

Santa Clara University

**Scholar Commons**

---

Staff publications, research, and presentations

University Library

---

Winter 2021

## Critical Information Literacy and Critical Service Learning

Andrea E. Brewster

Nicole Branch

Jennifer E. Nutefall

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/library>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. Please contact [mpub-help@umich.edu](mailto:mpub-help@umich.edu) to use this work in a way not covered by the license.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Library at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Staff publications, research, and presentations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [rscroggin@scu.edu](mailto:rscroggin@scu.edu).

# CRITICAL INFORMATION LITERACY AND CRITICAL SERVICE LEARNING

## Potential Partners in Students' Social Justice Learning?

Andrea E. Brewster, Nicole A. Branch, and Jennifer E. Nutefall

---

### Abstract

*Critical information literacy (CIL) and critical service learning (CSL) have developed in parallel over recent years but have yet to intersect robustly. Rooted in critical theory, these approaches emphasize both conceptual frameworks and practices that center questions of social inequality in our teaching and learning practices—and in our universities as institutions. A small body of literature suggests that students' social justice understanding is deepened when engaging with research-intensive assignments. Within this study, we explored students' understanding of social justice in connection with research-intensive and non-research-intensive course assignments. Using a semi-structured interview technique, we interviewed 23 undergraduate students from 15 different CSL courses over an academic year at a private, West Coast, faith-based university. Our intention within this article is to highlight under-researched CIL pedagogy and curriculum within CSL and to put forth a call to action to university faculty and librarians to collaborate in further research.*

### Introduction

Critical information literacy (CIL) and critical service learning (CSL) are two social justice orientations to pedagogy. These approaches have developed in parallel over recent years but have yet to intersect robustly. Rooted in critical theory, these approaches emphasize both conceptual frameworks and practices that question social inequality in our teaching and learning practices—as well as in our universities as institutions.

The role of librarians as educators was originally focused on instilling task-based information retrieval skills, termed “bibliographic instruction.” With a rise in focus on information-seeking skills in the 1980s and 1990s, the role of librarians as educators became more pronounced. Bibliographic instruction was eclipsed by the concept of information literacy with the development and adoption of the Information Literacy Competency Stan-

dards for Higher Education (henceforth Standards) by the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) in 2000. Information literacy refers to the suite of skills and dispositions necessary for identifying information needs and seeking, retrieving, and successfully using information sources, and the Standards contributed substantially to a re-orientation of library instruction to encompass more critical and higher-order thinking skills. Another sea change began when Elmborg coined the term “critical information literacy” in 2006 with a call for librarians to integrate critical theory into library practice. Over the next decade, critical librarianship developed into a distinct and robust thread within academic librarianship (Tewell, 2015). These moves within the profession toward greater integration of critical theory informed and helped shape the creation of the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (henceforth Framework; ACRL, 2015). Developed in the early 2010s and adopted by ACRL in 2015 to replace the Standards, the Framework explicitly situates information as social and political, acknowledging issues of power, social justice, and inequity as it relates to information seeking, access, and representation (Foasberg, 2015).

The ACRL Framework includes six frames related to information literacy. These frames represent “threshold concepts,” or big, foundational ideas related to information literacy. The frames are conceptualized as “a cluster of interconnected core concepts, with flexible options for implementation” (ACRL, 2015, p. 7). As such, the frames offer the opportunity for exploration and further development in understanding information literacy in a variety of contexts. Additionally, the Framework explicitly calls forth sociopolitical aspects of information, making it well aligned with CSL approaches. CSL is well suited to explore, in particular, three frames:

- authority is constructed and contextual
- information has value
- research as inquiry

Critical service learning developed along a similar trajectory as practitioners and scholars in the field of community service learning have grappled with issues of power, privilege, and representation (Grain & Lund, 2016; Tinkler et al., 2014). While service learning traditionally emphasized services and prioritized student learning (Mitchell, 2008), beginning in the late 1990s, there was greater adoption of a critical approach “that is unapologetic in its aim to dismantle structures of injustice” (Mitchell, 2008, p. 50) and prioritizes community transformation (Rhoads, 1997). Mitchell’s 2008 articulation of a critical service learning model is one that partners a social change orientation both with work to redistribute power and with the development of authentic relationships. Since then, many others have endeavored to understand and explore how service learning can be, at its best, a critical practice. Cipolle (2010), for example, pinpoints the connections between critical pedagogy, multicultural education, social justice education, and civic education.

Despite this parallel development, the integration of these critical, social justice–oriented approaches is not well represented in the community service learning literature (Smedley-López et al., 2017). While a body of literature presents case studies on the integration of information literacy and service learning (see, for example, Griffis, 2014; Hernandez & Knight, 2010; Janke et al., 2012), only a small subset of scholarship focuses specif-

ically on the intersection of CIL and CSL (Bartow & Mann, 2020; Branch et al., 2020; Riddle, 2010; Sweet, 2013). Furthermore, as Riddle (2003, 2010) observes, there is a persistent “research void” in the literature of both service learning and librarianship regarding the impact of service learning for libraries” (2010, p. 133), particularly as it relates to critical approaches to both pedagogies. Additionally, while a lot has been written on the role of critical reflection in community service learning classrooms, there is far less about other types of course assignments (Kiely, 2005; Mayhew & Fernández, 2007). A small body of literature suggests that students’ social justice understanding is deepened when engaging with research-intensive assignments (Mitchell, 2007; Nutefall, 2009; Zempter, 2018); however, more research is needed on the best practices in CIL within community service learning classrooms. Calls within the CSL literature to integrate research into the service experience, value community members as information sources, and critically assess complex social and political conditions point to the potential of greater integration of CIL in community service learning curriculum (Smedley-López et al., 2017).

Within this study, we explored students’ understanding of social justice in connection with research-intensive and non-research-intensive course assignments. Using a semi-structured interview technique, we interviewed 23 undergraduate students from 15 different CSL courses over an academic year at a private, West Coast, faith-based university. These courses represent a variety of disciplines, embed social justice learning outcomes, and meet a general education requirement. Students discussed learning outcomes in connection with research-intensive and non-research-intensive course assignments and reflected on the cognitive, affective, and behavioral impacts of these courses.

## Self-Reflection: Critical Research Methodologies and Positionality

In any scholarly work, we acknowledge the subjectivity of the researcher within the research process. In keeping with the work of Peshkin (1988) and others, we argue that researchers should engage systematically with their own subjectivity throughout the research process, not merely as a post-analysis afterthought. As we in the field have long valued critical reflection as an essential component of students’ learning within CSL pedagogy (Ash & Clayton, 2009a, 2009b), we welcome the opportunity to share our ongoing reflections on our own positionality in connection with this study.

### Individual

We decided to collaborate in this research because community service learning pedagogy is relevant to the programs we oversee, the courses we teach, and our own personal interest in social justice and civic engagement in undergraduate education. Rooted in early conversations on the role of critical information literacy in community service learning courses, we wondered about the impact of research-intensive coursework on students’ social justice learning outcomes. This research has allowed each of us to explore and learn more about critical service

learning and critical information literacy, bridging disciplines and areas across the university. (To date, this collaboration has also led to a pilot project involving the multiyear participation of a class librarian in one of our community service learning courses. We anticipate this project may lead to additional partnerships and projects between our university units.)

