service-learner?*
2. “Relationship [to] environment”: *Are there differing versions of what “the environment” means here? How does the natural environment (and maybe weather specifically) seem*

to come into this document? Is it present or absent? embraced or opposed? a challenge or an opportunity?

3. “Complex claim evaluating. . .”: Think about how parts 1) and 2) fit together. *What changes (or what is at stake) depending on the relationship the document imagines between the U District and its natural environment? Does the relationship to the environment seem uniform across the community or communities? What kinds of points of connection does the document offer between the built environment and the natural environment? Who and what is being imagined into the future of this neighborhood, and how? Should a reader concerned about climate issues approve or disapprove of the way this neighborhood is being planned—and why? (emphasis added)*

In reviewing Ethan’s instructions, we can see that his primary objective is to have students explore the University District through a lens informed by Lefebvre’s triad of spatiality: conceived space, perceived space, and lived space. Conceived space is defined as “the space of scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers” (*Production* 38) – space as defined and imagined by dominant groups in society. Within the context of this assignment, the U District neighborhood as depicted via the language of the UDF is the conceived space. Perceived space, described as the “material expression of social relations in space” (Reynolds *Geographies*, 15), reflects how the U District as a space is *actually* utilized, which may differ when compared with how it is conceived in the UDF. By asking his students to investigate points of difference in the projection and reality of the U District as a community and environment, Ethan is setting his students up to understand the neighborhood as a lived space - a complex social product constructed out of the intended and unintended actions of those who inhabit and pass through it.

As the findings reveal, there are some instructors who already approach service-learning composition as an ecology. Their themes, selection of course readings, and assignments guide students toward an understanding of rhetoric as a meaning-making force that cannot be traced to any one singular constituent. And, yes, we cannot avoid asking how such an approach to rhetoric and composition pedagogy benefit the students. By closely examining the student writing that comes out of English 121, it becomes clear that students not only gain an awareness of their surrounding local communities and environments, but certain students, especially those coming from another country, also begin to develop a personal sense of voice and agency through service within those spaces.

Eliminating Placeless-ness

As the findings reveal, service-learning composition and the expansion of writing pedagogy beyond the university campus has had a significant effect in helping students develop a more nuanced understanding of rhetorical awareness and exigency. Multiple students mentioned a transformed understanding of learning, from something that occurs only within a classroom to a networked process that occurs at the community organizations as well. During our interview, Amy confessed that

Honestly, before the class started, I thought service learning was just like, “Oh, you're taking a class and you are volunteering while taking a class.” There's no real correlation between it. But then [Holly] made us [realize]. . . it's not about the volunteering itself. It's more about applying things and thinking about new ideas or concepts or just being socially aware of your surroundings. And the environment you are in.

Similarly, Kathy's student Josh mentioned that although he had just been introduced to service-learning prior to taking the course, he “actually found the concept really interesting, where you

don't just study in the classroom. There is an outside component to it. . .It's all about the learning experience.”

An ecological conceptualization of learning and knowledge production was not the only thing that students acquired from English 121. One unanticipated advantage of service-learning pedagogy is its potential to reduce the sense of placelessness that many students experience as they enter the college environment, especially for international students. For many of these students, their disposition as outsiders are amplified significantly during service-learning; many are not only strangers to the university environment, but Seattle and even the country as a whole. The feeling of disorientation is painfully captured in a blog that Lucy, an international student from China who was in Jessica's Autumn course, kept:

Before I take this class, I have only stepped in America for nearly one month. I still remembered when I go to a bank to open an account, the banker told me he will find a translator for me because he can't understand my English. I was stuck in depression for many days and at that time my biggest hope is to speak English fluently. When I first come to the class, I remembered the first discussion is very embarrassed for me because I can only said, "You say first" and hope I can avoid speaking.

Lucy's excerpt reveals the degree to which physical spaces are constructed socially through language and discourse and just how prominent a sense of placelessness may be for newcomers to the US. The language barrier that Lucy experienced not only isolated her from Seattle, but the English 121 classroom as well.

For many international students, the community organization that they served at and the populations they interacted with played a significant role in helping them establish a sense of community. Case in point: one of the most popular English 121 partners is the Asian Community

Collective¹³, a community center located in Seattle's International District that is geared toward helping Chinese and other Asian immigrants and their families. For many of the Chinese students who served at this particular organization, their bilingual identity functioned as an advantage within the space of the community center. As one student in Kathy's Autumn Quarter reflected on her time there:

Sometimes [the kids] tend to speak Chinese in the classroom and it's kind of challenging for us to tell them not to do so especially when they realized that we can speak the same language. However, it's also advantageous to explain something to them in both Chinese and English when they barely understand what's the content they're reading about.

Through a shared cultural background and language, Chinese students serving at the Asian Community Collective are able to simultaneously establish a stronger relationship to their community organization as well as gain a greater understanding of the neighborhood and the immigrant populations that it serves. In addition, the transformation of their native tongue from a disadvantage to an advantage helps international students shift from an outsider to an insider role in Seattle and begin seeing the city as a more familiar space. Although further research is warranted, the initial findings here demonstrate the importance of service-learning instructors selecting the appropriate community organizations to partner with their course.

The acknowledgement and analysis of time and space as rhetorical elements is crucial to the success of any service-learning composition program. As the findings in this chapter reveal, many of the courses and assignments developed by past and current English 121 instructors help students conceptualize rhetoric and writing as an interconnected activity influenced by a multitude of social factors. The past four chapters have examined service-learning through an

¹³ Name of organization has been changed to preserve anonymity.

ecocomposition-based lens, focusing particularly on genre, reflection, and space. The concluding chapter aims to take those findings and use them as a guide to develop a revised English 121 model that more effectively integrates academic and non-academic influences, thereby constructing a more ecological understanding of service-learning composition pedagogy. Specifically, what are the types of relationships that can be formed between instructors, students, and community partners? How can such a curriculum be structured and sequenced in terms of assignments? Finally, how can the writing that emerges from the curriculum be assessed?

Chapter 6: Building Towards an Ecological Understanding of English 121

In this culminating chapter, I return to the objective that was set at the beginning of this project, which was to examine service-learning composition pedagogy—specifically taught through the English 121 program at the University of Washington—through an ecocomposition-oriented lens. That is, I sought to analyze the webbed and incredibly nuanced environment that is constructed when academic writing is integrated with community engagement, and the specific pedagogical strategies and techniques that composition instructors employ in managing and addressing the various demands placed upon their curriculum. Ultimately, my goal for this final chapter is to reflect back on findings that have emerged from the previous three chapters and combine them with scholarly research on writing program administration and assessment in order to propose a model of English 121 that is more ecologically-oriented. Specifically, my proposed service-learning composition model focuses on the further development of three English 121 components: faculty training and orientation, re-orientation of the departmental outcomes toward more recognition of community-based writing goals, and potential assignments that guide students to investigate and explore the local communities that their academic work is situated within.

In keeping with the grounded theory approach, I used in examining my data, I analyze my findings on the role of metagenre, reflection, and spatial rhetoric in English 121 as well as instructor interview responses in order to construct a contextualized and accurate representation of the program. In addition, I put my findings in conversation with contemporary research on writing program assessment and administration and propose potential pedagogical tools that will result in a service-learning composition program that attunes all participants—from instructors and faculty to community partners and students—to the unique ecology that is English 121. My

proposed model for the program represents an intersection of both theory and praxis, drawing from theory while still being grounded in the locality of the service-learning composition program here at the University of Washington.

The Place of Service-Learning in Writing Program Administration

On the basis of my interviews with Kathy, Jessica, and Caroline, as well as my review of the end-of-term surveys from past English 121 instructors, it is clear that while many appreciated teaching a composition course that extended beyond the traditional writing classroom, there was a lack of self-confidence when it came to leading and facilitating a service-learning composition course. Much of this anxiety can be traced to the lack of a formal orientation training program for first-time English 121 instructors. That is, the orientation process for service-learning composition pedagogy is much less structured than the English 131 orientation, the traditional expository writing course offered by the English department. In preparation for teaching English 131, instructors go through a strict 7-day schedule that includes an introduction to the EWP writing outcomes, syllabus development and revision, assignment workshops, and classroom management techniques. In addition, during the first quarter of teaching English 131, all first-time instructors are required to take English 567, a graduate seminar titled “Theory and Practice of Composition,” where instructors work together to explore readings that discuss the theories and practices that govern writing pedagogy. As the seminar’s syllabus states, “in the process of examining various theories and practices, we will work together to understand the ‘why’ behind the ‘what we do’ and ‘how we do it’ when we teach writing.” (Rai and Bawarshi). The course culminates with instructors developing a teaching portfolio, composed of a teaching philosophy statement and annotated samples of artifacts that they will use in their personal English 131 course.

A major notable difference between the English 131 and English 121 orientation schedule is the time dedicated to training instructors¹⁴. The orientation process for English 131 totals roughly 40 hours of training and workshop time, as compared with the 10 total hours dedicated to English 121. In addition, the English 131 orientation is much more condensed, occurring consecutively across 7 days during the end of the summer, whereas the English 121 orientation is divided into individual workshops that occur during the Spring Quarter after instructors are first notified of their upcoming teaching assignment and during the Autumn Quarter when they have already begun teaching their English 121 course; the summer is thus skipped entirely. A third difference is the absence of an ancillary pedagogy course like English 567 that supports service-learning pedagogy. Although the English 121 program provides multiple texts and readings for instructors via the online community page, instructors are not given the opportunity to share, discuss, and explore the texts collaboratively in a course; rather, instructors are left to their own accord to figure out how to apply the service-learning pedagogical theories to their classes. The abbreviated orientation hours, untapped use of time during the summer term, and absence of a supplemental seminar suggest that the English 121 program relies heavily on instructors to draw on their English 131 teaching experience as they enter into newly appointed service-learning positions. As a consequence, rather than conceiving of English 121 as a completely new teaching ecology in which multiple communities are integrated and participating together in the process of knowledge production, traditional expository writing is still conceived as the central node while service-learning is a supplemental component that instructors are expected to easily add to their previously-developed composition curricula.

¹⁴ For comparison, see Appendix 3 for a detailed outline of both the English 131 and English 121 orientation schedule.

Not surprisingly, my interviews with the three English 121 instructors and the end-of-term surveys gathered from English 121 instructors reveal a very different perception of the program. Many first-time instructors describe a sense of unfamiliarity and uncertainty in their ability to lead a service-learning classroom. For Caroline, her biggest concern was the inability to facilitate class discussions that would help students address any uncomfortable service-learning experiences in a productive manner: “That’s. . .one of the reasons why I was not wanting to teach this class, but also wanting to teach the class. Because talking about the scarier issues is something I don’t quite feel comfortable with, with my level of teaching experience and training.” Because of the added component of community engagement, Caroline considered her role in the classroom to go beyond simply teaching writing – it now included a mediating element that she felt was not addressed during the English 121 orientation process. During our final interview, she lamented,

Really, I think with this course, especially just ‘cause I don’t feel like I have the training to address [social issues] very well myself, I am always in fear of doing it the wrong way, in terms of shutting a student down or something like that. . .honestly, [after] our training last quarter. . .and even in the fall, I still have no clue what we were even doing.

Caroline brought up one specific moment in which a female student approached her about feeling unsafe working with the population at her community organization, which Caroline was not sure how to handle: “[The student] emailed me at the end of the quarter just saying how much she appreciated what a good listener I was through that. . .the listening really helped her, but I wouldn’t know what to do beyond listening.” As my last chapter demonstrated, many instructors recognized and embodied the expansive, dual instructor/administrator disposition that was required in the service-learning classroom. However, as Caroline’s testimony reveals, there

were intricacies beyond the logistical aspects of service-learning that required more in-depth training.

English 121 instructors also revealed a sense of disconnect from the other major influences of the program, namely the Carlson Center and their community partners. Although the current orientation does include numerous interactions between instructors and the Carlson Center staff, the infrequency has led to various moments of miscommunication between the two participants. As Jessica explained:

I feel like a lot of times, when we have the meetings with them at the Carlson Center, they are so immersed in that culture of service learning that sometimes they don't really understand how someone outside of that is trying to be integrated with [them]. I mean, they do acknowledge that but there's times when they'll be trying to communicate something to me. . .but I don't really recognize what the appropriate response is.

She recalls an instance when she was unsure of the process for getting students registered with community partners:

I've mentioned to students, "You need to go to the Carlson Center. If you want me to go with you, I will." . . .but I know that there's been times when, based on the way [the Carlson Center] words the email or the way they talk with me, they'll mention something like, "Oh yeah, it's great that you are supporting your students in this way or helping them, but maybe you need to empower them more to take responsibility for these things themselves." . . .Sometimes, I get kind of mixed signals like, what is my role as a teacher? Should I be supporting the students, going with them to the Carlson Center? Or, is it just like "go, do your thing with the Carlson Center"?

Similarly, in Caroline's experience, the lack of interaction with the Carlson Center led to an unfamiliarity with the program resources available to her:

I feel like there are a ton of resources available to me through the Carlson Center. I don't necessarily know what they are, and I haven't quite taken the time to ask. . . I just feel like there are a ton of resources, I feel very supported, I just feel like I don't necessarily know what all of them are.

In the issues that both Jessica and Caroline raise, the lack of opportunities to interact and collaborate with the Carlson Center staff prevents first-time English 121 instructors from fully entering the service-learning discourse community. That is, miscommunication in Caroline's example came about due to her inexperience with the ideals, values, and practices of the Carlson Center, while Jessica had a very abstract view of the material elements that made up the service-learning environment. As a result, both English 121 instructors remained outsiders to the service-learning community, despite being asked to teach within it.

