Examining community partners' perspectives on reciprocity and co-education.

Alexa Darby
Elon University

Lauren Willingham
Elon University

Tammy Cobb
Alamance Arts

ABSTRACT

This study examines how community partners understand reciprocity and co-education in service-learning. Twenty community partners participated in 30-minute telephone interviews. When asked to define reciprocity, participants identified the importance of communication and maintaining a two-way relationship. With regard to co-education, community partners highlighted communication, the back-and-forth nature of the relationship, and their role as a facilitator. This study will help universities and community partners increase the effectiveness and maximize the benefits of their service-learning relationships.

As the field of service-learning has grown, so has the scholarship on service-learning and community partnerships. Research has substantiated both the benefits and challenges of service-learning for community partners (Jacoby, 2015b). The scholarly literature has also examined reciprocity between universities and community partners (Jacoby, 2015b). However, scholars have yet to examine empirically the relationship between service-learning, reciprocity, and co-education, particularly from the community partners' perspective.

Reciprocity in service-learning occurs when community partners and members of the university share ideas and responsibility for knowledge creation and project outcomes. When genuine reciprocity exists, both the university and the community benefit from the service-learning relationship (d'Arlach et al., 2009; Miron & Moely, 2006). Research has identified the importance of taking community partners' perspectives into account to yield the greatest benefits for both the community and the university (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Cruz & Giles, 2000; Hammersley, 2012; Janke, 2013; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000).

When community partners have insufficient input into the service-learning relationship, the consequence may be a lack of

community impact (Butin, 2003). In contrast, expanding community partners' input increases the reciprocity and mutual benefits of service-learning (Janke, 2013), yielding more positive outcomes for the university and community alike. Henry and Breyfogle (2006) emphasize that the element of reciprocity is important in distinguishing service-learning from community service or other forms of volunteering.

Research has highlighted the need to clearly define reciprocity to avoid confusion among those engaged in its practice and scholarship (Dostilio et al., 2012). This term may be understood in multiple ways and interpreted differently by various parties in a relationship. Three suggested conceptualizations of reciprocity are *exchange-oriented*, in which both groups do something for the other; *influence-oriented*, in which both groups influence what the other is doing; and *generativity-oriented*, in which both groups work together to co-create something new (Dostilio et al., 2012). Given these multiple conceptualizations of reciprocity, it is important to gain insight into how community partners themselves define and use this term.

Sandy and Holland (2006) argue that although reciprocity is a well-established term in the field of service-learning, the means for achieving reciprocity are poorly understood. Scholars have found that the longer and more frequent the contact between the community partner and the university, the better the relationship will be. This in turn impacts the reciprocal nature of the service-learning experience (Sandy & Holland, 2006; Worrall, 2007). Henry and Breyfogle (2006) also recommend a shift from a "traditional" to an "enriched" approach to reciprocity in which the goals, perception of power, partner identity, boundaries, outcomes, and scope of commitment are changed as needed. In this enriched model authority is shared, flexible boundaries are maintained, and all parties benefit.

Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2000) examined how universities tend to use service-learning as a way of doing work *for* community partners instead of doing work *with* them. While "doing for" creates a sense of separation between the university and community in which the university is seen as superior, "doing with" results in mutuality in which the university and community are viewed as equal partners. In a study by Blouin and Perry (2009), programs in which community-based organizations were treated not as subjects or recipients but instead as equal contributors were found to produce greater benefits for the community. Based on these findings, the authors argue that establishing shared power and shared control will improve the outcomes of service-learning for everyone involved.

Tinkler, Tinkler, Hausman, and Tufo-Strouse (2014) offer six recommendations to support reciprocity in service-learning relationships:

> (a) be attentive to the community partner's mission and vision,
> (b) understand the human dimension of the community partner's work,
> (c) be mindful of the community partner's resources,
> (d) accept and share the responsibility for inefficiencies,
> (e) consider the legacy of the partnership, and
> (f) regard the process as important. (p. 137)

Simply put, ensuring that community partners' voices are heard is critical to fostering and sustaining reciprocal service-learning relationships.