In addition to our mutual interest in the topics raised by this research, we each brought perspective from our lived identities and backgrounds to this project. Our research team included two white women and one woman of color, from varied academic and social backgrounds. Collectively we brought our experience as instructors, program administrators, assessment practitioners, and academic staff members in higher education. These varied aspects of our identities and experiences informed both the structure and analysis of this study. Our own intellectual traditions and conceptual grounding (in the fields of information sciences and education) are steeped in critical theory (à la the Frankfurt School), feminist theory, and critical race theory. Long appreciators of community service learning forbearers Dewey and Freire, we value experiential learning (Dewey, 1938) and acknowledge that education is necessarily political (Freire, 1985) but also potentially emancipatory (Freire, 1970/1993).

## Institutional

We also conceptualized our positioning within the university as an institution. Community service learning and information literacy pedagogies, curriculum-wise, are often on the academic margins. Research shows that faculty who teach community service learning courses often receive lower student course evaluation scores, largely due to students' perceptions of the additional challenges of the pedagogy (Blakey et al., 2015). Similarly, academic librarians have long perceived challenges within the academy related to awareness and legitimization of their roles as classroom instructors (Fagan et al., 2019). Furthermore, scholar activists who teach about social justice often encounter marginalization within the academy (Ladson-Billings, 2001; Ukpokodu, 2016). Fortunately, the CSL courses on our campus meet a general education requirement and align with the university's articulated social justice mission. Additionally, information literacy is one of the eight core learning goals for undergraduate education at the institution. Part of our interest in exploring students' research assignments in their CSL courses is our professional belief that, in addition to explicit social justice–related learning outcomes, critical thinking and information literacy contribute to the development of an educated citizenry who care about and contribute to the common good. (See, e.g., National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012; Bringle et al., 2011.)

## Sociopolitical

Within so-called neoliberal reason, the very notion of democracy is at stake (Brown, 2015). While much has already been written about neoliberal forces on higher education, critical pedagogies can challenge these oppressive structures (Giroux, 2010; Morrow & Torres, 1995). Critical approaches, such as CIL and CSL, are grounded

in critical theory, which “postulates an awareness of the reproductive economic and political functions of education in capitalism” (Morrow & Torres, 1995, p. 247). In a time of great social and political divisiveness, even program and course embedded learning outcomes can become contested terrain. This is both urgent and mission aligned in the Ignatian context in which we conducted this study. Ignatian pedagogy as it is applied at this institution seeks to center issues of power and oppression, to engage with community knowledge, and to create a more just and equitable world. This alignment, in our context, creates overarching institutional support and validation for integrating critical approaches. At the same time, the themes and issues raised over the past four years (such as campaigns of disinformation and the need to value and elevate the voices and experiences of traditionally disenfranchised people both on campuses in the community) point to the continued need for value-centered institutions, and higher education more broadly, to grapple with an imperfect alignment. The more we engage in research-based practices to examine the alignment between mission and practice, the more robust our social justice teaching and learning will be.

## Research Questions

1. How do students describe their social justice learning in CSL courses with explicit, embedded social justice-oriented learning outcomes?
2. How do research-intensive assignments impact students’ understanding of social justice?

## Methods

At Santa Clara University, all undergraduate students are required to fulfill a general education requirement by completing a class that involves direct, face-to-face CSL pedagogy with members of underserved communities; incorporates structured oral and written reflection; and embeds social justice-oriented teaching and learning into the curriculum. All courses that meet this requirement are pre-approved through a faculty committee syllabus review to confirm they meet these criteria. The committee also confirms that the course fully integrates three rigorous learning outcomes related to the goals of civic engagement, diversity, and social justice into the academic content of the course. These courses are offered through many different departments and programs across the university and yet are cohesive in that students will engage with these same three social justice-oriented learning outcomes in their CSL course regardless of the disciplinary lens, particular CSL experience, or additional discipline-specific learning outcomes of each course.

The CSL experiences vary by course goals; common focus areas of community partner organizations include education, healthcare, housing, law, and environment. Many partners (but not all) serve five low-income predominantly Latinx neighborhoods that make up the Greater Washington community in San Jose, California. All are vetted for their alignment with the social justice-oriented learning outcomes of the CSL courses and the opportunities they provide for sustained and substantive experiential learning with their clients. Also, it’s

important to note that the university partners with the Greater Washington community through a place-based initiative that involves CSL but also extends the scope of the partnership to include engaged teaching, scholarship, and a sustainable development program.

In order to address our research questions deeply and allow us to explore a little-researched topic, we approached data collection with a qualitative methodology: structured one-on-one interviews with students (Creswell, 1998, 2009; Marshall & Rossman, 2015). After the university's institutional review board approved our proposed study in April 2019, we developed an interview protocol to align with our research questions. Using a cognitive interviewing technique (Beatty & Willis, 2007), we tested our interview questions with two students who met the criteria for the study. Through this process we were able to refine the questions for clarity and finalize the interview protocol.

## Sample

We identified student interview participants via an email sent in May 2019 to all students who had completed a CSL course in the two quarters prior to the email (fall 2018 and winter 2019). We used this same procedure in October 2019 with students who completed a CSL course in spring 2019 and summer 2019. (We invited a total of 1,436 unique students from 59 course sections.) While we used this convenience sampling technique, we endeavored to represent through the interviews a variety of CSL courses and demographic diversity among students. In total, we interviewed 23 undergraduate students from 15 different CSL courses over an academic year. All student participants were traditional college age (18–22) and reflected the ethnic diversity of the campus. (The most recent campus data [using IPEDS reporting categories] indicates that, among undergraduates, 3% are Black or African American; 18% are Hispanic/Latino; 49% are white, non-Hispanic; 16% are Asian, non-Hispanic; 7% are two or more races, non-Hispanic; 4% are nonresident aliens [international students]; and 2% are other.) Fifteen were females (65%), and 8 were males (35%). Over two-thirds were upper division (third- and fourth-year) students (70%), and just under one-third were lower division (first- and second-year) students (30%). About three-quarters of the courses were upper division (74%), and about a quarter were lower division (25%). The 15 CSL courses were offered through 10 unique departments and one non-departmental program; courses represented the following subject areas: social sciences, cognitive sciences, engineering, humanities, performing arts, and interdisciplinary studies.

We included in the study all students who responded and met the course completion criteria, submitted a copy of their culminating course assignment that allowed them to demonstrate their proficiency on the social justice-oriented CSL learning outcomes, and were available to participate in the interview during one of the various time slots available to the researchers. The three researchers split interviews as evenly as possible between them.

Students were invited in the interviews to discuss the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of their social justice-related learning and their culminating course assignment in the course. (See Appendix A for the interview protocol.)