In addition to the Carlson Center, instructors teaching English 121 also brought up a similar pattern of miscommunication with community partners, an issue that has been discussed frequently by service-learning researchers in the past (see Becket et al.). During our interviews prior to her first quarter of teaching, Kathy recognized the potential benefits of having more engagement with community partners, particularly for students:

If each organization was able to send a representative and the Carlson Center were able to organize that, I feel that would be amazing. . . It might also force some of those organizations that are less structured to step up their game because they would have to present, "Okay. This is what the student expectations are going to be, and this is what

we're going to do and offer to you so that you know how we're structured.” So, the ones that aren't structured might need to bring something more concrete to the [course].

Without more in-depth and continuous communication between instructors and their community partners, their students end up becoming what Jessica refers to as the “primary information conduits,” thus relying on students and their writing to gain access to their community partners. As these excerpts demonstrate, English 121 instructors view effective service-learning pedagogy as being supported by multiple components, not just the English department. The Carlson Center and the community partners cannot simply be passive elements, but must *extensively* participate in the formation of the ecology. In the following section, I propose an English 121 instructor orientation model that emphasizes consistent interaction and participation between the instructors, Carlson Center staff, and community organizations, as well as potential pedagogical resources and heuristics that may assist incoming writing instructors in the facilitation of their curriculum.

The move toward developing a collaborative pedagogy in WAC programs—the programmatic umbrella which service-learning composition pedagogy falls under—has already been suggested by scholars in the field. As Martha Townsend notes, instead of writing instruction being developed in an isolated manner by individual faculty members, “larger units of faculty are now coming together to determine essential connections between programmatic, learning, and writing outcomes” (82). Yet, according to Shirley Rose and Irwin Weiser, writing that engages the public and service-learning pedagogy have been relatively unexplored within writing program administration (5). There are a multitude of reasons; for one, it is hard to research and develop writing program administration that address service-learning due to the highly-contextualized nature of community-based writing. As Nicole Amare and Teresa Grettano

have noted, budget issues, student responsibilities outside the classroom, building connections with community organizations, and training faculty can differ to a great degree between institutions, thus making it hard to construct service-learning paradigms and models that are transferrable. This has resulted in a large collection of data on service-learning, but germane only to the institutional framework from which they emerged. Consequently, as Eyler and her colleagues have pointed out, external verification of the positive impact of service-learning on students' writing skills development are mixed, and this issue is intensified by the high cost of time and resources required to conduct research in service-learning composition settings, as compared with more traditional classroom-based writing instruction (3).

The objective of this section is not to argue for a one-size-fits-all set of guidelines for English 121 instructor training and development that is applicable to all university-level service-learning programs; rather, it aims to highlight the benefits of providing more writing program development and administration that reflects the collaboration between academic and local communities rather than through a lone department. Eli Goldblatt advocates for the importance of WPAs to recognize and possess an ecological-oriented view of writing, even if the home institution does not possess a service-learning program: "Whether or not students in a writing program work with people off campus, the context of literacy in the immediate area and the larger region of a school can be a powerful factor in the thinking of a WPA" (292). In this particular conceptualization, instructors, university staff, and community organizations are all "participants within a social network and an implicated subject within a political process" (293).

English 121 Orientation and Training: A Proposal

In order to help new instructors effectively utilize their prior English 131 experiences during the English 121 orientation process, I have developed a heuristic influenced by findings

that emerged from this project. Specifically, in chapter 3, it was apparent that many of the assignments that instructors created for their service-learning course—despite reflecting different genres—could be classified within the same community writing-based metagenre. Based on this finding, I have created a resource that instructors can use during their orientation to help design assignments that not only address EWP outcomes, but also draws on students’ service-learning experience:

Assignment name	Which EWP outcome(s) will this assignment help students demonstrate?	How does this assignment demonstrate the EWP outcome(s)?	How does this assignment help students write <u>for</u>, <u>with</u>, or <u>about</u> their community organizations?	What assignments or genres do students need to know in order to complete this assignment? What subsequent assignments or genres will this assignment help students learn?
<i>e.g., Short Assignment 1-</i>	<i>e.g., Outcome 1.3 - The writing has a clear</i>	<i>e.g., Students must rhetorically analyze a text or</i>	<i>e.g., Students are given the opportunity to</i>	<i>e.g., Students need to know summary as</i>

<i>Rhetorical analysis essay</i>	<i>understanding of its audience and various aspects of the writing (mode of inquiry, content, structure, appeals, tone, sentences, and word choice) address and are strategically pitched to that audience.</i>	<i>document that is currently being utilized at their community organization.</i>	<i>learn about the community organization they are joining; in addition, students gain a sense of the language/genres that construct their community organization.</i>	<i>well as how to organize an academic essay. After completing this assignment, students will have a better sense of how to produce a relevant artifact for their community organization.</i>
----------------------------------	--	---	--	---

Figure 6.1. English 121 Metagenre Resource

The resource is broken up into four different sections. The first two ask instructors to frame a potential assignment in the context of the EWP and to reflect on how it helps students demonstrate one or more of the writing outcomes that govern all 100-level UW English courses. The third category prompts instructors to consider their assignments within a service-learning context. Specifically, in what way does the assignment allow students to incorporate some aspect of the community into their writing? More importantly, the category asks instructors to think about whether students write for, with, or about their community – the three objectives that

govern community-based writing courses as detailed by Thomas Deans. By drawing on their attention to those three purposes, the table helps instructors become aware of possible imbalances in terms of community engagement, such as students too often writing about a community partner rather than with them. The final category in the resource is designed to help instructors begin to see their service-learning curriculum through an ecological lens. Instead of designing assignments that are isolated from one another, instructors must now consider how an assignment functions as an antecedent or ancillary genre to another task or project.

Another gap that instructors identified in their orientation process is an unfamiliarity with the community partners that they are working alongside. Thus, an additional revision to the English 121 program would be to extend the responsibility of the English 121 Director and the Carlson Center Director to include a community-based observational duty as well. In the EWP program, all 100-level courses are facilitated by an Assistant Director (AD), who in addition to handling classroom issues, also participates in classroom observations. These observations are especially emphasized during an instructors' first year of teaching and prove to be a valuable tool in helping new instructors gain feedback on their pedagogy. Although the English 121 Director does spend time observing incoming instructors, they are strictly limited to observing the on-campus classrooms. As the past chapters have demonstrated, the educational landscape in a service-learning context is much more dynamic than it is in a traditional writing curriculum, as the classroom often extends beyond the campus. The moments that emerge during a student's time at their service site can greatly influence their overall development as not just writers, but as participants within the local Seattle community. To overlook the community partners in the observation process is essentially to ignore a major component of the service-learning experience. It may, therefore, be more beneficial for the English 121 and Carlson Center Director

to observe and collect basic information on each of the incoming instructors' community partners prior to their orientation.

As guidance, we may be able to draw from the observation practices of ADs in the University of Washington in the High School (UHWS) program, a cross-institutional program that offers high school teachers across Washington State the ability to teach college credit-bearing courses within the localized context of their own schools. As part of their administrative duties, ADs who oversee UWHS English teachers are required to travel and observe classroom instruction at various sites across the region with the goal of providing feedback to teachers on how well they are synthesizing the EWP writing outcomes into their local English curricula. Much like how off-campus observations provide UWHS ADs with more insight into the interconnectivity between the EWP and high school English departments, instructors in the English 121 program could benefit from learning more about the community organizations that students are being asked to enter. The following is a form I developed for English 121 on the basis of the observation template used by UWHS ADs:

Observing Coordinator:	
Date of Visit:	Community Organization:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which neighborhood is the community organization located? What public transportation options can students use to get there? What is the parking situation like (e.g., street, lot)? 2. Provide a brief description of the population that the community organization serves, as well as the activities that English 121 students will be asked to facilitate: 3. Based on staff responses, what type(s) of service are they expecting from English 121 students? 4. Based on staff responses, do English 121 students have the opportunity to write <u>for</u> or <u>with</u> the community organization? If so, in what capacity? 5. Any comments from the staff or other members regarding the English 121 program? 6. Any additional comments that may be useful for the English 121 instructor or students to know? 	

Figure 6.2. English 121 Observation Form

The guiding questions on the form are designed to cover multiple areas of the organization so that incoming instructors get a clearer sense of how to integrate their writing curriculum with the values and objectives of the community partner. Details regarding getting to and from the site is helpful to students during the initial registration period, while information on student expectations and writing opportunities could help instructors create assignments that would afford students the opportunity to draw on their service experiences in a productive and effective way. The completed form would also be digitally archived on the English 121 Community Page, along with past instructors' teaching portfolios, making it an accessible resource for all future service-learning instructors. Despite the initial labor of visiting multiple community

organizations, it is likely that the directors would not have to observe the organization every year; details like transportation logistics and student expectations tend to stay static. Instead, regular correspondence via email or phone could be maintained by the director or the instructors themselves and the observation form could be updated in smaller pieces, depending on any revisions to a particular organization's structure.

Another alteration that can potentially address many of the issues raised by instructors is the addition of a supplemental sequence of workshops that incoming English 121 instructors would take during their first quarter of teaching, similar to the required seminar for new English 131 instructors. A set of workshops would help new instructors recognize and bridge the difference between traditional composition pedagogy and composition pedagogy informed by community engagement. They would also function as a space where English 121 instructors could begin to refine the hybrid teacher/administrator disposition that characterizes service-learning pedagogy. To facilitate this shift, workshops would be co-led by the English 121 Director and Carlson Center Director. This would give everyone an opportunity to engage with the Carlson Center as a discourse community on a more frequent basis as well as to develop the administrative aspect of their teacher identity under the guidance of experts.

Similar to English 567, another advantage of having mandatory workshops is the ability for new English 121 instructors to discuss and analyze readings and theories (both of which they already receive) related specifically to service-learning and community-based writing pedagogy in a classroom setting. Given that new instructors are still outsiders to the service-learning community at the beginning of the academic year, simply presenting resources is not enough. As Caroline revealed in one of her earlier statements, new instructors also need guidance from community insiders to understand how to utilize said resources. Thus, multiple workshops during

their first quarter as service-learning instructors would facilitate consistent interaction between new instructors and Carlson Center staff and subsequently promote more familiarity with the service-learning program not only from the perspective of the composition classroom, but the Carlson Center as well.

During these workshops, students would not only explore the theories and praxis that govern service-learning, they would also contribute research and knowledge into the local English 121 context. In line with how the program is currently set up, incoming instructors will still be asked to produce a teaching portfolio at the end of the academic year, consisting of sample assignment prompts and an end-of-term survey. However, the addition of workshops would afford instructors the opportunity to track their curriculum development through weekly reflections. As findings from chapter 4 reveal, reflective writing plays a key role in helping teaching assistants make sense of their service-learning experience; it also provides a metaphorical space for them to slow down, stop, and analyze the learning that occurred in the classroom and at their community organization. It is important to recall that English 121 students were only able to reflect productively through consistent guidance and prompting. Therefore, the reflective practices that governed the English 121 classrooms serve as an ideal model for guiding instructor reflections during the workshops as well.

Susanne Harrington argues that in order to foster increased self-awareness in writing programs, we ought to look towards the same reflective strategies we use with our students. In terms of writing program administration, reflection can function as not only a research tool, but one that helps map the potential trajectory of the overall program, as it “moves us to ask questions like ‘What is the program learning?’ ‘How is that learning occurring?’ and ‘Where do we want to go next?’” (145). Currently, new instructors are only asked to reflect in an end-of-

term survey, with the main purpose being to provide future instructors with detailed insight into the specifics of the English 121 experience. However, without a series of reflections that scaffold up to the final end-of-term survey, instructors ultimately reflect for the pedagogical development of others rather than for their own. In the proposed workshop sequence, instructors would be required to keep a weekly log that asks them to integrate concepts from course readings with their classroom experiences, while also detailing specific successful and problematic events that may have occurred in their classroom. Finally, based on the findings of the advantages that come with collaborative reflection, instructors would be expected to share out their observations with one another to generate a list of potential strategies for addressing service-learning issues in the local English 121 context.

The revisions proposed above—pedagogical resources like the metagenre chart and the community organization observation form, as well as a supplemental workshop sequence that provides incoming English 121 instructors with a structured space to discuss and reflect upon service-learning pedagogy—are carefully designed in response to issues raised by past and current instructors. If some of these changes were implemented, new English 121 instructors would gain a clearer understanding of the components that make up the service-learning ecology, as well as find the discourse community itself much more accessible. However, it is not just the orientation process that challenged new instructors; the departmental writing outcomes and assessment practices can also be modified so that they can more effectively respond to the writing that emerges from service-learning curricula.

Proposing Updated Assessment Practices for English 121

The role of assessment in composition pedagogy has undergone a long and complicated process. In her article “Looking Back as We Look Forward: Historicizing Writing Assessment,”

Yancey recounts the development of writing assessment in three waves. The first wave, which occurred between 1950 and 1970, took on the form of objective tests that measured the mechanical aspects of writing such as punctuation use and grammar. According to Yancey, these tests often addressed students' knowledge of writing and literacy *prior* to their time in the classroom and were used as a tool by institutions to determine what courses students would be placed into as well as what type of content would be covered in a given course. It was not until the second wave, which Yancey marks as lasting from 1970 to 1986, that writing programs began to implement a more direct measure of students' writing by holistically assessing writing a produced in the course itself. Yancey specifically points to a pedagogical model that various writing instructors and administrations borrowed from the Advanced Placement Program; the course would culminate with a final essay test rated by teacher-readers using selected anchor papers and scoring guides, as well as an agreed-upon method of determining what constituted "acceptable" writing. It was during this second wave that composition programs became more concerned with the validity of their assessment practices. While testing procedures that measure students' knowledge of grammar was reliable and provide a transferrable form of assessment across various educational contexts, such a test does not accurately determine a student's ability to write and compose.