Recognizing service-learning as a shared responsibility involving reciprocity between the university and the community lends itself to understanding community partners as co-educators. While reciprocity is increasingly discussed in the literature on service-learning, however, very little is understood about the role of community partners as co-educators. *Reciprocity* is defined as an exchange of ideas or resources by two or more entities. *Co-education* represents a process that involves sharing ideas in the pursuit of knowledge. These two terms differ in that reciprocity is focused on giving and receiving, while co-education is focused on teaching and learning. Whereas reciprocity between universities and community partners allows students to learn how to adapt to and function in a real-world environment (Cooper & Orrell, 2016), this real-world experience would not be possible without engagement and co-education from community partners (Cooper & Orrell, 2016).

In a recent empirical study, Davis, Madden, Cronley, and Beamon (2019) identified a gap in the literature related to community partners' definition of service-learning. They found that many community partners have trouble distinguishing between volunteerism, service-learning, and other forms of experiential learning. To date, no empirical research has investigated how community partners themselves define their role in the context of service-learning.

The shared responsibility for service-learning lends itself naturally to examining the link between reciprocity and co-education. XXX (2016) studied community partners' perspectives on educating students about diverse populations. They found that students learned as much if not more from the community partner as from the professor. This research highlighted the role of community partners as co-educators with regard to teaching about diversity. While community partners are slowly beginning to be identified as co-educators, they are still not recognized as full collaborators in service-learning (Hammersley, 2012). The purpose of this study is to understand how community partners define and understand reciprocity and their role as co-educators in the context of service-learning.

Methods

The participants in this study are employed by non-profit organizations that have a working relationship with the university and that serve the community in the areas of health, education, and economic stability. The organizations, located in the southeastern U.S., reside in a community that is home to approximately 174,055 residents in nine municipalities. Mostly rural, with an 18.5% poverty rate, its largest municipality is the city, which is home to approximately 60,000 residents. The county's 424 square miles are located in the middle of the state and accessed from the north, south, east, and west via Interstates. The university conducting this study is in the Southeastern United States and the study received IRB approval.

The researchers randomly selected 27 prospective participants from the total sample of 74 individuals who have collaborated with the university's community engagement center and information was entered in a database. Potential participants received an email inviting them to participate in the study. After a week, if they had not responded to the email they were contacted by phone. It is important to note that at the time of the study community partners may have faced challenges associated with the

COVID-19 pandemic. Twenty community partners agreed to participate in a phone interview. The interviews were conducted one week after the participants agreed to be in the study. The interviews lasted on average 30 minutes, and each participant received a $20 gift card as a thank you for completing the study.

Fifteen of the participants were female and five were male. Eight participants worked for organizations focused on health, four for organizations focused on education, and eight for organizations focused on economic stability. The participants have worked in their fields on average 11-20 years and in their organizations on average 6-10 years (see Table 1).

Table 1
Demographics

Name	Field	Years in Field	Years with Organization	Years Working with Students	Number of students
Steven	Economic stability	11-20	11-20	More than 5	6-10
Sarah	Health	21-30	11-20	More than 5	11-20
Stephanie	Health	31-50	11-20	More than 5	11-20
Annie	Economic stability	6-10	1-5	More than 5	50 or more
Nicolas	Health	31-50	31-50	More than 5	50 or more
Kathryn	Health	11-20	6-10	More than 5	31-50
Brad	Economic stability	11-20	1-5	3-4	50 or more
Jessica	Economic stability	1-5	105	3-4	6-10
Jack	Education	21-30	11-20	More than 5	31-50
Sharon	Education	11-20	1-5	More than 5	50 or more
Amanda	Economic stability	31-50	21-30	1-2	31-50
Kim	Health	11-20	1-5	More than 5	11-20
Becky	Education	31-50	21-30	More than 5	50 or more
Monica	Health	6-10	11-20	More than 5	50 or more
Kevin	Economic stability	1-5	1-5	3-4	50 or more
William	Health	21-30	11-20	More than 5	21-30
Isabel	Economic stability	11-20	6-10	More than 5	50 or more
Sandra	Health	31-50	11-20	1-2	1-5
Nancy	Economic stability	6-10	1-5	More than 5	50 or more
Samantha	Education	11-20	6-10	3-4	11-20