## Results

Although this study is qualitative and exploratory in nature, we undertook our analysis of the data with a two-phase process. First, we employed an analytic rubric that provided us a lens through which to examine multiple dimensions of students' social justice learning; we also developed a simple holistic rubric to record students' research experiences within the course. Second, we conducted content analysis on the same transcripts to look more closely at those themes and for other themes that might emerge from the data.

### Analytic Social Justice Rubric

As part of a previous assessment project in partnership with Santa Clara University's Office of Assessment and Ignatian Center, Andrea Brewster compiled an analytic rubric in which various components of social justice learning are represented. Borrowing heavily from the work of Cipolle (2010) and Tinkler et al. (2014), we reviewed our interview transcripts for five areas of students' social justice learning: view of service, view of others, view of group differences, understanding the problem, and taking action. (The rubric, in Appendix B, also draws from Mitchell (2008), Westheimer and Kahne (2004), and Morton (1995).)

Some will argue that each of the three types of civic participation included within our rubric (charity/personal responsibility, social awareness/personal participation, and social justice/engaging in social change) is of civic value (Morton, 1995; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004), each with strengths and weaknesses. However, we posit along with others that a "social justice/engaging in social change" orientation to community engagement is our pedagogical goal in a social justice-oriented CSL curriculum (Cipolle, 2010; Mitchell, 2008; Tinkler et al., 2014).

Within this analysis, we rated the themes for the depth and complexity of social justice learning each student demonstrated toward that theme. A level one (1) score represents a social justice orientation of "charity/personal responsibility"; a level two (2) score represents a social justice orientation of "social awareness/personal participation"; and a level three (3) score represents a social justice orientation of "social justice/engaging in social change."

In order to assess the rubric for validity on our campus, we examined it in connection with student work products and in connection with student open-ended comments on a quarterly survey sent to students participating in CSL courses. The example quotations in each cell of the rubric (Appendix B) are drawn from student responses to that quarterly survey.

### Research Intensiveness Coding

Within our study we explicitly sought to uncover students' understanding of research in connection with their community-based learning experience as well as the relationship between their research and critical approaches to service and information. We did not analyze assignment prompts and instead based our analysis of interview

transcripts on students' perceptions of their assignments. To understand the intensiveness of research incorporated into the course, we used student perception of types of sources used within the course. We used engagement with multiple source types to define "research intensiveness" within this study for two reasons: (a) because of the variety of assignments that students described, examining source types provided a framework that was flexible enough to accommodate multiple assignments; and (b) because the Framework emphasizes the relational, sociopolitical, and community-embedded nature of information, students' inclusion of non-scholarly sources became an important information type in our analysis. The source types we identified and coded for include:

- Outside sources: Students described finding and integrating sources of information through their own research. They included popular, trade, and scholarly sources, depending on the assignment or task.
- Assigned course materials: Students described using source materials (e.g., texts, multimedia, guest speakers) that were assigned by the instructor.
- Own reflection: Students described engaging in their own reflection through formal prompts (e.g., written assignments) and informal information (e.g., note taking).
- Community authority: Students described community members as authoritative sources of information and experts who imparted valuable knowledge that informed their service experience and coursework. This authority came from various members of the community.
- Community members as exhibits/units of study: Students described seeing community members as objects that they observed (e.g., to observe presentations of mental illness) rather than authoritative sources of information.

Community members as exhibits/units of study emerged from our analysis of student transcripts as a counterpoint to community members as authoritative sources. This orientation to community members as exhibits runs counter to CSL approaches, and therefore we did not include this in our determination of high research intensiveness. (Refer to Appendix C and Appendix D for emblematic quotations from student participants in the study.)

To align our interpretation of the rubrics and establish inter-rater reliability for this study, the research team participated together in a scoring calibration session of the two rubrics. We discussed extensively how we would collectively interpret student data within the transcript as we scored it using the rubric. This allowed us to confirm both the "durability" of the rubrics for our data set and that we were using the rubrics consistently.

We three researchers divided the remaining 21 interviews among us such that two of us scored each interview. In addition to the rubric scoring, we also evaluated each student interview transcript for evidence or absence of CIL in their social justice-oriented culminating course assignment according to the ACRL Framework.

In keeping with best practices in the use of analytic rubrics (Maki, 2010), we then met, reviewed our raw data scores together, and reconciled through a careful discussion process any rubric score differences. If two raters scored a given rubric row differently, we discussed our differences, explained our scores, and came to consensus. We were able to reach a final consensus on reconciled scores in each rubric row for all of the transcripts.

## Results

The rubric mean scores indicated to us that, overall, students are making progress in their social justice–oriented CSL courses. Mean scores averaged near a level two (2) score (representing a social justice orientation of “social awareness/personal participation”) across the measured social justice dimensions. Students demonstrated greatest proficiency in their understanding of group-level differences with respect to privilege/marginalization and in their understanding of social justice (mean scores 2.43 and 2.39, respectively).

To further consider this data, we built a research intensiveness scale in connection with the culminating assignment students produced to demonstrate their social justice learning in their CSL course. Rooted in the ACRL Framework, we rated as “research intensive–high” students who used sources beyond their course material, used assigned course texts/material, and consulted community members as authoritative sources. We rated as “research intensive–low” students who used only some or none of those three.

Only five students (across four courses) met our established criteria for high research intensiveness. Although admittedly a small number, we were intrigued to find that the data closely mirrored the pattern of scores across all courses on each of the dimensions of social justice learning included in the rubric, but mean scores were

**Table 1**  
*Interview Transcript Scores on Social Justice Rubric*

All interviews	View of service	View of others	View of group differences	Understanding the problem	Taking action to address the problem
mean	1.91	2.09	2.43	2.39	2.09
Social justice/ engaging in social change (3)	13% (3)	26% (6)	48% (11)	39% (9)	26% (6)
Social awareness/personal participation (2)	65% (15)	57% (13)	48% (11)	61% (14)	57% (13)
Charity/personal responsibility (1)	22% (5)	17% (4)	4% (1)	0%	17% (4)

**Table 2**  
*Research Intensiveness Scale*

Research intensiveness	Types of research intensiveness	Number of students
Research intensive–high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information sources from outside course content</li> <li>• Assigned course texts/materials</li> <li>• Community members as authoritative sources</li> </ul>	5
Research intensive–low	Some or none of the types listed above	18

**Table 3**  
*Interview Transcript Mean Scores on Social Justice Rubric by Research Intensiveness*

	View of service	View of others	View of group differences	Understanding the problem	Taking action to address the problem
Research intensive–high mean	2.20	2.40	2.80	2.60	2.20
Research intensive–low mean	1.83	2.00	2.33	2.33	2.06

higher in every instance. Table 3 captures the mean score comparisons of all courses with “research intensive–high” and “research intensive–low” courses.

We also considered other variables that might impact the rubric score data. We looked at student gender, student class level (first- and second-year students vs. third- and fourth-year students), and course level (lower division courses vs. upper division courses) but identified no meaningful differences. Due to our sample size, we were not able to examine student ethnicity or socioeconomic status meaningfully in connection with the rubric score data.