The third wave, which extended from 1986 to the present day, is characterized by the portfolio, which instructors use to assess not a single final essay, but rather "multiple writing samples on different occasions and in various rhetorical modes" (138). Not only did a wider range of writing provide a more accurate representation of a students' overall writing ability, it also offered a method of assessing writing that parallels how it is most commonly conceptualized: as a socially situated action that is constructed by (and constructs) the

environment in which it is embedded. The call for writing programs to acknowledge the importance of context in their assessment practices has been especially emphasized by scholars like Brian Huot. In his 2002 text *(Re)Articulating Writing Assessment for Teaching and Learning*, Huot argues that “assessment practices need to be based upon the notion that we are attempting to assess a writer’s ability to communicate within a particular context and to a specific audience who needs to read this writing as part of a clearly defined communicative event” (102). To ignore or overlook context while assessing student writing would ultimately distort the student’s writing ability in an inaccurate manner. At the conclusion of his book, Huot puts forth a list of guiding principles for writing assessment practice, which include more attention to assessment that is site-based, locally controlled, and developed collaboratively. Although Huot did not explicitly reference service-learning composition in his text, it is evident that his principles for assessing writing fit well within a service-learning composition program like English 121. Especially in the context of service-learning, assessment can be a delicate and complex process; both Kathy and Caroline expressed difficulties in tailoring the overarching EWP outcomes to suit the needs and demands of community-based writing. As Caroline described it, the EWP outcomes, despite their emphasis on developing students’ rhetorical awareness in a variety of writing situations, still were unable to address some of the genres that students were using to express their relationship to their service-learning work:

I see assignments where it's like, you're writing about what you're doing at your community partner, or you're using your personal experiences to have your final paper. . .and I'm like, “I don't know how to make that fit the outcomes. I don't know how to give feedback on that.” I had [my students] do that their first quarter, where they had to

say, what's your personal service philosophy? And I was like, "I do not know how to give them feedback on their personal service philosophy."

For Kathy, it was only when she began to conceptualize English 121 as distinct from English 131 that she finally felt confident in her ability to teach the course: "I think it was helpful to me to finally figure out that I didn't have to follow exactly the structures that were in place for 131. Trying to feel like I need to be meeting those expectations literally. . . it gave me less, I feel like, less latitude to focus on the service-learning." By trying to adhere strictly to the EWP outcomes, Kathy expressed concern that her curriculum actually restrained her pedagogy by limiting the types of writing she was able to assign in her course.

While it is possible that some of these issues can be alleviated through more training and orientation time via workshops, the challenges that instructors face in assessing the writing that comes out of English 121 raise an interesting question: Does the EWP need to follow Huot's call for more locally-constructed and context-specific assessment practices and develop a set of writing outcomes exclusively for its service-learning courses? As indicated in chapter 2, all 100-level EWP courses are governed by the same set of four writing outcomes. However, what separates English 121 from all other 100-level writing course (i.e., English 109/110, 131, and 111) is its collaboration and involvement with community organizations and the Carlson Center – both of which are situated outside of the English department. It can be argued that the contexts in which English 121 writing (and writing pedagogy) occurs in are more nuanced than those in other courses, which are taught strictly on the UW campus and therefore require a different standard of assessment and evaluation. This, however, is by no means a simple process. Pamela Steinke and Peggy Fitch argue that the nature of service-learning often demands an evaluative process that captures the transferable "real world" skills they aim to develop in their students:

“An increase in service-learning assessment may lead to a greater emphasis overall on assessments that better measure those skills and abilities needed for success outside academia” (28). In other words, service-learning instructors ought to be looking for evidence of knowledge transfer in the work their students produce. However, as researchers have argued, transfer can be difficult to study because it’s difficult to define and identify (see Beach; Wardle). Thus, the most important element to consider when assessing service-learning writing—and perhaps what is not provided in the current set of EWP outcomes—is an objective that prompts students to demonstrate the symbiosis between their writing development and their service-learning work. As instructors, we must go beyond simply asking students to write *about* their service. Instead, as Steinke and Fitch argue, “assessments must demonstrate that local service-learning efforts enhance locally specific student learning outcomes” (24). To nuance this point, I would argue that it is just as significant for students to demonstrate the reciprocity of service-learning: how did learning and writing designed to address the EWP outcomes help their service-learning?

Rather than completely modify the EWP outcomes, a supplemental outcome could potentially be added that specifically addresses the link between service-learning and composition:

Outcome 5: To demonstrate an awareness of how service and community engagement contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of the EWP outcomes, as well as how the skills gained in the English 121 classroom contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of service-learning.

One option for assessing how well students are demonstrating this outcome would be to revise the final portfolio sequence that all students taking 100-level EWP courses must complete. As it stands, the final portfolio is comprised of an introductory cover letter, four critical reflections

that articulate how the students demonstrated each of the four EWP outcomes through their produced writing, a final reflection that summarizes their learning experiences over the course of the quarter, and a compendium of their written work. The portfolio is graded holistically and ultimately makes up 70% of the student's final grade for the course. For students taking English 121, it may be valuable to replace the initial cover letter or the final reflection with a service-oriented reflective essay. This proposed portfolio model mirrors the one that Kathy developed for her English 121 curriculum that requires her students to compose and include a "My Service" essay in their final portfolio.¹⁵ Kathy's prompt begins to guide students towards examining the link between the work they do at their community organizations and her course theme of educational equity. However, if we wish to assess students' abilities to link their writing knowledge with their civic engagement, we would need to develop a prompt that includes more explicit language aimed at addressing the newly proposed EWP outcome. Here is one possible example:

"My Service" Reflection: For your final portfolio, please compose a critical reflection *that weaves together your experiences at the community organization with your development as a writer*. Specifically, in what way did your own service-learning experiences contribute to your understanding of the EWP outcomes? Which outcomes became easier to grasp because of your work with your community organization? How so? *Conversely, which of the writing and composing skills you learned in the English 121 classroom help you in the process of writing for, with, or about your community organization, and in what way?*

¹⁵ A detailed version of Kathy's "My Service" Prompt can be found in chapter 4.

The addition of a service-related EWP outcome in the English 121 program and the associated critical reflection are significant in that they reinforce the uniqueness of service-learning as a hybridized pedagogical space.

As the above prompt shows, students are asked to integrate their various experiences, rather than strictly focusing on their academic or civic development. Scholars like David Fleming have raised concerns about public-engaged writing courses becoming so focused on students composing public genres that the critical aspect of the course falls by the wayside. As he notes, “I worry that in turning so definitively toward ‘society’ and away from ‘school,’ we may be neglecting aspects of classroom education that are not necessarily antithetical to a genuinely practical mission for rhetoric and composition. . .there is still a need for academic discourse; the function of ‘school’ and its discourses” (215). David Coogan parallels this argument in his article “Service Learning and Social Change: The Case for Materialist Rhetoric,” where he discusses a service-learning project that failed to generate parents’ involvement in Chicago public schools. After reflecting on the events that unfolded, Coogan notes that the project ultimately failed because students and staff “were thrust into rhetorical production. . .before they had done any rhetorical analysis” (687). Specifically, Coogan and his co-researchers failed due to inaccurately assuming the means of generating social change, via producing public texts and advocacy documents, “that [were] either unrealistic or irrelevant to the life experiences or priorities of the parents” (687). Effective community-based writing courses require more than the production of a material artifact; they also require analysis of local historical context facilitated by an instructor within a classroom setting. While the local publics that lie beyond the campus—both the familiar ones that students inhabit as well as the unfamiliar community organizations they are just beginning to enter—operate as sites for students to learn about varying discourses and

ideologies, the classroom environment and the work that occurs there is crucial for providing a time and space where students can critique and closely examine the issues they encounter in their daily lives.

Another tool that may contribute to a more effective, locally-constructed assessment process is a rubric that English 121 instructors can utilize for evaluating students' reflective writing. As Caroline mentioned earlier, like service philosophies, personal writing is difficult to evaluate, and chapter three revealed that several service-learning instructors chose not to grade students' service reflections at all. While this created an open space for students to compose freely, it also created a gray area for some students in terms of where their service participation fit in their final grade, given that reflective writing was often closely linked to students' service experiences. The language of the English 121 orientation manual does not help in defining service participation requirements; instructors are only told that students typically spend 20 to 40 hours at the community partner during the academic quarter. In addition, there is no established time-logging resource for instructors to keep track of their students' service hours. Instead, students are asked to track the hours on their own and instructors are not made aware of their students' status until near the end of the quarter, based on an evaluation that community organizations complete for each student. In terms of how service is currently assessed in the English 121 program, the policy in the most recent version of the English 121 manual states that participation in service-learning is 10% of the final course grade. Students whose organizations report that they have fulfilled their commitment, or are expected to by the end of the quarter, will receive full credit for this 10% of their course grade in English 121. Students whose organizations report that they have not fulfilled their commitment and are not expected to by the end of the quarter will receive no credit for this 10%.

A major issue with simply allocating service to 10% of the final grade is that it fails to represent the integrated and webbed nature of service-learning pedagogy. That is, given that many of the assignments are dependent on students drawing from their service experiences as evidence, the grade they receive on formal writing assignment and in-class activities are also influenced by their service. Thus, to tell students that completion of their service hours corresponds to 10% of the final grade misrepresents service-learning as a pedagogy and further perpetuates the service component as merely an add-on to the class. Jessica, for example, recalled one specific moment that occurred during week six of her winter quarter:

I got an email from a student who was like “hey, maybe this is irrelevant, but I haven't started my service learning yet,” and like, “what does this mean for this assignment?” He did get registered but he never got involved. . .He mentioned to me later too that he thought maybe he just wouldn't do the service learning 'cause it's only the 10% or whatever.

Both Kathy and Caroline also indicated issues with students not registering or going to their community organization until deep into the academic quarter. Although logistical challenges and scheduling conflicts are often the cause of late starts in service work, more emphasis on evaluating and assessing reflective writing like critical logs and service journals may be key in emphasizing the importance of service in the students' overall final grade and not just the participation component.

One possible tool that may help instructors is a framework developed by James Dubinsky, Marshall Welch, and Adrian Wurr. The “ABC123” system is a synthesis of two previously-developed tools for assessing reflection within a service-learning context; the first component is based on Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo and Sally Raskoff's “ABC's of Reflection,”

an assessment practice in which instructors critique their students' reflective writing for the presence of three main components: "A" for affect, which involves a description and explanation of what and how students feel; "B" for behavior, which involves an articulation of student behavior(s) and action(s) before, during, and after a particular learning experience; and "C" for cognition, which indicates a student's understanding and comprehension of course content and theories, or as Welch puts it, "students are making the cognitive connection between the service-learning experience and what is taught in the class" (24). One method of assessment using the ABC system is to score one point for the existence of each component for the maximum possible score of three points. For example, if a student's critical log recounted the emotions and feelings they experienced during their last site visit (affect) and mentioned the activities they participated in during the visit (behavior), but did not connect the visit to any ideas or theories from classroom discussion or course readings, then the student would be awarded two out of a possible three points for their reflection. However, as Dubinsky and his colleagues point out, such an approach does not account for the critical, i.e., the depth of the response.

To gauge how well students are developing a critical awareness of social issues, the second component of the "ABC123" system is derived from the work of James Youniss and Miranda Yates, who assessed students' reflective awareness at three levels. At level one, reflective writing is oriented to the self, with an emphasis on focusing on the personal experience: "I did. . .I experienced. . .I disliked. . . ." At level two, students demonstrate a greater understanding of social issues from the perspective of others. As Dubinsky and his colleagues note, reflective writing at level two "reveals new insight and appreciation of an experience or context outside of one's self" (162). Finally, reflections at level three reveal an awareness of "previously unknown systemic or cultural variables that impact circumstance embedded within

the service experience” (162). In other words, students are able to draw connections between the situations occurring at the local community organization with sociopolitical issues occurring on a macro scale.

The ABC123 scoring process is fairly straightforward; students are still given a single point for any statement related to affect, behavior, and cognition. However, to assess how in-depth student reflections are, the accumulated points for the ABCs must then be multiplied by the level of critical analysis demonstrated within the reflective writing. Dubinsky and his colleagues explain:

For example, a student may reflect on what they did (behavior) and how they felt about the experience (affect) earning two out of three points since they did not include a cognitive statement. . .If [the reflection] makes a compelling statement about the cultural or political ramifications of the circumstances surrounding the service experience, a score of “3” is given. [The points from the ABCs] is then multiplied by the “3” awarded for the cultural/systemic comments for a total score of “6”. (162)

In this framework, each reflective writing assignment is assessed on a scale of 0 to 9, with 9 being the maximum possible score if a reflection mentions all three ABCs and addresses macro-level social issues as revealed through community engagement. In utilizing the ABC123 system in their curriculum, English 121 instructors would not only develop a way of assessing reflective writing, it would also reinforce the significance of service in the overall trajectory of the course. Assessing service-related reflection ultimately grants instructors a way of evaluating students’ dedication to their community organization instead of basing their participation grade on an arbitrary and ambiguous number of service hours.

For those instructors who wish to keep their reflective writing assessments an open and ungraded space, I propose a modified version of the ABC123 system that may still help students draw connections between their classroom-based knowledge and their experiences with their community organizations. Rather than assign a “grade” to each piece of reflective writing, I have developed a rubric that tracks the development of a student’s critical awareness:

In the reflection, is there evidence of:	Yes/No/Somewhat	4) Is the reflection predominantly oriented to the self, the community context, or a larger system/culture? Explain:
1) Affect?		
2) Behavior?		
3) Cognition?		