The participants have been engaged in collaborations with the university for an average of 3-4 years and have worked with an average of 21-30 students. They primarily worked with students in the context of academic courses, internships, events,

and as volunteers with the main emphasis on academic service-learning. Jacoby (2015a) defines service-learning "as a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs, together with structured opportunities for reflection designed to achieve desired learning outcomes" (p. 2). In previous literature community partners had trouble differentiating between the various types of service (Davis et al., 2019).

Community partners were asked to provide demographic information and respond to interview questions. The interview questions included:

- How do you define co-educator?
- How do you see yourself as a co-educator?
- Describe a time when you were a co-educator.
- What tools do you use as a co-educator?

Participants were also asked questions related to reciprocity, including:

- How do you define reciprocity?
- Describe a time when you experienced reciprocity.
- What factors were necessary for reciprocity?

Responses to these questions were transcribed verbatim for analysis.

The number of years participants had worked with university students, the number of students with whom they worked, and the contexts in which they had worked with students were examined for mid to high frequency. After we compiled the participants' responses in a Word document, we uploaded them into a software program, Dedoose, where we conducted open coding. Dedoose was used because it is the software owned by the university. Open coding involved identifying relevant fragments from each excerpt in response to our analysis questions (Boeije, 2010). The following analysis questions guided the coding of each transcript.

- What does it mean to be a co-educator?
- How do you carry out the role of a co-educator?
- What does it mean to have reciprocity?

Following open coding, we placed the codes in a table to identify patterns, known as categories. Categories are "a group or cluster used to sort parts of the data" (Boeije, 2010, p. 95). We created a visual display to help us examine the categories. This allowed us to see how the categories interact, which led to the development of themes.

Findings

The participants were asked to define reciprocity, identify the factors that contribute to reciprocity, and define co-education. Community partners overwhelmingly talked about the give-and-take nature of their relationship with the university. This point was evident in their definitions of both reciprocity (18 out of 20) and co-education (15

out of 20). The findings were unpacked for both of these areas leading to the subheadings.

Co-education

Of the 20 participants, 15 discussed the need for co-education to occur from both the university's and the community organization's side. Twelve participants identified effective communication as a vital element in co-education. In addition, eight participants highlighted their view of themselves as facilitators as a key to their understanding of the definition of co-education.

Both Sides

Participants largely defined co-education as the involvement of "both sides." Nicolas highlighted the importance of sharing knowledge between the organization and the university, a dynamic that is critical for maintaining a balanced relationship between these two partners. In response to the question, "How do you define co-educator?" Nicolas emphasized the importance of linking academic learning with experience beyond the classroom. He noted,

> So, I think that's kind of what a co-educator is designed to do, is to get that blend out there to say, yes, we are going to tell you about the textbook principles and how things work, but we're also going to show you how it works in real life.

Similar to Nicolas, Steven expressed the need for both sides to be engaged in co-education. He also discussed the meaning of co-education in relation to the real world beyond the classroom. He described students' engagement in the community as, "just a window into the world outside of a classroom—both sides." As seen in Table 1, Steven has worked with six to 10 university students over a period of more than five years. While Steven is not veteran community partner, he does have sufficient experience to express a clear goal for students to obtain real-world experience coupled with the class material, enabling learning to take place on "both sides."

Jack sought to orient students to the daily operations of his organization in the hope that they would apply this knowledge in the classroom and thereby share it with their peers. When asked to define co-educator, Jack responded, "So we were able to educate [the students] on what we did, or what we do, every day. And they were able to use that in turn for whatever classes they may have been taking."