## Content Analysis

The directionality of students’ rubric scores in courses with research-intensive assignments guided us to explore the multidimensionality of research intensiveness. In addition to the rubric scoring process, we also applied content analysis (Krippendorff, 2004) to the transcripts to explore students’ construction of the themes within the social justice rubric. In addition to the social justice dimensions, additional analysis categories surfaced: perceptions of information use, perceptions of assignments, and the ACRL frames (*information has value, authority is constructed and contextual, and research as inquiry*).

## Service Orientation (Perception of Relationship)— View of Service

One of the key metrics of a student’s learning through CSL is the perception the student gains of the meaning of a service learning experience. While best practices in CSL dictate that course instructors and on-site community supervisors frame the experience and orient the student to a social justice view of the service (Kajner et al., 2013; Mitchell, 2008), getting students to this orientation can be a process of growth. We envision within the rubric this development process as a staged process, beginning with a “charity/personal responsibility” orientation in which the student values charity and giving back to the community. As the student develops relationships with individuals at the CSL site, a student will develop a view of service based on compassion and empathy, rooted in connection with the other. A deeper level of engagement with the other then occurs when students are able to frame service as a way to work in solidarity with the other on behalf of systemic change.

As you’ll see within our data, the students we interviewed most often demonstrated evidence of “social awareness/personal participation.” Participation at the CSL sites built authentic relationships and boosted students’ personal involvement and caring. On average, student interviewees were able to reach this second-level service orientation of social awareness/personal participation by the end of their CSL course experience, even though it was only a quarter-long (10-week) course.

Meanwhile, the students who were rated as having a “research intensive–high” experience scored only slightly higher on the rubric, as none expressed a “charity/personal responsibility” view of service.

## View of Others

The sustained and substantive interactions with community members within a CSL experience are meant to allow students to see past first impressions and a deficit view of others. Rather, a social justice orientation toward the other is asset based and connected. Not only are community members more than “the disadvantaged,” they are unique individuals with strengths, skills, and resources.

At the end of the CSL experience, over half of students (57%) demonstrated evidence of “social awareness/personal participation,” coming to view the individuals at their site as unique and multifaceted. About a quarter (26%) were able to identify specific strengths within community members that made communities stronger, challenged stereotypes, and built interpersonal connections. Again, the students who were rated as having a “research intensive–high” experience scored higher on the rubric, and none expressed a “charity/personal responsibility” view of service.

## Diversity—View of Group Differences

I think I wrote a lot about recognizing your privilege, what role it plays, seeing what it’s like to have it and to be without it, because I felt like that was kind of what I got out of this whole community-based learning [experience]. —Student 16

We evaluated students’ understanding of diversity through their ability to recognize and understand group differences with respect to privilege and marginalization. Their responses ranged from a lack of acknowledgment of group-level differences to understanding of the structural factors that underpin group differences. Students talked about group differences in terms of the sources they selected for their papers or projects and how they illustrated those differences within the assignment; they also described the insights they gained from observing those differences at their CSL site.

Students in our study demonstrated the highest gains on this social justice learning outcome. Overall, almost half of students showed evidence of “personal awareness/personal participation,” and almost half indicated a “social justice/engaging in social change” viewpoint. Most notably, only one student in the study presented a “charity/personal responsibility” perspective on this metric. This engagement with privilege and marginality usually also included self-referential statements about one’s own positionality (i.e., students were considering themselves in comparison to the experience of underserved communities). Moreover, almost all students with a “research intensive–high” experience received a “social justice/engaging in social change” score on the rubric, resulting in a mean score of 2.80.

**Table 4**  
*Excerpt from Social Justice Rubric—View of Service*

	Charity/personal responsibility (1)	Social awareness/personal participation (2)	Social justice/engaging in social change (3)
Service orientation	Values charity: give back to community; do <i>for</i> others	Values caring: compassion and empathy; do for, but are in relationship with, others	Values social justice: systemic change, work in solidarity
Emblematic quotation from the data set	“So, I think it is about going out, reaching out, kind of giving back to the community, serving.”	“I can . . . actually dedicate my life into doing something that can impact, can improve the issue and also [address] a health area that I felt like needed some improvement.”	“But when you’re with people and you make personal connections and you realize the intricacies of how policies are affecting them or how their environment is impacting them, that’s when you begin to I think want to make the move to make the change, instead of just want that change.”

**Table 5**  
*Social Justice Rubric Mean Scores for View of Service*

View of service	All interviews	Research intensive–high
Mean	1.91	2.20
Social justice/ engaging in social change (3)	13% (3)	20% (1)
Social awareness/personal participation (2)	65% (15)	80% (4)
Charity/personal responsibility (1)	22% (5)	

**Table 6**  
*Excerpt from Social Justice Rubric—View of Others*

	Charity/personal responsibility (1)	Social awareness/personal participation (2)	Social justice/engaging in social change (3)
View of the others	Demonstrates deficit view of others: less fortunate, disadvantaged	View others as individuals, each with own story, not stereotypes	View others as equals; community members are seen as strengths & resources; connected to others
Emblematic quotation from the data set	“I didn’t feel like I was stereotyping, but I did go in with preconceived notions and [I] think they were negative.”	“I feel like my experience there opened me up to, I guess, the real humanity that I felt there and . . . there were definitely instances where I felt like I really felt with these people and the pain that they were going through.”	“During that first week because we did a little brainstorm, the first day of class, of what older people are. And a lot of people said things like slow. . . . So then you know you kind of get a sense like, oh, they are not as useful. That’s like you know what came up, like not as useful. But that’s completely wrong. And that’s something that I definitely learned from this.”

**Table 7**  
*Social Justice Rubric Mean Scores for View of Others*

View of others	All interviews	Research intensive–high
mean	2.09	2.40
Social justice/engaging in social change (3)	26% (6)	40% (2)
Social awareness/personal participation (2)	57% (13)	60% (3)
Charity/personal responsibility (1)	17% (4)	

**Table 8**  
*Excerpt from Social Justice Rubric—View of Group Differences*

	Charity/personal responsibility (1)	Social awareness/personal participation (2)	Social justice/engaging in social change (3)
Diversity	Indicates everyone is the same <i>or</i> everyone has individual differences. No analysis of group-level privilege/marginalization	Acknowledges group differences with respect to privilege/marginalization	Understands group differences with respect to privilege/marginalization
Emblematic quotation from the data set	“I would talk to my mom about the class and she was like, yeah, stop complaining, you’re lucky.”	“I have a list of privileges, but if they just had one or two of those privileges, they could have probably not been in that position.”	“[A] lot of elderly people . . . it’s easy for them to be abused, even in their home situations or even at a place like this. I don’t think that they were being abused there, but there’s definitely places [where] that happens at and it’s really good to be aware of that. . . . [Before taking the class] I had never really thought about how social justice applied to the elderly.”