Figure 6.3. English 121 Reflection Rubric

After completing each service-based reflection, instructors would complete the rubric accordingly and make it available for students to view. The objective is not to necessarily evaluate the quality of the content, but to provide an avenue that allows instructors an opportunity to identify and recognize strengths and weaknesses in a student’s ability to reflect critically. Which of the ABCs need to be emphasized? If a student is focusing too much on self-oriented reflection, what can be done to help them shift towards a more critical form of analysis? It is important to note that these assessment rubrics are only beneficial if reflective writing assignments occur frequently throughout the quarter. Otherwise, it will prove difficult for students to learn from instructor feedback. Ultimately, regardless of how it is applied, the ABC123 assessment system will help integrate students’ service experiences deeper into the composition side of their English 121 experience.

A Proposed English 121 Assignment Sequence: Drawing Attention to Space

Finally, a more ecologically-oriented model of the English 121 program relies not only on changes made to the orientation process or assessment practices; it also requires instructors to take an ecocomposition approach toward their assignment design. When writing for, with, or about the community, students can also gain an understanding of how the physical spaces in which their service is situated may influence the writing that is produced. As the previous chapter indicated, while English 121 instructors already encourage students to write for a local, non-academic audience, community-based writing requires more than audience awareness. A potential consequence that may result is that students end up focusing solely on the human elements of their service-learning experiences while overlooking what the non-human and material components of their community organizations reveal about the ideals, values, and the social issues they are involved in. Robert Brooke and Jason McIntosh build upon this idea, suggesting that “rhetorical action comes as much from the choice of *where* to locate one’s argument and emotional appeals as it does from the choice of who to address and what to argue for” (147). Thus, in order to help their students develop a more complete understanding of rhetorical awareness, instructors who are teaching service-learning composition must teach the role of space and physical location in discourse (re)production.

Writing that engages the community and makes an argument on behalf of the community requires more than just the construction of a good claim. As Coogan argues, it begins “with an analysis of those historical and material conditions that have made some arguments more viable than others” (668). Thus, it is imperative that service-learning composition pedagogy recognize the geographies our students work in and pass through, and how the social issues that affect our community partners are rendered through spatial conditions. Although many English 121 instructors teach genre and rhetorical analysis to demonstrate the meaning-making capabilities of

the texts and documents, there is still pedagogical room in the program for the construction of assignments that push students to investigate the spatial conditions of their community organizations as well.

I propose a sequence, comprised of readings and short writing assignments that ultimately build up to a major writing project designed to facilitate inquiry and analysis of community organizations as a physical space in addition to a collection of staff members and human participants. This sequence is informed by a combination of literature from the field of ecocomposition, spatial rhetoric, and my own prior pedagogical experiences teaching place-based writing.

Component 1: Establishing the Field

Prior to any type of fieldwork, the link between rhetoric and space must be introduced and explored by students. To do so, instructors first need to expose students to the literature of the field. To begin the sequence, excerpts from texts such as Yi-Fu Tuan's *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, Tim Cresswell's *Place: An Introduction*, and Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* can be used to frame physical locations and geography as socially-constructed entities. By reading these authors, students begin to see spaces as capable of influencing—as well as being influenced by—the social. Next, readings that establish the relationship between discourse and the physical environment will help localize the concept of space within the context of the writing classroom. Specifically, Nedra Reynold's seminal text *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference* challenge readers to examine the question of “how do students, writers, or learners experience spaces and places in the everyday, and how might this inform cultural and material theories of discourse?” (2). Finally, instructors may wish to introduce students to texts such as Joe Letter and Judith

Kemerait Livingston's "Toiling in 'the Land of Dreamy Scenes': Time, Space, and Service-Learning Pedagogy" and Annie Merrill Ingram's "Service Learning and Ecomposition: Developing Sustainable Practices through Inter- and Extradisciplinarity"; these articles explore the topic of place-based writing in relations to specifically service-learning pedagogy. This progression of theories and concepts, starting with the broad introduction of space as a rhetorical entity and ending with the specific analysis of spatial rhetoric in service-learning composition, will prepare students for the subsequent assignments in this sequence, which involve traveling through local neighborhoods in order to begin a process of inquiry.

The acknowledgement of the physical environments in which students' community organizations are embedded within is a crucial step in getting them to perceive service-learning as extending beyond the campus walls and into the local publics. If, as instructors, we can orient students' attention to the material components of their service, it may also help repurpose the "hard labor" that students commonly criticize about their service experience. Instead, physical work can be conceived as a starting point for an inquiry process. Letter and Livingston recalled a similar critique of their service-learning course, which included students doing physical work in City Park, a public space near the Tulane University campus, after Hurricane Katrina:

This raises eyebrows from colleagues and others who inquire about our service-learning course and then question its "academic value." But no writer would deny the significance of sensory detail and immediacy, and therefore, we see the harsh physical experience at City Park as a starting point. . . (77)

By paying attention to the nonhuman elements of their service-learning experience, students may begin to view physical work on a farm or cutting vegetables at a food shelter as a learning

moment or burgeoning research topic, or what Holmes describes as the “conscious and unconscious intentional strategies for writers” (428).

Component 2: Spatial Analysis of Community Organizations

To build off of the first component and get students conducting spatial analysis of their own, I propose a modified assignment prompt that I once designed for a 200-level rhetoric course¹⁶. First, students are separated into groups whose members all serve at the same organization. The objective of this assignment is for students to explore the physical makeup of their community organization, such as the site’s architecture, layout of rooms, and entry points. Students are also asked to investigate the immediate local surroundings of the organization, examining details including access to public transportation and the types of buildings that neighbor the organization. Then, each group gives a multimodal presentation on the rhetorical capabilities of their community organization and its surrounding area to the rest of the class, which includes the evidence they gathered via photography, video, and sound clips. In so doing, they answer the following question: How do the spaces that make up and surround their community organization influence or affect the thoughts, views, or actions of those who interact with it?

To guide students through the data-gathering process, I have created a checklist for analyzing spatial rhetoric based on a heuristic for analyzing visual rhetoric originally published in Karla Saari Kitalong and Marcia Muth’s *Getting the Picture: A Brief Guide to Understanding and Creating Visual Texts*. This checklist will help facilitate the group’s analysis of their community organization¹⁷. In the first level of the checklist, students begin by identifying the rhetorical situation in which the organization is embedded, accounting for its history,

¹⁶ See Appendix 4

¹⁷ See Appendix 5

participants, and the exigence behind its formation. At the second level, students are looking for patterns and the design features of the physical space. Finally, the third level moves students to analyze the meaning behind those patterns and the effects they have on those who interact with the space.

There are a number of ways this assignment would help students recognize the unique role of space within a service-learning composition program like English 121. For one, it forces students to leave the classroom, thus establishing the kind of “traveler identity” that Drew encourages. As I noted in the preceding chapter, Drew advocates for the opening up of the classroom, pushing students to see the campus classroom as one small part of the overall learning process, rather than locating all of the learning within the classroom. As she argues, “if we are truly interested in the pedagogical. . .then students must be invited to name and explore the ways in which they embody the many spaces they inhabit, and the discourse in which they both do and hope to participate” (66). In addition, this assignment may also help develop a new understanding of what constitutes research and inquiry within a composition course. Students often misconceive academic research as a monotonous process that can be performed at any time by going to the library or accessing online databases. By getting students to travel to local communities and document their own data using tools like cameras and audio recorders, research in English 121 is transformed into a meaning-making act that requires students to engage directly with their environment. Instead of simply searching for evidence or data, students participate in the actual construction of it.

Before they send students out into local communities, English 121 instructors need to consider certain nuances. The first point of consideration is the relationship that students have with the communities they are exploring. Richard Marback asks any researcher doing extensive

fieldwork to critically reflect on how they are representing the spaces they are investigating; in his article “Speaking of the City and Literacies of Place Making in Composition Studies,” Marback examines the relationship that both locals and tourists establish with The Heidelberg Project, an art installation in the middle of an impoverished Detroit neighborhood. Although various visitors travel to and see the project, Marback argues that “the people sharing the space of Heidelberg Street do not necessarily engage each other in productive discussion of urban decline, nor do they by themselves transform the disabling rhetorics of city space” (151). Marback’s argument suggests an inherent problem with Drew’s traveler disposition: are travelers, by nature, simply passing through the communities instead of actively engaging with the issues that affect them? In the context of my study, this question reverberated loudly, given that most of my student participants were not living in the communities they were serving and almost none returned to their community organization the following quarter. In other words, as instructors and as staff in a service-learning program, how can we address the privilege that comes with being an English 121 student who travels through these communities, does his or her service, and leaves once the quarter ends without continuing to address some of the sociopolitical issues that plague these communities?

Another detail to think about when asking students to engage with physical environments is student safety. That is, if the community organization is located in an unsafe area or a neighborhood that the students are uncomfortable navigating, then student safety takes priority and the assignment must be modified. To address this concern, any assignment prompt introducing fieldwork would need to ultimately caution students to the situational risks that come with community engagement¹⁸.

¹⁸ See Appendix 6

The issues discussed here—the privilege of many English 121 students in being able to freely leave communities, as well as upholding student safety—do not have a clear-cut solution or answer. Rather, as service-learning instructors, we must remember that they are dynamic and lasting problems that do not have a permanent resolution. In the end, our objective may be to consistently dedicate time and space within our curricula to discussing and assessing the concerns whenever they emerge.

Component 3: Final Mapping Project

The final component of this space-based writing sequence is a mapping project that prompts students to construct a personal multimodal visualization of their community partner and their overall service-learning experience¹⁹. Map-making, as Drew argues, helps students grasp the politics of place as well as practice rhetorical awareness through the utilization of traditionally non-academic genres. In “Deep Maps: Teaching Rhetorical Engagement through Place-conscious Education,” Robert Brooke and Jason McIntosh explore the utilization of a multimodal “Deep Map” project, in which students construct a visual diagram of the geographic features they most often interact with. Sequence wise, the spatial analysis that English 121 students conducted in the previous component serves as the ideal scaffold into this final mapping project, given that data regarding the material conditions of each community organization would already be collected and analyzed. However, as Brooke and McIntosh point out, the goal of Deep Maps and similar map-making activities is not to construct a literal, accurate-to-scale representation of local communities; rather, it serves as another reflective tool for guiding students toward recognizing the physical space as capable of producing rhetoric. These maps not only help students conceptualize the spaces they inhabit, but they make visible what was once

¹⁹ See Appendix 7

invisible - what Brooke and McIntosh refer to as a way of allowing students to identify what they “*did not* know about their places: the blank spaces of unexplored land, the neighborhoods they lived in but did not know much about. . .” (136, original emphasis). Thus, by creating a map, students may come to notice a pattern of absence or certain gaps in their perception of their community organization or neighborhood.

A secondary part of this final project may be an in-class sharing and discussion segment where students who serve at the same organization compare their maps to one another. In doing so, conversations may emerge regarding how classmates who work with the same community partner have differing interpretations of their service-learning experience. In this way, the role of space and place within the class becomes nuanced even further; that is, space is not only capable of generating meaning, but different meanings for different authors. Ultimately, students may wish to investigate how this detail complicates the overall ecology of service-learning pedagogy.

Conclusion

This chapter reimagined three main elements of the English 121 ecology: the training/orientation process, the governing outcomes and assessment practices; and an assignment sequence informed by an awareness of space. While the current conceptualization of English 121 is already strongly integrated into the department, the Carlson Center, and community influences, the suggestions I have made in this chapter could potentially enhance the overall program by providing more opportunities for community staff members to participate in curriculum design, as well as rethinking ways of incorporating more service-learning pedagogy into the composition side of the program. As I have noted over and over again, the goal of this chapter is not to propose an idealized model for teaching English 121. Rather, through this chapter and this overall project, I hope to demonstrate the complicated and dynamic nature of

service-learning composition pedagogy. It is only through continued research into a service-learning ecology that new ideas and theories on assignment design, instructor orientation, and community engagement can be cultivated and flourish.

Coda

Like many research projects, the motivation for investigating the structure of service-learning composition pedagogy originally came from personal interest. During my first year as a service-learning instructor, I found the process of designing a course challenging yet intellectually stimulating. I recall telling colleagues about the dynamic and nuanced environment that service-learning embodied and how trying to create a course that acknowledged and addressed all of the students' various experiences was like trying to put together a jigsaw puzzle while the image was constantly changing. As I noted in chapters 1 and 2, the elements in any service-learning program—both human and non-human—are constantly coming in and out of focus. For this reason, it was only by conceptualizing the program as an ecology that we as researchers could begin to identify and consider pedagogical influences that may have otherwise gone unnoticed. As instructors and researchers, it is time for us to “start theorizing ourselves as already connected and [to use] our connectedness [to unleash] potential that actually stems from that ecological interconnectedness” (Rickert, qtd. in Rivers “Circumnavigation”). This interconnectedness is especially valuable in service-learning; that is, the service work that all students go through should not be viewed as an add-on or supplement to disciplinary knowledge. Rather, service should be seen as deeply enmeshed in learning process, as the engine that drives all of the learning that occurs within the service-learning classroom.

Although various factors affect the construction and continuation of any service-learning program, it was my goal to provide further insight into three specific elements that constantly appeared as points of emphasis in my data. In chapter 3, I outlined the literature on genre as a social force and its ability to construct communities. Then, using a metagenre heuristic, I explored the most commonly designed assignments in English 121 and, despite their stylistic

variations, categorized them into three metagenres each of which integrates students' writing knowledge with the ideologies they encounter at their service-learning organization. By revealing how multiple genres embody dual purposes in the context of service-learning, first-time service-learning composition instructors may find it easier to apply their prior pedagogical experiences in a brand new environment.