Nicolas, Steven, and Jack illuminate the nature of effective co-education as a two-way street. Relationships of this type require willing partners on both sides. No matter how long a community partner has collaborated with the university, both sides must remain open-minded and committed for the partnership to continue to succeed.

Communication

Communication was identified by 12 of the 20 participants as a key element of co-education. This category encompassed three themes: technology (7), open communication (5), and understanding (4). Some participants referenced more than one of these themes in their responses. The participants were adamant about the importance of these elements.

The number one area of communication referenced was technology. Examples of technology ranged from sending emails to using sophisticated databases. Nancy emphasized the need to teach students the vital role of everyday communication through technology as a means of advancing the community organization's work. When asked, "What tools do you use as a co-educator?" Nancy shared,

> Mostly right now, media technology . . . using that media for texting, using a video chat, email, those types of things, to reach out and allow students to experience conversations with these people who are doing [this work], or like I am in the field.

Technology, from this perspective, provides a tool to promote and maintain relationships between the community and the university.

Participants highlighted open communication as another key category within communication. When asked to "Describe a time when you were a co-educator," Sandra emphasized the importance of maintaining "direct communication with [the student intern] while working with her and in meetings one-on-one. Working with her as she was doing her work in the community. Giving her feedback. Listening to what she had to say." Sandra identified open communication as a key to maintaining a successful partnership.

Participants also emphasized the importance of understanding as the foundation for effective communication. William underscored the need to convey information clearly to all parties involved in the service-learning experience. When asked to describe a time he was a co-educator, William described collaborating with the university in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. He responded, "So we want to make sure that the students, faculty, residents, everybody knows, hey, this is what's happening." William highlights the importance of communicating information clearly and consistently to all members of the team so they share a common understanding of the organization's activities and purpose—and in this case, its planned response to an unexpected crisis.

Facilitator

Eight of the 20 participants characterized themselves as facilitators and not necessarily co-educators. While a co-educator plays an active role in educating students, a facilitator oversees student learning based on a framework set by the professor. Participants who viewed themselves as facilitators described their role as ensuring that students have a voice in the learning process. In response to the question, "How do you see yourself as a co-educator?" Jessica reflected, "I've seen myself, I guess, more as a community facilitator, giving [students] an opportunity to learn about being exposed to what we do." Rather than seeing herself as a co-educator, Jessica viewed herself as a facilitator whose role was to promote student learning.

Facilitators keep their students' learning objectives at the forefront of their thinking. When asked, "How do you define co-educator?" Sarah replied,

> We're helping [students] to meet those goals [of the academic course]. But the objectives for their learning experience are coming from the instructor. So we're

> facilitating them in helping them to meet those goals, to learn the things that they need to learn.

By relying on the faculty member to frame the course objectives and set goals for the students, Sarah is able to focus on student needs and facilitate student learning as it relates to her organization.

A significant number of the participants described co-education as a relationship that requires commitment from both sides. While the contributions of each side may differ, the two sides are unified by the shared goals of promoting student learning while benefiting the community. Keys to achieving this learning and reaping these benefits include effective communication—accomplished through the use of technology, a commitment to open communication, and ensuring shared understandings of organizational activities and purpose—and recognizing that some community partners may frame their role as that of a co-educator while other view themselves as facilitators.

Reciprocity

Reciprocity is similar to co-education in that communication and mutual giving and receiving lie at its foundation. When asked to define reciprocity, 18 of the 20 participants discussed giving and receiving, while eight participants highlighted communication.

Giving and Receiving

This high-frequency category was divided into four areas: give and take, mutual benefit (8), learning and knowledge (6), and relationships (5). Some participants referenced more than one of these areas in their responses. The give-and-take nature of reciprocity was mentioned most frequently by participants.

In Becky's experience, the give-and-take yields mutual gain for community partners and the university. She defined reciprocity succinctly, stating, "I gain volunteers and [the students] gain knowledge." Similarly, Sharon discussed the directionality of reciprocity in her definition, observing that in her experience the sharing of knowledge and the subsequent learning go both ways. Echoing Becky, in response to the question, "How do you define reciprocity?" Sharon noted,

> I always think of reciprocity as a give-and-take. I know that in a relationship with the university students, I think it is a give-and-take. I think I learn from them just as much as they learn from me.