**Table 9**  
*Social Justice Rubric Mean Scores for View of Group Differences*

View of group differences	All interviews	Research intensive–high
mean	2.43	2.80
Social justice/engaging in social change (3)	48% (11)	80% (4)
Social awareness/personal participation (2)	48% (11)	20% (1)
Charity/personal responsibility (1)	4% (1)	

## View of Social Justice (Situating the Locus of the Problem)—Understanding the Problem

Students were explicitly asked within the interviews to share their understanding of what social justice is and to speak to how producing the culminating assignment impacted their understanding of social inequality in the community. A “charity/personal responsibility” understanding of social justice points solely to the role of personal effort in determining one’s life outcomes. A “social awareness/personal participation” view requires a more nuanced understanding of social justice—recognition of the need for basic rights for everyone. And a

**Table 10**  
*Excerpt from Social Justice Rubric—Understanding the Problem*

	Charity/personal responsibility (1)	Social awareness/personal participation (2)	Social justice/engaging in social change (3)
View of social justice	Identifies individual responsibility; if everyone just tried harder; “pull oneself up by the bootstraps”; blame the victim	Recognizes the need to protect and ensure basic rights for all	Examines the policies and practices that maintain and reproduce the status quo that favors certain groups at the expense of others
Emblematic quotation from the data set	N/A	“I’d say [social justice is] a term for equalizing, like, facets of society for everyone” and “You’re going to different schools with different resources and it’s unfortunate that something that’s meant for everyone, that’s provided for everyone, is so different for everyone.”	“I think my in conclusion was that tracking can be a really good idea and has the potential to have large benefits for students across the board, but given some of the realities of the U.S. education system and abuse in society in general, namely the issue of different races [not being] equally represented in the teaching community, and we have racial biases that [have] consequences for students.”

**Table 11**  
*Social Justice Rubric Mean Scores for Understanding the Problem*

Understanding the problem	All interviews	Research intensive–high
Mean	2.43	2.60
Social justice/engaging in social change (3)	39% (9)	60% (3)
Social awareness/personal participation (2)	61% (14)	40% (2)
Charity/personal responsibility (1)		

sophisticated “social justice/engaging in social change” vantage point on social justice is one in which the student can articulate and demonstrate understanding of policies and practices that favor some groups and marginalize others. Students discussed their personal definitions of social justice and discussed the roles that their research, course texts/activities, and personal reflection/notes contributed to their understanding of social inequality specific to the community they encountered through their CSL. Most responded with hesitation and uncertainty when asked to “define social justice” but were much more expansive and insightful when asked to characterize the role of the assignment in their understanding of social inequality within a specific community.

After having completed their CSL course, none of the students in our study responded in a way that we would rate as a “charity/personal responsibility” perspective. Instead, the mean score across all responses was 2.43, indicating that about 61% of students expressed “social awareness/personal participation” views, and 39% voiced “social justice/engaging in social change” perspectives. Among students with a “research intensive–high” experience, the mean score was 2.60, with the majority of students (60%) expressing a “social justice/engaging in social justice” view. Students who engaged with at least some research materials related to social inequality were able to articulate the main ideas from that research and discuss how those findings impact communities they encountered.

## View of Social Action—Taking Action to Address the Problem

After they were asked to share their understanding of social inequality relevant to community members they encountered through their placements, students were asked to discuss how they themselves had changed as a result of taking the CSL course. Next, they were asked to provide an example of changed behaviors and to reflect on the impact of the course and CSL experience on their developing sense of purpose (e.g., clarification of skills, abilities, values, professional or personal pursuits). Students often reported their own social action activities and future plans; others discussed what they feel needs to be done in general, without identifying themselves as an active participant in that action.

The majority of students (57%) described the need to address community challenges through a “social awareness/personal participation” lens, increasing opportunities and improving the lives of others. Fewer (about a quarter of all students and just one “research intensive–high” student) identified concrete and specific ways not just to improve individual lives but to enact social change and address the root causes of the injustices they witnessed.

As indicated in the previous section, students were, by and large, quite proficient at expressing the need to address social inequality and, in some cases, clearly understood some of the salient levers that perpetuate injustices. However, regardless of the intensiveness of the student’s research experience, it’s clear that students still

**Table 12**  
*Excerpt from Social Justice Rubric—Understanding the Problem*

	Charity/personal responsibility (1)	Social awareness/personal participation (2)	Social justice/engaging in social change (3)
View of social action	Increase resources	Treat people fairly and increase opportunities	Examine causes of injustice and work for social change
Emblematic quotation from the data set	“[I]t doesn’t have to be the parent, but there should be ways in which students have access to resources.”	“[I] didn’t know if they’re getting actual emotional and mental help. And so that was one issue, one part that I felt like maybe there was a need for. Having that kind of mental health component for these people that just went through a really traumatic experience. So I think it has changed me, kind of like seeing that there’s other paths.”	“[W]e want to help people. Wanting to do something that that isn’t just about making myself feel better about myself, but really empowering the people around me . . . that’s what social justice is, empowering people around us.”

**Table 13**  
*Social Justice Rubric Mean Scores for Taking Action to Address the Problem*

Taking action to address the problem	All interviews	Research intensive–high
Mean	2.09	2.20
Social justice/engaging in social change (3)	26% (6)	20% (1)
Social awareness/personal participation (2)	57% (13)	80% (4)
Charity/personal responsibility (1)	17% (4)	

need more support to achieve a “social justice/engaging in social change” perspective on transformative social action.

## Information Sources

The ACRL Framework, and in particular the frames *authority is constructed and contextual*, *information has value*, and *research as inquiry*, provides strong conceptual approaches to integrate CIL and CSL. The frame *authority is constructed and contextual* recognizes that expertise is formulated within relationships and communities “based on the information need and the context in which the information will be used” (ACRL, 2015, p. 12). Within this frame “authority is a type of influence recognized or exerted within a community,” and “various communities may recognize different types of authority.” CSL offers a prime setting to explore this frame related to social justice. While in most academic settings, this authority is firmly rooted in scholarly authority, CSL offers the opportunity to examine and affirm the expertise of community members. Additionally, the use of reflection as a best practice in community service learning is in line with this frame. Through reflection, students integrate their own experience as a source of learning.

The frame *information has value* asserts that “[i]nformation possesses several dimensions of value, including as a commodity, as a means of education, as a means to influence, and as a means of negotiating and understanding the world. Legal and socio economic interests influence information production and dissemination” (ACRL, 2015, p. 16). CSL opportunities particularly relate to dimensions of voice, access, and marginalization related to information: for example, the knowledge practice to “understand how and why some individuals or groups of individuals may be underrepresented or systematically marginalized within the systems that produce and disseminate information” (ACRL, 2015, p. 16).

The frame *research as inquiry* emphasizes the iterative, progressive, and connected nature of research. This frame encourages inquiry to reach beyond academic silos as “this process of inquiry extends beyond the academic world to the community at large, and the process of inquiry may focus upon personal, professional, or societal needs” (ACRL, 2015, p. 18).

Our findings related to information use are organized around information use and assignments as well as these three frames. Refer to Appendix D for emblematic quotes related to these frames.