In chapter 4, I turned my attention to the function of reflection in English 121. Hatcher, Bringle, and Muthiah suggest that reflection “engage[s] the learner in examining and analyzing the relationship between relevant, meaningful service” that when done effectively offers the potential “for learning to broaden and deepen along academic, social, moral, personal, and civic dimensions” (39). While reflection has been lauded by many for its academic value, chapter four explored the mechanisms by which it occurs effectively. As my findings demonstrate, students need detailed writing prompts and the consistent scaffolding in order to critically analyze their community-based experiences rather than just describing them. In addition, reflective writing—like the end-of-term survey—play a key role in helping new English 121 instructors gain a sense of the similarities and differences between teaching service-learning composition and their prior teaching experiences. Finally, we see that reflection not only holds value in terms of bridging the classroom and the community, it also provides a space where students are given the opportunity to utilize their emotions and feelings as a catalyst for transformative learning. As service-learning composition instructors, our goal should be to weave reflection deeply into the fabric of our course, to the point where integrating classroom and community experiences becomes routinized for students. Only then can service work be conceptualized as central to the learning process rather than as an ancillary component.

Chapter 5 represents a major point of emphasis in terms of understanding service-learning composition as an ecology. As I coded and analyzed instructor interviews and course materials, discussions of both physical and imagined spaces appeared regularly. It became clear that service-learning composition pedagogy is inherently connected to an acknowledgement and understanding of space, not just as a background or setting, but rather as what scholars like Massey call social entities “constituted and reconstituted by the interrelations of real people and real communities” (qtd. in Mauk 378). Ultimately, a conception of physical locations as an ensemble of material and human elements allows students to examine how “places and activities constantly shift in relations to one another” (Reynolds *Geographies*, 5). Just as students are expected to engage with the staff and the populations they serve at their community organizations, an inquiry into the local neighborhoods that surround the campus and the community partners may demonstrate to students that space also functions as a rhetorical force. In addition, the findings in this chapter reveal that as instructors and students begin to conceptualize physical space as a significant participant in the overall service-learning ecology, the traditional boundaries between what is considered “academic” and “non-academic” began to dissolve. A classroom thereby emerges wherever students are producing knowledge. This detail holds value especially for marginalized students who experience a sense of placelessness when entering the campus environment. Emphasizing spatial rhetoric therefore constructs the environments that students come from, currently inhabit, and travel through as texts in and of themselves and thus worthy of examination.

I view my sixth and final chapter as the culminating response to a question implicit in the three findings chapters I have just described: Now that we have investigated how genre, reflection, and spatial rhetoric function in helping instructors negotiate the various demands of

the English 121 environment, what can we do as writing program administrators and instructors to make service-learning composition a more effective pedagogy? In the specific context of English 121, I emphasized instructor orientation and training, the EWP outcomes, reflective writing assessments, and assignments designed as potential areas that could be altered so as to better integrate students' writing knowledge with their service experiences.

I am not suggesting that my findings for genre, reflection, and spatial rhetoric are relevant and transferrable across contexts; on the other hand, composition and rhetoric as a field has long recognized the importance of these three components in teaching students how to write and compose effectively. For any writing program administrator interested in developing a service-learning writing course at their home institution, my findings could potentially act as starting points for imagining composition pedagogy that de-centralizes the academic campus and reconceptualizes the writing classroom as a space that spans multiple contexts and involves multiple participants, each contributing to the students' overall learning process. As a writing instructor and researcher, I look forward to the opportunity to study service-learning composition further, experiment with new methods and spaces through which its pedagogy can be implemented, and explore the process of discourse production alongside my students.

Bibliography

- Adler-Kassner, Linda. "Service-Learning at a Glance." College Cyberbrief (2000). Web.
- Amare, Nicole and Teresa Grettano. "Writing Outreach as Community Engagement." *WPA*, 30.3 (2007): 57-74. Print.
- Anson, Chris M. "On Reflection: The Role of Journals and Logs in Service-Learning Courses." *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*. Ed. Linda Adler-Kassner, Robert Crooks, and Ann Watters. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1997. 167-180.
- Ash, Sarah, and Patti H. Clayton. "Generating, Deepening, and Documenting Learning: The Power of Critical Reflection in Applied Learning." *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education*, 1.1 (2009): 25-48. Print.
- Ash, Sarah, Patti H. Clayton, and Maxine P. Atkinson. "Integrating Reflection and Assessment to Capture and Improve Student Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. 11.2. (2005): 49-60. Print.
- Astin, Alexander, and Linda Sax. "How Undergraduates are Affected by Service Participation." *Service Participation*. 39.3 (1998): 251-263. Print.
- Bacon, Nora. "The Trouble with Transfer: Lessons from a Study of Community Service Writing." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 6 (1999): 53-62. Web.
- Ball, Kevin. "Excavating Neglected Space(s): Asserting Community in the Composition Classroom." *Classroom Spaces and Writing Instruction*. Eds. Ed Nagelhout and Carol Rutz. Cresskill, N.J: Hampton Press, 2004. 167-187. Print.
- Barber, Benjamin R. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. University of California Press, 2003. Print.
- Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University" *Journal of Basic Writing*, 5.1 (1986): 4-23. Print.
- Basgier, Christopher. "Extra-Disciplinary Writing in the Disciplines: Towards a Metageneric

- Pedagogy.” *Across the Disciplines*, 11.2 (2014). Web.
- Bawarshi, Anis. “The Ecology of Genre.” *Ecocomposition: Theoretical and Pedagogical Approaches*. Eds. Christian Weisser and Sidney Dobrin, Albany: State University of New York, 2001. 69-80. Print.
- _____. “The Genre Function.” *College English*, 62.3 (2000): 335-360.
- _____. *Genre and the Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of Invention in Composition*. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2003. Print.
- Bazerman, Charles. “Genre and Identity: Citizenship in the Age of the Internet and the Age of Global Capitalism.” *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre: Strategies for Stability and Change*. Eds. Richard Coe, Lorelei Lingard, and Tatiana Teslenko. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 2002. 13-37. Print.
- Bazerman, Charles, Joseph Little, and Lisa Bethel. *Reference Guide to Writing Across the Curriculum*. West Lafayette, Ind: Parlor Press, 2005. Print.
- Beach, King. “Consequential Transitions: A Sociocultural Expedition Beyond Transfer in Education.” *Review of Research in Education*, 24.1 (1999): 101-139. Print.
- Beaufort, Anne. “Operationalizing the Concept of Discourse Community: A Case Study of One Institutional Site of Composing.” *Research in the Teaching of English*, 31.4 (1997): 486-529.
- Becket, Diana et al. “A Faculty Learning Community’s Reflection on Implementing Service-Learning Goals.” *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 12.1 (2012): 74-87. Print.
- Benedikt, Amélie Frost. “On Doing the Right Thing at the Right Time: Toward an Ethics of Kairos.” *Rhetoric and Kairos*. Eds. Phillip Sipiora and James S. Baumlin. Albany: State University of New York, 2002. 226-235. Print.
- Berlin, Professor James A. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900 - 1985*. 1st edition. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987. Print.

- Biesecker, Barbara A. "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation from Within the Thematic of Différance." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 22.12 (1989): 110-130. Print.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 1.1 (1968): 1-14. Print.
- Bizzell, Patricia. "Cognition, Convention, and Certainty: What We Need to Know About Writing." *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992. 75-104. Print.
- Boyd, Patricia Webb. "Making Space in Composition Studies: Discursive Ecologies as Inquiry." *Changing of Knowledge in Composition: Contemporary Perspectives*. Eds. Lance Massey and Richard C. Gebhardt. Logan: University Press of Colorado, 2011. 283-304. Print.
- Boyte, Harry. "Community Service and Civic Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72.10 (1991): 765-767. Print.
- Bracher, Mark. "Teaching for Social Justice: Reeducating the Emotions Through Literary Study." *JAC*, 26.3/4 (2006): 463-512. Print.
- Branch, Kirk. "What No Literacy Means: Literacy Events in the Absence of Literacy" *Reflections*, 9.3 (2011): 52-74. Print.
- Bingle, Robert G., and Julie A. Hatcher. "Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67.2 (1996): 221-239. Print.
- _____. "Reflection in Service Learning: Making Meaning of Experience." *Educational Horizons* (1999): 179-185. Print.
- _____. "A Service-Learning Curriculum for Faculty." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2 (1995): 112-122. Print.
- Bingle, Robert G., Patti H. Clayton, and Julie A. Hatcher. "Research on Service Learning: An Introduction" *Research on Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Assessment: Students and Faculty*. Eds. Patti H. Clayton, Robert G. Bingle, and Julie A. Hatcher. Sterling, VA: Stylus Pub, 2013. 3-25. Print.
- Brooke, Robert and Jason McIntosh. "Deep Maps: Teaching Rhetorical Engagement through Place-Conscious Education." *The Locations of Composition*. Eds. Christopher J. Keller

- and Christian R. Weisser. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007. Print. 131-149. Print.
- Brouwer, Daniel. "Communication as Counterpublic." *Communication As: Perspectives on Theory*. Eds. Gregory J Shepherd; Jeffrey St John; Theodore G Striphas. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications, 2006. 195-215. Print.
- Brouwer, Daniel and Robert Asen. "Introduction." *Public Modalities: Rhetoric, Culture, Media, and the Shape of Public Life*. Eds. Daniel C. Brouwer and Robert Asen. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010. 1-32. Print.
- Burnett, Sarah. "Eat Your Spinach! Why a Blend of Personal and Academic Discourses Matter." *Creative Composition: Inspiration and Techniques for Writing Instruction*. Eds. Danita Berg and Lori A. May. Multilingual Matters, 2015. Print.
- Burnham, Chris and Jackson, Rebecca. "Experience and Reflection in Multiple Contexts: Preparing TAs for the Artistry of Professional Practice." *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practices*. Eds. Betty P. Pytlik and Sarah Liggett. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. 159-170. Print.
- Canagarajah, A Suresh. "Understanding Critical Writing." *Second-Language Writing in the Composition Classroom: A Critical Sourcebook*. Eds. Paul Kei Matsuda et al. New York, NY: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006. 210-224. Print.
- Carlson Leadership and Public Service Center. "About the Carlson Center." *Carlson Leadership & Public Service Center*, www.washington.edu/carlson/about-the-carlson-center/. Accessed January 2017.
- Carter, Michael. "Stasis and Kairos: Principles of Social Construction in Classical Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review*, 7.1 (1988): 97-112. Print.
- _____. "Ways of Knowing, Doing, and Writing in the Disciplines." *College Composition and Communication*, 58.3 (2007): 385-418. Print.
- Certeau, Michel de., "Walking in the City". *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, California:

- University of California Press, 1980. 156-163. Print.
- Chaden, Caryn, Roger Graves, David A. Jolliffe, and Peter Vandenberg. "Confronting Clashing Discourses: Writing the Space Between Classroom and Community in Service-Learning Courses." *Reflections*, 2.2 (2002): 19-40. Print.
- Chapman, Marilyn L. "Situated, Social, Active: Rewriting Genre in the Elementary Classroom." *Written Communication* 16.4 (1999): 469-490. Print.
- Cicero, "De Oratore." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston: Bedford/St Martins, 1990. Print.
- Clark, J. Elizabeth. "From Selfies to Self-Representation in Electronically Mediated Reflection: The Evolving Gestalt Effect in ePortfolios." *A Rhetoric of Reflection*. Ed. Kathleen Blake Yancey. Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 2016: 150-165. Prints.
- Clarke, Adele, "Situational Analyses: Grounded Theory Mapping After the Postmodern Turn." *Symbolic Interaction*, 26.4 (2003): 553-576. Print.
- Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, and Susan L. Lytle. *Inside/Outside: Teacher Research and Knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1993. Print.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. "Students' Right to Their Own Language." *College Composition and Communication*. 25 (1974).
- Conway, Glenda. "Portfolio Cover Letters, Students' Self-Presentation, and Teachers' Ethics." *New Directions in Portfolio Assessment*. Eds. Laurel Black, Donald Daiker, Jeffrey Sommers and Gail Stygall. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1994. 83-92. Print.
- Coogan, David. "Service Learning and Social Change: The Case for Materialist Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication*, 57.4 (2006): 667-693. Print.

Cooper, David. "Reading, Writing, and Reflection." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 73 (1998): 47-56. Print.

Cooper, Marilyn M. "The Ecology of Writing." *College English*, 48.4 (1986): 364-375. Print.

Correia, Manuel and Robert Bleicher. "Making Connections to Teach Reflection." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14.2 (2008): 41-49. Print.

Cushman, Ellen. "The Public Intellectual, Service Learning, and Activist Research." *College English*, 61.3 (1999): 328-336. Print.\

CWPA. "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (3.0)." *Council of Writing Program Administrators*, 17 July 2014, <http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html>. Accessed January 2017

Davis, Adam. "What We Don't Talk About When We Don't Talk About Service." *The Civically Engaged Reader: A Diverse Collection of Short Provocative Readings on Civic Activity*. Eds. Adam Davis and Elizabeth Lynn. Chicago: Great Books Foundation, 2006. Print.

Deans, Thomas. "Genre Analysis and the Community Writing Course." *Reflections*, 5.1 (2011): 7-25. Print.

_____. "Service-Learning in Two Keys: Paulo Freire's Critical Pedagogy in Relation to John Dewey's Pragmatism." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 6.1 (1999): 15-29. Print.

_____. *Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition*. Urbana, Ill: Natl Council of Teachers, 2000. Print.

Dejoy, Nancy. "Faculty Development, Service-Learning and Composition: A Communal Approach to Professional Development." *Reflections*, 1.2 (2000): 30-34. Print.

Department of English. "Expository Writing Courses." *University of Washington*, english.washington.edu/expository-writing-courses. Accessed January 2017.

Dewey, John. *How We Think*. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, 1997. Print.