Eight participants identified the mutual benefits of reciprocity, in which both sides gain from the relationship. Each side defines what their own benefit will be. Kim emphasized the conditions for reciprocity and the mutual advantages that result.

> In most cases, [both parties] do it [engage in reciprocity] out of the goodness of how they feel, but ultimately it'll come back to them in some way. So I think it's ultimately the understanding that both parties will mutually benefit from that.

Similarly, Samantha emphasized the importance of mutual benefit in reciprocity, defining reciprocity as “the exchange of information or resources for everyone’s mutual benefit.”

Six participants identified learning and knowledge as vital elements of reciprocity. When asked to define reciprocity, Isabel reflected, “I think it’s our responsibility to give good feedback and create learning opportunities for these students so they can walk away from that experience being more ready for the workforce and for life.” Isabel cares about students’ long-term learning in terms of their readiness for the job market, in addition to the life skills they would obtain.

Kevin described the reciprocal interaction that occurs when the university students interact with the students his organization serves. In response to the question, “How do you define reciprocity?” Kevin noted,

> I believe when the students come here as well, they are learning a completely different sense of what goes on, on this side of the tracks, so to speak. When they’re seeing how the kids, and some of the kids live in situations, so on and so forth. And I think they learn a lot from our kids as well, so that’s where I think that reciprocity comes in.

The vastly different lived experiences of these two groups result in an optimal learning experience for everyone involved.

Among the most valuable outcomes of university and community collaboration are the relationships that result. Kathryn focused on the value of these relationships. Specifically, when describing the key to effective collaboration and the factors necessary for reciprocity, Kathryn stated, “It’s a strong relationship. It’s good, it’s good for both of us. It’s a win-win for everybody. Like I said, we get as much as we give, if not more sometimes.” Kathryn emphasized how the service-learning relationship produces positive outcomes for both the community organization and the university.

Communication

When asked to identify the factors that facilitate reciprocity, similar to their responses to questions about co-education, the participants emphasized the importance of communication. When asked, “What factors are necessary for reciprocity?” Annie noted,

> So just communication early on in the process and throughout, checking in and then being really clear with what they need from us up front, because it is a little bit daunting to commit if you’re not sure exactly what’s going to be asked of you.

Annie underscored the uncertainty community partners may feel when initiating a relationship with the university, and the university’s ability to assuage these concerns and establish reciprocity by clearly communicating its needs and expectations.

Similarly, when asked, “What factors are necessary for reciprocity?” Monica shared her belief that a willingness to work together and communicate are keys to creating a successful partnership. Monica emphasized the need for “communication, [a] willingness to want to work together. I don’t think a partnership ever truly functions properly if you don’t have communication and both parties aren’t willing to put everything they have into that partnership.” Monica’s experiences have led her to value transparent communication as a key element in maintaining reciprocity.

The factors associated with co-education reinforce the importance of reciprocity in the university/community partner relationship. The theme of “both sides” in co-education echoes the theme of “give and receive” in the context of reciprocity, demonstrating the mutual need for the community and the university to contribute to and reap the benefits of the partnership. Participants also emphasized strong communication as a critical element in both co-education and reciprocity.

Discussion

The community partners in this study defined reciprocity and discussed their perspectives on their role as co-educators in the context of service-learning. Reciprocity and co-education shared the factors of communication and the back-and-forth nature of the relationship. Participants highlighted three key components of communication: technology, open communication, and understanding. The back-and-forth nature of the relationship incorporated the themes of both sides, give and take, mutual benefit, learning and knowledge, and the importance of relationships. The study also found that some participants viewed themselves as facilitators rather than co-educators.