## Perceptions of Information Use

Of the information types analyzed in this study, students most frequently mentioned producing or integrating their own notes or reflection (87%). Students described working with outside sources more frequently (70%) than assigned course texts or materials (65%), though both source types featured prominently. These more “traditional” information sources were followed in terms of frequency by community members as authoritative sources of information (61%). While the least frequently mentioned source of information was community

members as exhibits or units of study (39%), given the complicated nature of this orientation to community members, it is notable that this theme arose.

## *Perceptions of Assignments*

In addition to reported use of sources, student interviews reveal varying perceptions of and experiences with assignments. Despite the focus on culminating assignments in the interviews, students described various ways information sources were integrated into the service experience, including producing “typical” research papers, developing lesson plans, understanding background of community or issues in the community, creating educational videos, bridging theory and service experience, and processing the service experience. This wide variety of uses of information in these CSL experiences is in alignment with the complex relational and socially situated conception of information literacy articulated in the Framework. This also illustrates the numerous opportunities within CSL classrooms to integrate CIL.

## *Authority Is Constructed and Contextual*

Interviews provided the opportunity to explore the ACRL frames *authority is constructed and contextual*, *information has value*, and *research as inquiry*, including both successes and challenges students experienced related to these frames.

**Community members as authoritative sources of information.** Students described various ways of accessing and utilizing community members as authoritative sources at their CBL placement sites. Students articulated the conception of community authority that aligns directly with the ACRL frame *authority is constructed and contextual*. For example, the following quotation illustrates the student’s ability to identify their own positioning and knowledge base as a student within the academy and the expertise of community members in addressing the needs within that community:

I think it’s really important to kind of moving from like our common mindset, especially I think here at Santa Clara, of us going into communities and helping them because we have more resources and we know more and we think differently about the world is a better way to do it. But I think that actually going out in the communities and seeing that they’re doing a lot of things that are benefiting them that we wouldn’t even think of, I think it’s very powerful, especially when looking at the future, how we want to improve social inequalities, it’s not us just like sitting in a classroom brainstorming ideas that we think is going to impact the community. But really going out in the community and testing it out and seeing if it’s actually beneficial or if they have better ways that they’re doing things that is actually improving their outcomes, more than what we as researchers, or we as students, or we as scholars would think would be appropriate.

—Student 18

In some cases, students articulated gaining insight to the particular challenges of the service setting of their CSL community placement site and broader challenges in the field.

One thing that really struck me is like the leaders of the program. They were talking about how they often had to fight for funding to continue the program because its funding has been cut. —Student 3

Students also described ways that the course instructor sought to both integrate community authority and encourage students to learn directly from community members.

Our professor gave us a couple opportunities where she would bring in the principal and kind of do like a panel type where she would tell us a little bit and then she just let us ask a bunch of questions, which is what we wanted to do, which was great. That facilitated conversation was really helpful. Same with the parents. . . . That was super helpful. But it was also really emphasized to go in our own time when we are in [the school] and just meet up with the parents and talk to them even more.” —Student 19

**Community members as exhibits or units of study.** In contrast to seeing community members as authoritative information sources, some students described viewing community members as “exhibits” or subjects of study.

I kind of like struggled with like the balance between like being like a scientific observer and just being like a person that these people were talking to. So like I feel like that was my main struggle. —Student 4

## *Research as Inquiry*

**Descriptions of the research process.** Students described a wide range of experiences with the research process related to their assignments or service experience. Some students described an intensive research process, including current knowledge and background research, expanding and contracting the search as new information was gained, and seeking out multiple perspectives on a topic.

So it started with referencing. You know what sorts of tracking we already knew of and this primarily from what we have experienced . . . what we’ve seen happen. And then just doing, you know, Googling around trying to find what different things classify . . . so what different programs will look like. And then from there, looking at, looking up articles on both sides. Those that were pro-tracking and those against, and looking at some of the issues that they were weighing in on, then once we got a good sense for the issues that were at hand looking, to see if there were any pointers to studies or statistics to back up how those issues play out beyond just, you know, a person’s impression of what, there’s a good thing. —Student 6

So the research process, specifically . . . I like to use all of the library databases, specifically PsycInfo, and there's another one that's right below that I can't remember . . . but it's also in the library database. I'm searching by keywords and then once I do find a peer reviewed article, I also check out the sources that they cited and then go from there. So it's like one source leads to another, and another, but sometimes I also will use Google Scholar, although I personally just haven't had as much luck with that. So I used the library, a lot more. —Student 5

Students also described various components built into the course or assignment that supported their research process, including topic development exercises, scaffolding, and feedback on selected sources. These supports align with recommended practices in writing studies and information literacy.

So we had a couple different steps for the class. It's kind of like [another class] where we had to propose a topic and then come up with an annotated bibliography, submit a draft of part of the paper, I think. And then it was submit another draft. And then the final draft. —Student 5

Depending on your research topic. So the professor also provides help with where you should find information or even information itself at some points. And oh, I do, actually, I do remember that before the annotated bibliography, she wanted to see two articles that we had found and see how they kind of play into the topic that we want. So then we had a one-on-one meeting to talk about that and figure out, oh are these first few articles, you know, get set, to kind of keep, good enough sources to kind of research it more and find others. —Student 5

Other students described a lack of support or a lack of motivation to access support that was provided.

[On selecting a topic] Honestly, we just looked something up online. —Student 14

So a lot of what I've learned from this class from the textbook and theoretical with your own statistics and that kind of concepts and stuff like that. But in terms of how this material extends to the social part and social justice part of things. I got that out of the learning experience. But in terms of research. I don't think we did any research. —Student 17

Um, well, to be honest, I don't think we had that much support. I know that it was out there if we wanted to, but it wasn't. . . . I didn't use it personally because [the instructor] said that "Oh, like you can always meet with me" and we had one mandatory meeting. After that she said "if you have any other questions you can meet with this lady at the library." —Student 11

**Alignment between the assignment and CSL experience.** In our interviews, we asked students about the connection between culminating assignments and their service experience. Students perceived a wide range of experiences with the alignment or lack of alignment between the assignment and the CSL community experience.

Descriptions of a lack of alignment indicate several challenges in connecting course content with the placement site. Some students articulated a lack of alignment with theory and their specific placement site, including the perception that certain theories needed to be integrated to satisfy the instructor, and not having enough time to cover topics specific to the placement site within the course because of the wide variety of placement sites in the course.