- Devitt, Amy J., et al. "Materiality and Genre in the Study of Discourse Communities." *College English*, 65.5 (2003): 541-558. Print.
- Dobrin, Sidney. "Writing Takes Place." *Ecocomposition: Theoretical and Pedagogical Approaches*. Eds. Christian Weisser and Sidney Dobrin, Albany: State University of New York, 2001. 11-25. Print.
- Dobrin, Sidney I. and Christian R. Weisser. "Breaking Ground in Ecocomposition: Exploring Relationships between Discourse and Environment." *College English* 64.5 (2002): 566-589. Print.
- Drew, Julie. "The Politics of Place: Student Travelers and Pedagogical Maps." *Ecocomposition: Theoretical and Pedagogical Approaches*. Eds. Christian Weisser and Sidney Dobrin, Albany: State University of New York, 2001. 57-68. Print.
- Dubinsky, James, et al. "Composing Cognition: The Role of Written Reflections in Service-Learning." *Service-Learning and Writing: Paving the Way for Literacy(ies) through Community Engagement*. Ed. Isabel Baca. Leiden: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2012. 155-180. Print.
- Duffy, Cheryl Hofstetter. "Tapping the Potential of Service-Learning: Guiding Principles for Redesigning Our Composition Courses." *Reflections* 3.1 (2003): 1-14. Print.
- Durst, Russel. "Writing at the Postsecondary Level." *Research on Composition: Multiple Perspectives on Two Decades of Change*. Ed. Peter Smagorinsky. New York: Teacher College Press, 2006. 78-107. Print.
- Eberly, Rosa A. "From Writers, Audiences, and Communities to Publics: Writing Classrooms as Protopublic Spaces." *Rhetoric Review*. 18.1 (2009): 165-178. Print.
- Eby, John W. "Why Service-Learning is Bad." 1998,
http://www.messiah.edu/agape/svc_learning/faculty/pdf/wrongsvc.pdf. Accessed 23 April 2015.
- Emmons, Kimberly. "Rethinking Genres of Reflection: Student Portfolio Cover Letters and the Narrative of Progress." *Composition Studies*, 31.1 (2003): 43-62. Print.
- EWP. *2015-16 Introduction to English 121: Resources, Guidelines and Policies*. Department of English, University of Washington. Seattle. 2016. Web.

- ____. "Chapter 2: English 131: Background & Overview of the Course." *English 131 Instructors' Manual 2016-17*. Department of English, University of Washington. Seattle. 2016. Web.
- ____. "Chapter 9: Portfolios in English 131." *English 131 Instructors' Manual 2016-17*. Department of English, University of Washington. Seattle. 2016. Web.
- Eyler, Janet et al. *A Practitioner's Guide to Reflection in Service-Learning: Student Voices & Reflections*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1996. Print.
- Eyler, Janet, and Dwight Giles. *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999. Print.
- Farmer, Frank. *After the Public Turn: Composition, Counterpublics, and the Citizen Bricoleur*. 1 edition. Boulder, Colorado: Utah State University Press, 2013. Print.
- Fecho, Bob, JoBeth Allen, Claudia Mazaros, Hellen Inyega. "Teacher Research in Writing Classrooms." *Research on Composition: Multiple Perspectives on Two Decades of Change*. Ed. Peter Smagorinsky. New York: Teacher College Press, 2006. 108-140. Print.
- Feldman, Ann M. *Making Writing Matter: Composition in the Engaged University*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009. Print.
- Fleming, David. "Finding a Place for School in Rhetoric's Public Turn." *The Public Work of Rhetoric*. Eds. John Ackerman and David Coogan. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2013. 211-228. Print.
- Flower, Linda. *Community Literacy and the Rhetoric of Public Engagement*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.
- Follman, Joe. "An Overlooked Lens: Applying Structuration Theory, Actor-Network Theory, and Theories of Space to Service-Learning." *International Journal of Research on Service and Community Engagement*, 3.1 (2015): 1-17.
- Foster, Helen. "Kairos and Stasis Revisited: Heuristics for the Critically Informed Composition Classroom." *Composition Forum*, 14.2 (2005). Web.
- Franklin, Betty, Smith. "Reading and Writing the World: Charity, Civic Engagement and Social Action in Service-Learning." *Reflections*, 1.2 (2000): 24-29. Print.

- Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Social Text*, 25/26 (1990): 56-80. Print.
- Freedman, Aviva. "Show and Tell? The Role of Explicit Teaching in the Learning of New Genres." *Research in the Teaching of English*, 27.3 (1993): 222-251. Print.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1968. Print.
- Fullwood, Kendra. "Pro Christo et Humanitate: Making Lives Through Literacy and Community Partnerships at Shaw University" *Reflections* 10.2 (2011): 136-151. Print.
- Fulwiler, Toby, and Art Young. "Introduction." *Language Connections: Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum*. Eds. Toby Fulwiler and Art Young. Urbana, Ill: Natl Council of Teachers, 1982. Print.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles. "Kitchen Tables and Rented Rooms: The Extracurriculum of Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, 45.1 (1994): 75-92. Print.
- Goldblatt, Eli. *Because We Live Here: Sponsoring Literacy Beyond the College Curriculum*. Cresskill, N.J: Hampton Press, 2007. Print.
- _____. "What is Community Literacy?" *A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators*. Eds. Rita Malenczyk et al. Anderson, South Carolina: Parlor Press, 2013. 289-300. Print.
- Gorelick, Risa. "Broadening the Community: Service-Learning Connections to the Writing Classroom." *Reflections*, 1.1 (2000): 24. Print.
- Grimmett, Peter. "The Nature of Reflection and Schön's Conception in Perspective." *Reflection in Teacher Education*. Eds. Peter Philip Grimmett and Gaalen L Erickson. Vancouver. B.C.; New York: Pacific Education Press; Teachers College Press, 1988. 5-15. Print.
- Guerra, Juan. "Cultivating Transcultural Citizenship in a Discursive Democracy." *Texts of Consequence: Composing Social Activism for the Classroom and Community*. Eds. Christopher L. Wilkey and Nicholas Mauriello. New York: Hampton Press, 2013. 83-115. Print.
- _____. *Language, Culture, Identity and Citizenship in College Classrooms and Communities*. New York; London: Routledge, 2015. Print.
- Habermas, Jürgen. "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964)." *New German*

- Critique*, 3 (1974): 49-55. Print.
- Hallman, Heidi L., and Melanie N. Burdick. "Service Learning and the Preparation of English Teachers." *English Education*, 43.4 (2011): 341-368. Print.
- Harris, Joseph. "The Idea of Community in the Study of Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, 40.1 (1989): 11-22. Print.
- Harrington, Susanmarie. "The Place of Assessment and Reflection in Writing Program Administration." *Discord and Direction*. Eds. Susan James Mcgee and Carolyn Handa. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2005. 140-154. Print.
- Hatcher, Julie, Robert G. Bringle, and Richard Muthiah. "Designing Effective Reflection: What Matters to Service-Learning?" *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11 (2004): 38-46. Print.
- Hauser, Gerard A. *Vernacular Voices*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2008. Print.
- Heilker, Paul. "Rhetoric Made Real: Civic Discourse and Writing Beyond the Curriculum." *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*. Eds. Linda Adler-Kassner, Robert Crooks, and Ann Watters. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1997. 71-77. Print.
- Herzberg, Bruce. "Community Service and Critical Teaching." *College Composition and Communication*, 45.3 (1994): 307-319. Print.
- _____. "Service Learning and Public Discourse." *JAC* 20.2 (2000): 391-404. Print.
- Hillocks, George. *Teaching Writing as Reflective Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1995. Print.
- Holmes, Ashley. "Transformative Learning, Affect, and Reciprocal Care in Community Engagement." *Community Literacy Journal*, 9.2 (2015): 48-67. Print.
- Holmes, Steven. "Multiple Bodies, Actants, and a Composition Classroom: Actor-Network Theory in Practice." *Rhetoric Review*, 33.4 (2014): 421-438.
- Huckin, Thomas N. "Context-Sensitive Text Analysis." *Methods and Methodology in*

- Composition Research*. Eds. Gesa Kirsch and Patricia A. Sullivan. Carbondale, Ill: SIUC UP, 1992. 84-104. Print.
- Hull, Glynda and Michael Angelo James. "Geographies of Hope: A Study of Urban Landscapes, Digital Media, and Children's Representations of Place." *Writing and Community Engagement: A Critical Sourcebook*. Eds. Thomas Deans, Barbara Sherr Roswell. Adrian J. Wurr. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010. 72-93. Print.
- Hullender, Ren, Shelly Hinck, Jeanneane Wood-Nartker, Travus Burton, and Sue Bowlby. "Evidences of Transformative Learning in Service-Learning Reflections." *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 15.4 (2015): 58-82.
- Huot, Brian. *Rearticulating Writing Assessment for Teaching and Learning*. 1 edition. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2002. Print.
- Ihara, Rachel. "Student Perspectives on Self-Assessment: Insights and Implications." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 41.3 (2014): 223-238. Print.
- Ingram, Annie Merrill. "Service Learning and Ecocomposition: Developing Sustainable Practices through Inter- and Extradisciplinary." *Ecocomposition: Theoretical and Pedagogical Approaches*. Eds. Christian Weisser and Sidney Dobrin, Albany: State University of New York, 2001. 209-233. Print.
- International Network of WAC Programs. *Statement of WAC Principles and Practices*. 2014. Web. <https://wac.colostate.edu/principles/statement.pdf>
- Jacoby, Barbara. "Preface: Service-Learning in Today's Higher Education." *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. Ed. Barbara Jacoby. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996. Print.
- Johanek, Cindy. *Composing Research: A Contextualist Research Paradigm for Rhetoric and Composition*, Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 2000. Print.
- Johnson, T. R. "Rhetoric and Service-Learning." *JAC*, 27.1/2 (2007): 242-252. Print.
- Jolliffe, David A. "Writing Across the Curriculum and Service Learning: Kairos, Genre and Collaboration." *WAC for the New Millennium*. Eds. Susan McLeod, Eric Miraglia, Margot Soven and Christopher Thaiss. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2001. 86-108. Print.

- Kapustka, Katherine. "Dilemmas of Service-Learning Teachers." *Deconstructing Service Learning: Research Exploring Context, Participation, and Impacts*. Eds. Shelley Billig and Janet Eyler Greenwich, Conn: Information Age Pub, 2003. 51-60. Print
- Karasik, Rona J., "Reflecting on Reflection: Capitalizing on the Learning in Intergenerational Service-Learning." *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education* 34.1 (2013): 78-98. Print.
- Keller, Christopher J., and Christian R. Weisser, eds. *The Locations of Composition*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007. Print.
- Kells, Michelle Hall. "Writing Across Communities: Deliberation and the Discursive Possibilities of WAC." *Reflections*, 6.1 (2007): 87-108. Print.
- Killingsworth, M. Jimmie. "Discourse Communities. Local and Global." *Rhetoric Review*, 11.1 (1992): 110-122. Print.
- Kinneavy, James. "Kairos: A Neglected Concept in Classical Rhetoric." *Rhetoric and Praxis: The Contribution of Classical Rhetoric to Practical Reasoning*. Ed. Jean Dietz Moss. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1986. 79-105. Print.
- Kirkland, David. "English(es) in Urban Contexts: Politics, Pluralism, and Possibilities." *English Education*, 42.3 (2010): 293-306. Print.
- Kolenko, Thomas A., et al. "A Critique of Service Learning Projects in Management Education: Pedagogical Foundations, Barriers, and Guidelines." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15.1 (1996): 133-142. Print.
- Kramer, Teresa Joy. "Uncertain Wanderings: Allowing Students to Lead, Fail, and Grow Within Service-Learning." *Writing on the Edge*, 24.2 (2014): 59-74. Print.
- LaDousa, Chaise. "'Everyone's Got Room to Grow!': A Discourse Analysis of Service-Learning Rhetoric in Higher Education." *Learning and Teaching*, 6.2 (2013): 33-52. Print.
- Latour, Bruno. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.
- Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. 1st edition. Cambridge England; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991. Print.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. 1 edition. Malden,

- Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 1992. Print
- ____. "Reflections on the Politics of Space." Trans. by M. Enders, *Antipode* 8 (1976): 30-37. Print.
- Leon, Kendall and Thomas Sura. "'We Don't Need Any More Brochures': Rethinking Deliverables in Service-Learning Curricula." *Writing Program Administration*, 36.2 (2013): 59-74. Print.
- Lesh, Charles N. "Emerging Voices: The Geographies of History: Space, Time, and Composition." *College English*, 78.5 (2016): 447-469. Print.
- Letter, Joe and Judith Kemerait Livingston. "Toiling in 'the land of dreamy scenes': Time, Space, and Service-Learning Pedagogy." *Reflections*, 9.1 (2009): 74-102. Print.
- Marback, Richard. "Speaking of the City and Literacies of Place Making in Composition Studies." *City Comp: Identities, Spaces, Practices*. Ed. Bruce McComiskey. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003. 141-155. Print.
- Marcus, George E. *The Sentimental Citizen: Emotion in Democratic Politics*. 1 edition. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2002. Print.
- Massey, Doreen. "Politics and Space/Time." *Place and the Politics of Identity*. Eds. Michael Keith and Steve Pile. London: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Mathieu, Paula. *Tactics of Hope: The Public Turn in English Composition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2005. Print.
- Mauk, Johnathon. "Location, Location, Location: The 'Real' (E)States of Being, Writing, and Thinking in Composition." *College English*, 65.4 (2003): 368-388. Print.
- McCarthy, Lucille Parkinson. "A Stranger in Strange Lands: A College Student Writing across the Curriculum." *Research in the Teaching of English*, 21.3 (1987): 233-265. Print.
- McComiskey, Bruce. *Teaching Composition as a Social Process*. 1 edition. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 2000. Print.
- McComiskey, Bruce and Cynthia Ryan. "Introduction." *City Comp: Identities, Spaces, Practices*. Ed. Bruce McComiskey. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003. 1-17. Print.
- McDonald, Christina Russell. "Toward Defining a Social Reflective Pedagogy for Eportfolios."