The findings of this study reinforce those of previous research in this area by illuminating the benefits of university/community partnerships, the need for both sides to give and receive, and the importance of communication for establishing and maintaining effective collaborations. D’Arlach et al. (2009) and Miron and Moely (2006) found that the university and the community mutually benefit from the service-learning exchange. In service-learning, students may learn as much, if not more, from the community partner as from the classroom instructor (XXX, 2016). A successful experience utilizes the expertise and contributions of both sides.

Unlike the previous literature, this study did not identify obtaining real-world experience as a category or a theme (Cooper & Orrell, 2016). Unique to this study, some participants viewed themselves as facilitators rather than co-educators. In this role, community partners looked to the university to frame the experience and set goals for student outcomes. Regardless of their view, it is vital that both parties agree on whether the community partner is functioning as a co-educator or a facilitator to work together successfully.

Additionally, participants highlighted the role of learning and knowledge and the long-term implications of the service-learning experience. A key finding that differed from the previous literature was the importance of a strong relationship between the university and the community partner. While the findings of this study largely support those of previous studies, this research illustrates how reciprocity and co-education go hand-in-hand and highlights the importance of investing time and communicating effectively in these relationships to enable both parties to reach their goals.

Due to the demographics of the sample, several limitations were identified. The sample size of 20 participants could have been larger, and future studies should investigate these questions on a broader scale. In addition, the sample was mostly female and participants were all from the same community in the Southeast, limiting the ability to generalize the findings. Moreover, a change in the interview protocol was necessary due to the COVID-19 pandemic. All interviews, which we intended to conduct in person, were instead conducted by telephone. During telephone interviews participants may be more distracted by their environment than they would be in person, leading them to be less engaged in the conversation. Finally, the interviewer's inability to read the body language of the participant and follow up on non-verbal cues in the context of a phone interview can reduce the effectiveness of the interview.

Implications

This study fills a gap in the literature on service-learning by illuminating community partners' understandings of reciprocity and co-education in the context of service-learning partnerships. The importance of reciprocity in the university/community partner relationship is widely recognized. However, co-education is a new term in the service-learning landscape. The findings of the present study enable us to direct our attention to creating the necessary conditions for reciprocity and co-education.

Communication can strengthen the relationship between community partners and faculty members when both sides are clear in identifying their goals and conveying their needs. The emphasis among participants on maintaining a two-way relationship highlights the importance of integrating ideas from both sides in establishing and sustaining service-learning relationships. In many situations, community partners are already integral contributors to student learning, although they may not be recognized for their work.

Future research should seek to better understand the role of community partners in educating students. Students' lived experiences also offer a resource that can be shared with the community partner, and the role of reciprocity in the relationship between the student and the community partner is another area for future study. Since faculty constitute a key component in service-learning, research should also examine faculty perspectives on reciprocity and co-education.

Future researchers should investigate the similarities and differences between the views of reciprocity and co-education held by faculty versus those of community partners. By looking at these stakeholders jointly, we can align the goals of universities and communities in order to improve their relationship. Finally, research should explore what motivates community partners to continue partnering with universities and working with service-learning students despite the considerable time such collaborations require and the challenges they entail.

Conclusion

Previous literature and the current study have noted the importance of frequent and long-term contact for successful service-learning relationships. Faculty and community partners must set aside time to collaborate. They need to communicate

early and often to clarify needs, so each side clearly understands the expectations for what it will provide and receive.

The perspectives of both faculty members and community partners need to be taken into account to ensure that the relationship benefits those on both sides. In the context of the service-learning relationship, some community partners identify as facilitators rather than co-educators, which may give them a different perspective on the nature of their responsibilities and their role. Through understanding reciprocity and co-education, universities and community partners can foster more successful service-learning relationships.

References

Blouin, D. D., & Perry, E. M. (2009). Whom does service learning really serve? Community-based organizations' perspectives on service learning. *Teaching Sociology*, *37*(2), 120-135.

Boeije, H. (2010). *Analysis in qualitative research*. Sage.