So let me think here, I would, to be honest, not the most relevant . . . So there was the aide and dying one, which was not relevant at all for the [community] placement and then also the other assignments that were more like, we didn't choose a topic we were just given a paper to write about those talked about also more terminal cases so ethical cases. Typically when death is involved, it becomes more of an ethical, you know, topic and more ethical challenge. So that's, those are the topics that we talked about in those scenarios were not present at [placement site]. So I will say they weren't very relevant. —Student 8

For the first few weeks, all we did was read [course topic] articles, and we just stick it in the paper; that's what's important. You know it doesn't matter what you're writing about. Just say [course topic]. Yes, I probably have it [inserted into papers] just super randomly and it doesn't make sense at all, because we just knew we just had to put it in. . . . We knew that whatever we did in class in all those articles who read, even if it had nothing to do with our community experience, we should put it in our writing to get a good grade. —Student 1

In contrast, some students described effective alignment of the service experience and the assignment. In some cases, this alignment supported greater understanding of social inequity and broader structural issues impacting communities. In these cases, alignment demonstrates the call within the frame *research as inquiry* to make connections beyond the academy to broader society and societal needs.

Well, I think it is very relevant because the cost and subsidization of the costs . . . needs to come from somewhere. I'm not certain if it's covered in the ACA but I think providing health care to marginalized communities such as Alzheimer's patients is very important. —Student 7

So things like readings, in-class activity, instructor feedback, our professor, lots of readings primarily and in-class discussion on different social determinants of health and how those factor into a community and kind of trickle down into like different health outcomes in the community. So, in our case, it was mostly lack of education [about social media] on the parental side and also the effects of the criminalization of people who

are coming out of the United States who aren't documented. So how that was affecting kids, how that was affecting their use of social media as an outlet, things like that. —Student 19

## *Information Has Value*

Student interviews revealed two dimensions related to the frame *information has value*. Some students described moments in the research process that illuminated the dimension of value related to socioeconomic interests and representation (or lack of representation) of certain voices within information products. Other students described leveraging information to extend their understanding of community issues and community members, beyond the confines of the course or course assignment.

**Representation and voice.** Students articulated greater awareness of power constructs related to the representation of voices and lack of representation of marginalized voices.

We found the best luck doing searches that involve political reform. So all you know, “I was in the room when they decided to vote on this bill legalizing dying in Colorado” or California. So those were the primary sources but it limited us because we only saw the political side of it and we never saw the personal side of it and it's a very personal, intimate decision. So it's kind of strange that we can't find primary sources about such a topic. —Student 8

So, I mean, I used our library catalogs and databases, but I mean it, there's not a ton of research on invasion communities specifically because they're kind of a . . . governments don't want to recognize them. So it's not like . . . it was really hard to find one specifically in Ecuador, but there have been successful invasion communities that have gained their land rights. So I based some of my analysis off of those successful amazing communities and how that can be carried over to help out with the situation in Ecuador. —Student 12

**Information agency.** Two students articulated what might be understood as “information agency” or deliberately and independently seeking out additional information and self-directed integration of information sources. Though we did not analyze the assignments from these courses, the students depicted purposefully seeking outside information (beyond the requirements of the class) to enhance their service experience, though for different reasons.

One student described using information sources to deepen their understanding of social justice and systemic inequity.

We had a hard time finding outside sources, because the paper did require a lot of sources but it also seems like it was mostly based on our personal experiences of being able to try to relate our personal experiences to research in those areas, was something that we didn't do a lot of in class. And so I think that like it was kind

of challenging at times to try to make that connection and try to back up some of what we were experiencing with others in the field who are researching those types of things. I think that it just took a lot longer for us to find sources and I think it was challenging because we didn't necessarily go into the project having done a ton of research in the first place. So I think it was a lot of going back and forth as we were going throughout the project. —Student 18

The student goes on to explicitly connect this new perspective on research to broader impacts in the community at large (reflecting both the frames *information has value* and *research as inquiry*).

I personally do a lot of volunteering and work with [campus student group] related to social justice, but we don't do a lot of synthesis of what that actually means and what some of the things that we're doing, what the research behind them is actually saying about how it's impactful. And I think being able to write a paper about it, and really sit down and think about, well, what did we accomplish and how is that both related to social justice and maybe in some aspects potentially harmful to the community and, how do we actually sit down and think about that and take the time to kind of reconcile what's going on. And I think doing the paper was really helpful. I think, had we not sat down and looked back with the research again and looked back at the course, the state of the quarter and what we've worked on, I think it wouldn't have been as meaningful to see the work that we do with the children and kind of the insights that we gathered from that, having not like sat down and wrote it all out. —Student 18

A second student described using information sources—after the conclusion of the course—to help them reflect upon and process the service experience.

I was really inspired to read a lot of books about [mental health] and got more into that this summer. . . . Because I felt like I got a very clinical definition of these conditions, but I didn't really know about people's firsthand accounts with having these conditions. So I wanted to look into that. —Student 17

The student went on to discuss at length these firsthand accounts that she had independently sought out and read. When asked “So do you think it would have been helpful to have read things like that, while you were taking the course?” the student responded:

Yes, but we did not have time. We just didn't have time. Yeah, it was a quarter system we have so much to cover. There were two midterms and finals and this one experience. But I'm really grateful that I did take the class because if I didn't, I might not have read all these books. —Student 17

## Discussion

Student participants in our study demonstrated evidence of social justice learning after completion of their (general education requirement) CSL courses. As indicated earlier, the student participants we included in the study all recently completed courses with the same set of embedded social justice learning outcomes. Overall, the 23 students showed varying degrees of social justice learning, averaging at about a “social awareness/personal participation” perspective across the five social justice learning dimensions we measured. The “view of group differences” and “view of social justice” averaged highest, with mean scores closer (but not yet reaching) a “social justice/engaging in social change” perspective. This tells us that students still have room to grow, and our teaching should better align with the learning aspirations we have for our students.

Only five student participants met our ACRL Framework-supported criteria for having completed research-intensive assignments in their CSL courses (i.e., students who used sources beyond their course material, used assigned course texts/material, and consulted community members as authoritative sources). Nevertheless, it bears noting that over half of students completed culminating assignments that incorporated one or more of these criteria (but not all three). This tells us that faculty are already integrating aspects of the Framework into their assignment design in CSL courses. Moreover, the greater evidence of “social justice/engaging in social change” perspectives among students in this highest research-intensive group suggests that further study of CIL relevance within CSL courses is warranted.

Furthermore, use of the ACRL Framework in our content analysis of students’ interviews illuminated the students’ ability to identify community members as experts in addressing the needs within their own communities. It also highlighted the converse: some students took from their community service experience a view of community members as objects of study. This outcome calls on faculty to do more to frame the mutuality of the CSL community experience.

Students within our study also discussed their research process related to their assignments or service experience and identified course activities that were particularly useful, such as topic development exercises, multiple drafts, and feedback on selected information sources. These scaffolding exercises (common within writing studies and information literacy) also seem to support a rigorous approach to social justice learning in CSL courses. In alignment with Freire’s (1970/1993) “praxis” of critical action and reflection on behalf of transformation, students seemed to respond best when the community service learning experience was directly related to the culminating assignment.

In terms of the frame *information has value*, we were particularly intrigued by the two students who demonstrated “information agency” (i.e., students’ independent seeking and integration of information sources) to deepen their understanding of systemic inequality and their CSL community experience. The two examples powerfully reflect a critical engagement on the part of these students with both community service learning and information literacy—and another avenue of potential interdisciplinary inquiry.