- A Rhetoric of Reflection*. Ed. Kathleen Blake Yancey. Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 2016: 203-226. Print.
- McGlam, Tricia, et al. "An Analysis of a Service-Learning Project: Students' Expectations, Concerns, and Reflections." *Journal of Experiential Education*, 30.3 (2008): 236-249. Print.
- McLeod, Susan. "The Pedagogy of Writing Across the Curriculum." *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*. Eds. Gary Tate, Amy Rupiper, and Kurt Schick. New York: Oxford UP, 2001. 149-164. Print.
- Meyers, Steven. "Service Learning as an Opportunity for Personal and Social Transformation." *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 21.3 (2009): 373-381. Print.
- Micciche, Laura. "Emotion, Ethics, and Rhetorical Action." *JAC*, 25.1 (2005): 161-184. Print.
- Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70.2 (1984): 151-167. Print.
- _____. "Opportunity, Opportunism, and Progress: Kairos in the Rhetoric of Technology." *Argumentation*, 8.1 (1994): 81-96. Print.
- Mishler, Elliot. "Meaning in Context: Is There Any Other Kind?" *Harvard Educational Review*, 49.1 (1979): 1-19. Print.
- Molee, Lenore, et al. "Assessing Learning in Service-Learning Courses Through Critical Reflection." *Journal of Experiential Education*, 33.3 (2010): 239-257. Print.
- Mutnick, Deborah. "Time and Space in Composition Studies: 'Through the Gates of the Chronotope'." *Rhetoric Review*, 25.1 (2006): 41-57. Print.
- Nelson, Julie D. "Moments of Opportunity: Engaging *Kairos* in the Classroom." *Radical Pedagogy*, 13.1 (2016): 54-62. Print.
- Owens, Derek. *Composition and Sustainability: Teaching for a Threatened Generation*. Urbana: NCTE, 2001.
- Parker-Gwin, Rachel, and J. Beth Mabry. "Service Learning as Pedagogy and Civic Education: Comparing Outcomes for Three Models." *Teaching Sociology*, 26.4 (1998): 276-291.

Print.

Parks, Steve and Eli Goldblatt. "Writing beyond the Curriculum: Fostering New Collaborations in Literacy." *College English*, 62.5 (2000): 584-606. Print.

Peterson, Linda H. "Writing Across the Curriculum and/in the Freshman English Program." *Writing Across the Curriculum: A Guide to Developing Programs*. Eds. Susan McLeod and Margot Soven. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1992. 43-51. Print.

Pigza, Jennifer. "Developing Your Ability to Foster Student Learning and Development Through Reflection." *Looking In, Reaching Out: A Reflective Guide for Community Service-Learning Professionals*. Eds. Barbara Jacoby and Pamela Mutascio. Boston, MA: Campus Compact, 2010. 73-93. Print.

Pine, Gerald. *Teacher Action Research: Building Knowledge Democracies*, Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc, 2008. Print.

Popham, Susan, et al. "Breaking Hierarchies: Using Reflective Practice to Re-Construct the Role of the Writing Program Administrator." *The Writing Program Administrator as Theorist: Making Knowledge Work*. Eds. Shirley K. Rose and Irwin Weiser. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2002. 19-28. Print.

Porter, James E. "Intertextuality and the Discourse Community." *Rhetoric Review*, 5.1 (1986): 34-47. Print.

Poulakos, John. "Toward a Sophistic Definition of Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 16 (1983): 35-48. Print.

Prebel, Julie. "Engaging a 'Pedagogy of Discomfort': Emotion as Critical Inquiry in Community-Based Writing Courses." *Composition Forum*, 34 (2016). Web.

Rai, Candice and Anis Bawarshi. *Theory and Practice of Composition Syllabus*. 2013. English Department, Seattle, WA. Microsoft Word file.

Ray, Ruth. "Composition from the Teacher-Researcher Point of View." *Methods and Methodology in Composition Research*. Eds. Gesa Kirsch, Patricia A. Sullivan. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992. 172-189. Print.

Redd, Teresa. "In the Eye of the Beholder: Contrasting Views of Community Service Writing." *Reflections*, 3.1 (2003): 15-36. Print.

- Reid, E. Shelley. "A Changing for the Better: Curriculum Revision as Reflective Practice in Teaching and Administration." *Writing Program Administration*, 26.3 (2003): 10-27. Print.
- Reiff, Mary Jo, and Anis Bawarshi. "Introduction: From Genre Turn to Public Turn: Navigating the Intersections of Public Sphere Theory, Genre Theory, and the Performance of Publics." *Genre and the Performance of Publics*. Eds. Anis Bawarshi and Mary Jo Reiff. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2016. 3-22. Print.
- Reynolds, Nedra. "Composition's Imagined Geographies." *College Composition and Communication*, 50 (1998): 12-35. Print.
- _____. *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference*. Carbondale, Ill: Southern Illinois University Press, 2007. Print.
- Reynolds, Nedra, and Rich Rice. *Portfolio Teaching: A Guide for Instructors*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006. Print.
- Rhodes, Jacqueline and Jonathan Alexander. "Reimagining the Social Turn: New Work from the Field." *College English*, 76.6 (2014): 481-487. Print.
- Rice, Jenny. *Distant Publics*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012. *Project MUSE*. Web. 26 Apr. 2017.
- Richards, Janet. "Transformations in Graduate Education Majors' Relational Care in a Service-Learning Writing Course." *Reading Improvements*, 50.1 (2013): 19-29. Print.
- Rickert, Thomas J. *Ambient Rhetoric: The Attunements of Rhetorical Being*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2013. Print.
- Rivers, Nathaniel. "Circumnavigation: An Interview with Thomas Rickert." *Kairos: Rhetoric, Technology, Pedagogy*, 18.2 (2013). Web.
- Rivers, Nathaniel and Weber, Ryan P. "Ecological, Pedagogical, Public Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication*, 63.2 (2011): 187-218. Print.
- Rose, Shirley and Irwin Weiser. *Going Public: The WPA as Advocate for Engagement*. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2010. Print.

- Rosenberg, Lauren. "Retelling Culture Through the Construction of Alternative Literacy Narratives: A Study of Adults Acquiring New Literacies." *Reflections*, 9.3 (2010): 75-114. Print.
- Sax, Linda, and Alexander Astin. "The Impact of College on Post College Involvement in Volunteerism and Community Service." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *Association for Institutional Research*, Albuquerque, NM, 1996.
- Schiappa, Edward. "Intellectuals and the Place of Cultural Critique," *Rhetoric, Cultural Studies, and Literacy*. Ed. John Frederick Reynolds. Hillsdale: Erlbaum, 1995. 21-27. Print.
- Schön, Donald A. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. 1 edition. New York: Basic Books, 1984. Print.
- Schumer, David. "Learning from Qualitative Research." *Service-Learning: Applications From the Research*. Ed. Alan S. Waterman. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1997. 25-38. Print.
- Silver, Naomi. "Reflection in Digital Spaces: Publication, Conversation, Collaboration." *A Rhetoric of Reflection*. Ed. Kathleen Blake Yancey. Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 2016: 166-200. Print.
- Smagorinsky, Peter. *Research on Composition: Multiple Perspectives on Two Decades of Change*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2005. Print.
- Smith, Craig R., and Michael J. Hyde. "Rethinking 'The Public': The Role of Emotion in Being-With-Others." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 77.4 (1991): 446-466. Print.
- Soja, Edward W. "Preface." *Spatializing Literacy Research and Practice*. Eds. Kevin M. Leander and Margaret Sheehy. New York: Peter Lang Inc., 2004. Print.
- Spinuzzi, Clay. *Network: Theorizing Knowledge Work in Telecommunications*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Steinberg, Kathryn, Robert G. Bringle, and Matthew J. Williams. *Service-Learning Research Primer*. Scotts Valley, CA: National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, 2010. Web.
http://servicelearning.gov/filemanager/download/Service-Learning_Research_Primer.pdf
- Steinke, Pamela, and Peggy Fitch. "Assessing Service-Learning." *Research and Practice in*

- Assessment*, 2 (2007): 24-29. Print.
- Stoecker, Randy. "Community-Based Research: From Practice to Theory and Back Again." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9 (2003): 35-46. Print.
- Townsend, Martha. "What are Writing Across the Curriculum and Writing in the Disciplines?" *A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators*. Eds. Rita Malencyk et al. Anderson, South Carolina: Parlor Press, 2013. 77-90. Print.
- Tryon, Elizabeth, Randy Stoecker, Amy Martin, Kristy Seblonka, Amy Hilgendorf, Margaret Nellis. "The Challenge of Short-Term Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14.2 (2008): 16-26. Print.
- Tucker, Bill. "Pippy and the Reflective Turn: A Model for Pedagogical Thinking." *Journal of Teaching Writing*, 18.1/2 (2000): 31-55. Print.
- Vatz, Richard E. "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 6.3 (1973): 154-161.
- Villanueva, Victor, ed. *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. Urbana, Ill: National Council of Teachers of English, 2003. Print.
- Wan, Amy J. *Producing Good Citizens: Literacy Training in Anxious Times*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2014.
- Wardle, Elizabeth. "Understanding 'Transfer' from FYC: Preliminary Results of a Longitudinal Study." *WPA*, 31.1-2 (2007): 65-85. Print.
- Wenger, Christy. "'Feeling Lore': The 'Problem' of Emotion in the Practice of Teaching." *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 10.3 (2011): 45-59. Print.
- Wells, Susan. "Rogue Cops and Health Care: What Do We Want from Public Writing?" *College Composition and Communication*, 47.3 (1996): 325-341. Print.
- Weisser, Christian. "Ecocomposition and the Greening of Identity." *Ecocomposition: Theoretical and Pedagogical Approaches*. Eds. Christian Weisser and Sidney Dobrin, Albany: State University of New York, 2001. 81-96. Print.
- Welch, Marshall. "The ABCs of Reflection: A Template for Students and Instructors to

- Implement Written Reflection in Service-Learning.” *NSEE Quarterly*, 25.2 (1999): 22-25. Print.
- Westheimer, Joel and Kahne, Joseph. “Educating the “Good” Citizen: Political Choices and Pedagogical Goals.” *Political Science and Politics APSC*, 37.2 (2004): 241-247. Print.
- Wilkey, Christopher, and Nicholas Mauriello. *Texts of Consequence: Composing Social Activism for the Classroom and the Community*. New York: Hampton Press, 2012. Print.
- Williams, Sean D. and C. Renee Love, “Cultivating Democratic Sensibility by Working with For-Profit Organizations: An Alternative Perspective on Service-Learning.” *Reflections*, 4.2 (2005): 124-145. Print.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. “Defining Reflection: The Rhetorical Nature and Qualities of Reflection.” *A Rhetoric of Reflection*. Ed. Kathleen Blake Yancey. Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 2016. 303-320. Print.
- _____. “Looking Back as We Look Forward: Historicizing Writing Assessment.” *CCC* 50 (1999): 483-503. Reprinted in *Assessing Writing: A Critical Sourcebook*. Eds. Brian Huot and Peggy O’Neill. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2009. 131-149. Print.
- _____. *Reflection in The Writing Classroom*. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 1998. Print.
- _____. “Seeing Practice Through Their Eyes: Reflection as Teacher” *Writing Center Research: Extending the Conversation*. Eds. Gillespie, Paula et al. Routledge, 2001. 189-201. Print.
- Zebroski, James T. *Thinking Through Theory: Vygotskian Perspectives on the Teaching of Writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1994. Print.

Appendix 1: EWP Outcomes

1. To demonstrate an awareness of the strategies that writers use in different writing contexts.

- The writing employs style, tone, and conventions appropriate to the demands of a particular genre and situation.
- The writer is able to demonstrate the ability to write for different audiences and contexts, both within and outside the university classroom.
- The writing has a clear understanding of its audience, and various aspects of the writing (mode of inquiry, content, structure, appeals, tone, sentences, and word choice) address and are strategically pitched to that audience.
- The writer articulates and assesses the effects of his or her writing choices.

2. To read, analyze, and synthesize complex texts and incorporate multiple kinds of evidence purposefully in order to generate and support writing.

- The writing demonstrates an understanding of the course texts as necessary for the purpose at hand.
- Course texts are used in strategic, focused ways (for example: summarized, cited, applied, challenged, re-contextualized) to support the goals of the writing.
- The writing is intertextual, meaning that a “conversation” between texts and ideas is created in support of the writer’s goals.
- The writer is able to utilize multiple kinds of evidence gathered from various sources (primary and secondary – for example, library research, interviews, questionnaires, observations, cultural artifacts) in order to support writing goals.
- The writing demonstrates responsible use of the MLA (or other appropriate) system of documenting sources.

3. To produce complex, analytic, persuasive arguments that matter in academic contexts.

- The argument is appropriately complex, based in a claim that emerges from and explores a line of inquiry.
- The stakes of the argument, why what is being argued matters, are articulated and persuasive.
- The argument involves analysis, which is the close scrutiny and examination of evidence and assumptions in support of a larger set of ideas.
- The argument is persuasive, taking into consideration counterclaims and multiple points of view as it generates its own perspective and position.
- The argument utilizes a clear organizational strategy and effective transitions that develop its line of inquiry.

4. To develop flexible strategies for revising, editing, and proofreading writing.

- The writing demonstrates substantial and successful revision.
- The writing responds to substantive issues raised by the instructor and peers.
- Errors of grammar, punctuation, and mechanics are proofread and edited so as not to interfere with reading and understanding the writing.