Bringle, R. G., Clayton. P. H., & Price, M. M. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service Learning & Civic Engagement, 1*(2), 1-20.

Butin, D. W. (2003). Of what use is it? Multiple conceptualizations of service learning within education. *Teachers College Record*, *105*(9), 1674-1692.

Cooper, L., & Orrell, J. (2016). University and community engagement: Towards a partnership based on deliberate reciprocity. In F. Trede & C. McEwan (Eds.), *Educating the deliberate professional* (pp. 107-123). Springer International Publishing.

Cruz, N. I., & Giles, D. E. (2000). Where's the community in service-learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *7*(1), 28-34.

Darby, A. N., Ward-Johnson, F., & Cobb, T. (2016). The unrecognized co-educator in academic service-learning: Community partners' perspectives on college students serving diverse client populations. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, *7*(1), 3-15.

d'Arlach, L., Sánchez, B., & Feuer, R. (2009). Voices from the community: A case for reciprocity in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *16*(1), 5-16.

Davis, J., Madden, E., Cronley, C., & Beamon, K. (2019). Voices from the field: A qualitative exploration of community partners' definitions of service-learning. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, *10*(1), 146-155.

Dostilio, L. D., Harrison, B., Brackmann, S. M., Kliewer, B. W., Edwards, K. E., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Reciprocity: Saying what we mean and meaning what we say. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *19*(1), 17-33.

Hammersley, L. (2012). Community-based service-learning: Partnerships of reciprocal exchange? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, *14*(3), 171-184.

Henry, S. E., & Breyfogle, M. L. (2006). Toward a new framework of "server" and "served": De(and re)constructing reciprocity in service-learning pedagogy. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *18*(1), 27-35.

Jacoby, B. a(2015). *Service-learning essentials: Questions, answers, and lessons learned*. Jossey-Bass.

Jacoby, B. b (2015). Taking campus-community partnerships to the next level through border- crossing and democratic engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *22*(1), 140-147.

Janke, E. (2013). Increased community presence is not a proxy for reciprocity. *eJournal of Public Affairs*, *2*(2), 1-23. doi:10.21768/ejopa.v2i2.13

Miron, D., & Moely, B. E. (2006). Community agency voice and benefit in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *12*(2), 27-37.

Sandy, M., & Holland, B. A. (2006). Different worlds and common ground: Community partner perspectives on campus-community partnerships. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *13*(1), 30-43.

Tinkler, A., Tinkler, B., Hausman, E., & Tufo-Strouse, G. (2014). Key elements of effective service-learning partnerships from the perspective of community partners. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, *5*(2), 137-152.

Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2000). Community-centered service learning. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, *43*(5), 767-780.

Worrall, L. (2007). Asking the community: A case study of community partner perspectives. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *14*(1), 5-17.

Alexa Darby is a professor in the Department of Psychology at Elon University. She received her M.A. in Educational Psychology from the University of Connecticut and her Ph.D. in Educational Psychology, specializing in qualitative research, from the University of Georgia. Dr. Darby's research interests include neurodiverse adults, service-learning pedagogy; faculty, student, and community partner emotions; and qualitative research methods.
Contact Information:

Elon University
Department of Psychology
2337 CB
Elon, NC 27244
+1 (336) 278-6405

Lauren Willingham is Elon University graduate who majored in psychology. Her areas of interest include service-learning, educational psychology, and developmental psychology.
Contact Information:

c/o Alexa Darby
Elon University
Department of Psychology
2337 CB
Elon, NC 27244
+1 (336) 278-6405

Tammy Cobb is the Executive Director for Alamance Arts in Graham, North Carolina. She received her B.A. in Human Services from Elon University, holds Certifications in Non-Profit Management from Duke University and Non-Profit Board Consulting from BoardSource. Her career includes employment for Alamance County Government, serving on the NC Commission for Volunteerism and serves on the boards of various local non-profit organizations.
Contact Information:

Tammy Cobb
Alamance Arts
213 South Main Street
Graham, NC 27253
+1 (336) 226-4495