Appendix 2: Interview Questions for Instructor and Student Participants

Instructor:

Pre-Autumn Questions

1. What made you want to teach English 121?
2. What did you think teaching a service-learning writing course was going to be like? In what ways has that stayed the same? In what ways has that changed?
3. What do you think the purpose or goal of your English 121 course is? What do you hope students learn in your course?
4. How did you come up with your course theme? In what ways do you see this course theme being effective for service-learning?
5. Describe what writing skills and strategies you will focus on when teaching English 121. In addition, describe how your writing assignments will help you teach towards these skills and strategies.
6. How do you envision teaching English 121 will be different than teaching English 131? Will you be modifying your pedagogical style at all? If no, explain why not.

Pre-Winter Questions

1. What were some challenges you faced while teaching English 121 that you did not experience when teaching English 131? How do you plan on addressing these challenges?
2. What were some successes have you had while teaching English 121 that you did not experience when teaching English 131? How do you plan on maintaining this success?
3. Now that you have had a chance to read student responses from the Autumn Quarter interviews, what stood out to you about the feedback?
4. Were there any writing prompts you assigned that you felt students did not execute in the fashion that you had intended? Why do you think this occurred? Will you be modifying this assignment in the upcoming Winter Quarter?
5. What are three areas of your curriculum/syllabus that you see modifying for the Winter Quarter?

Post-Winter Questions

1. Now with two quarters of English 121 experience, what are some details about your pedagogy that you noticed changing between Autumn Quarter and Winter Quarter?
2. Did you see any changes in your students' writing as a result of the change(s)? If so, what are some examples? If not, why do you think there was no change(s)?
3. What are three areas of your curriculum/syllabus that you see modifying for the Spring Quarter?
4. Now that you have had a chance to read student responses from the Winter Quarter interviews, what stood out to you about the feedback?
5. Now with two quarters of English 121 experience, how would you say your identity as a composition instructor in a service-learning course differs from your identity as a general first-year composition instructor?
6. How would you say the writing prompts you create differ when teaching a service-learning course than a general first-year composition course?

Student:

1. In your own words, describe the kinds of writing that you are doing in English 121? Be as descriptive as you can. To help you think, imagine one of your friends is thinking about taking English 121 and wanted to get a sense of the types of writing you guys do.
2. Similar to the previous question, describe the types of reading you are doing in English 121.
3. What do you think are the most important things you learned in English 121?
4. What new writing skills and strategies have been taught to you in English 121 that you have not encountered in past writing classes?
5. Do you think any of the writing that you are doing in this course has any applicability to what you are doing at your service-learning site? Is it helping you communicate better there with either students or your supervisor?
6. Were you familiar with service-learning before taking English 121? If not, did your instructor take the time to define S-L? How would you say she defined it?
7. In your own words, what is the course theme? How do the course readings help you explore this theme further?
8. Related to the last question, how do you think the writing that you have been doing in the course help you explore this theme further?

9. Service-learning courses are often seen as a “bridge” between the university environment and the local community. How well do you think your instructor is building this bridge in your English 121 class? In other words, do you feel like there is a strong relationship between the things you are learning and doing in class and what you are experiencing at the service learning site?
10. In your opinion, what has been the most “beneficial” writing activity this quarter and why? The least “beneficial” and why? Before you give me an answer, explain to me a bit how you are defining “beneficial” in this situation.
11. Can you pinpoint any specific writing assignment or activity that helped you strengthen your ability to write in a university setting? In what way? How about any writing assignment that helped you strengthen your ability to write in a non-university setting? In what way?

Appendix 3: Sample English 131 and English 121 Orientation Schedules

English 131 Orientation Outline

On the first day of orientation, you will receive a detailed orientation schedule listing times, daily activities, and specific tasks. In order to give you a preview of what the orientation will cover, this list outlines the daily schedule and highlights the topics covered.

Date and Times	Topics Covered
Sunday, September 15 9:00 to 11:30 12:30 to 3:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions • EWP learning outcomes and 131 curriculum • Developing course descriptions • Distribute materials • Drafting your English 131 course description (for homework)
Monday, September 16 9:00 to 12:00 1:00 to 4:00 (International TAs must attend TA/RA session from 2:45-4:00)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EWP policies • English Department Introductions • Workshop course descriptions • Scaffolding and designing assignment sequences; assessment criteria for student papers • Reviewing Parts I-IV of <i>Contexts for Inquiry</i> (for homework) • Drafting your first major paper assignment (for homework)
Tuesday, September 17 9:00 to 11:30 12:30 to 3:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop first major paper assignment • Designing and scaffolding short assignments and using textbook to support lesson planning • Developing course calendars • Outlining your assignment sequence and course calendar; revising first major paper assignment (for homework)
Wednesday, September 18 9:00 to 12:30 1:30 to 3:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop assignment sequence outlines • Feedback and grading • Developing lesson plans and class demonstration • Drafting lesson plans; revising shorter assignments and calendar (for homework)
Thursday, September 19 9:30 to 5:00 (lunch included)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MicroTeaching • Writer's Help workshop • Teaching argument, claims, and other writing skills • Workshop lesson plans and shorter assignments • Continue building course calendar and revising/finalizing assignment sequence; microteaching preparation (for homework)
Friday, September 20 12:00 to 4:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lunch • Introduction to the Library, Writing Centers, and FIGs • Student and experienced TA panels • Designing syllabi • Drafting your syllabus; finalizing course calendar and assignment sequence
Monday, September 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching with technology; building technology tools • Syllabus check

9:00 to 12:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portfolio grading overview • UW campus resources • Classroom management and persona • Wrap up • End of orientation party/pot luck
1:00 to 3:15	
6:00 pm to 10:00 pm	

English 121 Orientation Outline

First conversation (30 minutes): Before this first meeting, instructors are given the English 121 orientation manual, and provided access to the English 121 Community Page, the web archive of shared resources and course materials.

Friday, May 16, 1:30-3:00 pm, location TBA: (90 minutes): This meeting includes all incoming instructors and staff from the Carlson Center for Leadership and Public Service, who manages all of the students' placements in community-based organizations. Prior to this meeting, instructors will have drafted a "one-pager", a document written by each service-learning instructor that communicates the overview, assignments, and role of service-learning in their proposed ENG 121 course. Together, with fellow instructors and Carlson Center staff members, each instructor workshops through the one-pager. In addition, this meeting provides new service-learning instructors with further insight into the logistics of the program, such as getting students signed up for service-learning positions and getting feedback from community partners about students' service.

Tuesday, May 20 (optional): While not a required part of the orientation schedule, English 121 instructors are recommended to visit the Spring Celebration of Leadership and Public Service, an on-campus event that showcases the projects done by many UW students and the community organizations that partner with the university.

By June 13 (60 minutes): English 121 instructors are to have met with Carlson Center Director or Assistant Director to confirm their theme for fall quarter and discuss any remaining questions about their revised one-pager and potential community partners for their fall English 121 course.

Thursday, September 18, 9:00-11:30 (2.5 hours): All incoming English 121 instructors meet with Carlson Center staff and the English 121 program director to discuss their course planning, last-minute questions regarding logistics of student registration with community partners, and to make a visit together to at least one community partner (by bus or on foot). Instructors are also expected to bring copies of a 1-2 page document including a summary of the short and major papers in their assignment sequences, a list of the readings they plan to assign, a brief explanation of some of the ways they plan to incorporate students' community-based learning into class activities and assignment prompts, and any remaining questions.

Mid-November, time and location TBA (1.5 hours): Meeting between instructors, the program director, and Carlson Center staff joining 30 minutes to reflect on fall quarter courses and questions, review the English 121 end-of-term portfolio process, and discussion regarding any changes to be made to the course theme or community partners for winter quarter.

The final 3 hours of the 10 hour orientation/training time for English 121 are reserved for individual development including: meeting with the English 121 Director, visiting a spring 2013 English 121 class, attending the May 20 Spring Celebration, and creating your course portfolio (or other form of course materials your cohort decides will be most useful when we meet in November).

Appendix 4: Assignment Prompt – Spatial Analysis of Community Organization

As we move through the quarter, our understanding of space and place will become more and more complicated and nuanced. We will encounter various definitions and perceptions of place, some that parallel one another and some that challenge one another.

In this assignment, you and your group mates will explore the physical space that surrounds and makes up your community organization. The goal of this assignment is fairly straightforward: Visit the location and document some of its characteristics. Based on the evidence that you gather, work together to make a claim (or perhaps claims) about the rhetorical capabilities of your community partner. In other words, how does the space influence or affect the thoughts, views, or actions of those who interact with it? Then, on the day of your presentation, your group will lead the class discussion for the first 20-30 minutes of class.

What should we document? (Many of these are drawn from our visual/spatial analysis strategies checklist)

- The physical “ingredients” of your community organization; that is, what material(s) are used to construct it?
- The objects (seating, plantation, art) within your community organization; ask yourself: Is there a lack of something?
- Descriptions of the people interacting with your community organization; what is it about your community organization that you think draws them to it?
 - What actions are these people performing? How does the space promote this? Is there any characteristic of the physical space that seems to shut down particular actions?
- The environment **around** your community organization; does your service site differ from the environment around it? Does it fit in? Remember, where the space is located help you learn more about its rhetorical capabilities.
- Your experience traveling to the community organization. Could you get there by public transportation or is it accessible only by personal vehicles? Did you have a tough time finding it? How come?

These are just some ideas you can document. Rely on the spatial rhetoric checklist. Nearly all of those guided questions can be appropriated and made relevant to the analysis. **You are not required to answer all of the questions on the checklist,** but you should aim to answer as many that are applicable to your community organization.

How should we document it?

Any or all of the following practices are encouraged:

- Photographs
- Moving images (video)

- Drawing or a diagram
- Audio recording of sounds
- Textual description

Basically, anything that will help you effectively bring your community organization into the classroom environment. You are not required to create a PowerPoint, but that may be the best medium for you to present some of the things you document.

Appendix 5: Spatial Rhetoric Checklist

Level 1: What is the big picture?

- What is the situation or motivation for the construction of the community organization?
- What is its purpose?
- What population(s) does the organization seem to be meant for? Conversely, are there any audience(s) that are excluded?

Level 2: What characteristics of the space can you observe?

- What objects are included in/around the organization? How are they arranged? Cluttered? Sparse?
- What action(s) does the organization seem to promote? What does it seem to shut down?
- What is the environment surrounding the organization like? What features does it share with the organization? What features are different?
- What elements contribute to the design of the organization? What colors, shapes, or signs does it include? How are they arranged? Does the design of the organization *explicitly* evoke any particular feeling, memory, or association?
- What can you hear as you are exploring the organization? Is it loud? Quiet? What does this inform you about the neighborhood or community in which it is located?

Level 3: How can you interpret what the organization *suggests*?

- What feeling or mood does it create? How does it create this mood?
- What sociological, political, economic, or cultural attitudes are reflected through the organization?
- Are there any symbolic meanings behind the color, shapes, and signs found at the organization? Think about this: are there any differences between what the design explicitly states and what is symbolized?
- What theme or themes can you identify at the organization?

**One thing to constantly keep in mind as you are gathering data is: What is excluded? That is, analysis is not always about seeing what is there and what that means, but also what is not there, and thus what message is being conveyed by the fact that someone or something is not represented.

Appendix 6: Fieldwork Safety Protocol

What else should we consider when we are doing this assignment?

Respect others around you. Remember that you are sharing this space with others. Be careful about your noise level and shoving cameras in strangers' faces.

- Be honest. If anyone is curious about what you guys are doing, tell them about this class. You may even want to bring this prompt along so they have a better sense of the assignment.
- With that said, you may encounter staff members or people in your organization who are uncomfortable with being captured on audio or video. Again, be polite, honest, and disengage from the situation if they ask you to do so.
- Important: If something does come up during your exploration, your group may want to reflect upon it afterwards and think about what that situation contributes to the overall rhetorical capabilities of the community organization.

Appendix 7: Assignment Prompt – Multimodal Map of Your Service-Learning Experience

If we buy into Cresswell’s argument that we come to embed places with our own meanings and knowledges, then each of our service-learning experiences could be represented differently, even if we are serving at the same organization. Therefore, for this final project, I am interested in your personal visualization of your overall service-learning experience.

Task: This final project is comprised of three parts:

1. **A custom “My Map” powered by Google Maps:** For this section of the final project, you will be asked to compose a digital map.

As we go through the next couple of week, you will visit 4-5 locations around Seattle that you believe have or had some influence on your overall service-learning experience. You will mark these locations on your map, supplement them with images, audio, and visuals, as well as a brief description and reflection. In turn, you will be creating a personalized “take” on this location, and explain how it’s relevant to your experiences in this course.

In terms of picking locations, Google Maps allow you to annotate and label beyond buildings and landmarks. You are also able to label and mark paths, roads, and everyday street corners. **That means you can even mark bus and traffic routes.** As you are thinking about this project, be sure to reflect on the spaces that may not come to mind right away, but still hold some sort of meaning.

2. **Analysis:** You will be doing the bulk of your analysis in a 3-4 page paper in which you will be making an argument about how exactly these locations influenced your service-learning experience. To support your claim, you will:
 - Conduct rhetorical analysis of these locations, examining their rhetorical capabilities (just like our group presentation)
 - Reflect on how your relationship with these locations supports, challenges, or complicates theories we have been reading on identity performance and power dynamics.

While 3-4 pages is not a long paper, analysis here will be complex. Many of the readings we have been doing this quarter argue that there is an interconnected relationship between space, identity, and power – that all these aspects relate and play off one another. In this paper, it is up to you to examine how your personal service-learning experience takes up this argument.

3. **Presentation:** What good is a personal interpretation of service-learning if it is only seen by yourself and the instructor? The second section of this final project will be a short 5-10 minute presentation to the class about your customized map, the various locations you decided to mark, and your rationale for selecting those locations.

Please provide the URL to your Google Map at the top of your paper. If I do not have access to your map by the due date (either because you forgot to provide the URL or the link is broken) I will not be able to grade the map portion of your final project.