While we endeavored to represent the student composition on campus, we acknowledge that our findings represent a majority white student body at a faith-based institution. Approximately 10% of students self-reported

as first-generation college students during the time of data collection. We realize this does not reflect student populations at other institutions.

Having surfaced through these early interviews a connection between research-intensive assignments and students' social justice learning, we would like to follow up with a survey to a much broader group of students. We'd like to examine the relative impact of these research-intensive assignments on various subgroups of students and include more CSL courses. We would also like to extend our study to include deeper exploration of unique features of students' assigned community partner sites and how they are integrated into research-intensive assignments. In addition, we want to compare assignment prompts in the CSL courses with student work products and to analyze them for themes related to CIL, CSL, and the ACRL Framework.

Throughout this research project, we have been impelled by Riddle's (2010) contention that CIL and resource-based learning can help strengthen and connect traditional pedagogies and community service learning pedagogies. He also points to service learning as a "tool" to engage CIL and asks more broadly about how "service learning might inform our understanding of social justice, civic engagement, and citizenship" (Riddle, 2010, p. 138). Riddle encouraged further empirical research specifically to address the potential reciprocal power of integrating CIL and CSL.

Our study in many ways is a response to Riddle's call. Ultimately, our intention within this article is to highlight under-researched CIL pedagogy and curriculum within CSL, to center the focus on teaching and learning for social justice, and to put forth a call to action to university faculty and librarians to collaborate in further empirical research. We also encourage university faculty and librarians to strengthen their partnership in developing content and teaching CSL courses.

## Attachments

Appendix A: Interview Protocol

Appendix B: Social Justice Rubric

Appendix C: Emblematic Quotes—Social Justice Rubric

Appendix D: Emblematic Quotes—ACRL Framework

Appendix E: Emblematic Quotes—Source Types

## Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the collaboration and support of our colleagues in the Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education and the Office of Assessment for their long-standing partnership in furthering high-impact community service learning at Santa Clara University. Of particular note is the social justice rubric we employ in this study, developed within an earlier collaborative project with these offices. We also deeply appreciate the undergraduate students at Santa Clara who generously shared their time and insights on behalf of this study.

## References

- Ash, S. L., & Clayton, P. H. (2009a). Generating, deepening, and documenting learning: The power of critical reflection in applied learning. *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education*, 1(1), 25–48. <http://hdl.handle.net/1805/4579>.
- Ash, S. L., & Clayton, P. H. (2009b). *Learning through critical reflection: A tutorial for service-learning students*. Ash, Clayton, & Moses.
- Association of College & Research Libraries. (2000). *Information literacy competency standards for higher education*. <https://alair.ala.org/handle/11213/7668>.
- Association of College & Research Libraries. (2015). *Framework for information literacy for higher education*. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>.
- Bartow, J. R., & Mann, P. (2020). Reimagining epistemologies: Librarian-faculty collaboration to integrate critical information literacy into Spanish community-based learning. *Currents in Teaching and Learning*, 11(2), 16–31.
- Beatty, P. C., & Willis, G. B. (2007). Research synthesis: The practice of cognitive interviewing. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71(2), 287–311. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfm006>.
- Blakey, J. M., Theriot, S., Cazzell, M., & Sattler, M. (2015). Is service-learning worth it? A mixed-methods study of faculty's service-learning experiences. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 3(1), 1–18. <https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/handle/10106/26310>.
- Branch, N. A., Nutefall, J. E., & Gruber, A. M. (2020). Service learning, community-based learning. In J. D. Ruelle (Ed.), *The engaged library: High-impact educational practices in academic libraries* (pp. 121–137). Association of College & Research Libraries.
- Bringle, R. G., Studer, M., Wilson, J., Clayton, P. H., & Steinberg, K. S. (2011). Designing programs with a purpose: To promote civic engagement for life. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 9(2), 149–164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-011-9135-2>.
- Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution*. Princeton University Press.
- Cipolle, S. B. (2010). *Service-learning and social justice: Engaging students in social change*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Kappa Delta Pi.
- Elmborg, J. (2006). Critical information literacy: Implications for instructional practice. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(2), 192–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2005.12.004>.
- Fagan, J. C., Ostermiller, H., Price, E., & Sapp, L. (2019). Librarian, faculty, and student perceptions of academic librarians: Study introduction and literature review. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2019.1691026>.
- Foasberg, N. M. (2015). From Standards to Frameworks for IL: How the ACRL Framework addresses critiques of the Standards. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 15(4), 699–717. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/595062>.

- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation* (D. Macedo, Trans.). Bergin & Garvey.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum. (Original work published 1970).
- Giroux, H. A. (2010). Bare pedagogy and the scourge of neoliberalism: Rethinking higher education as a democratic public sphere. *The Educational Forum*, 74(3), 184–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2010.483897>.
- Grain, K. M., & Lund, D. E. (2016). The *social justice turn*: Cultivating “critical hope” in an age of despair. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 23(1), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcsloa.3239521.0023.104>.
- Griffis, P. J. (2014). Information literacy in business education experiential learning programs. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 19(4), 333–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08963568.2014.952987>.
- Hernandez, M., & Knight, L. A. (2010). Reinventing the box: Faculty-librarian collaborative efforts to foster service learning for political engagement. *The Journal for Civic Commitment*, 14(1), 1–15.
- Janke, R., Pesut, B., & Erbacher, L. (2012). Promoting information literacy through collaborative service learning in an undergraduate research course. *Nurse Education Today*, 32(8), 920–923. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2011.09.016>.
- Kajner, T., Chovanec, D., Underwood, M., & Mian, A. (2013). Critical community service learning: Combining critical classroom pedagogy with activist community placements. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 19(2), 36–48.
- Kiely, R. (2005). A transformative learning model for service-learning: A longitudinal case study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12(1), 5–22.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. Jossey-Bass.
- Maki, P. (2010). *Assessing for learning: Building a sustainable commitment across the institution* (2nd ed.). Stylus Publishing.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2015). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Mayhew, M. J., & Fernández, S. D. (2007). Pedagogical practices that contribute to social justice outcomes. *The Review of Higher Education*, 31(1), 55–80. <http://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2007.0055>.
- Mitchell, T. D. (2007). Critical service-learning as social justice education: A case study of the citizen scholars program. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40(2), 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680701228797>.
- Mitchell, T. D. (2008). Traditional vs. critical service-learning: Engaging the literature to differentiate two models. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(2), 50–65. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0014.205>.
- Morrow, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (1995). *Social theory and education: A critique of theories of social and cultural reproduction*. State University of New York Press.
- Morton, K. (1995). The irony of service: Charity, project and social change in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2(1), 19–32.
- National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Association of American Colleges & Universities. <https://www.aacu.org/crucible>.

- Nutefall, J. E. (2009). The relationship between service learning and research. *Public Services Quarterly*, 5(4), 250–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228950903199271>.
- Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity—One’s own. *Educational Researcher*, 17(7), 17–21. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X017007017>.
- Rhoads, R. A. (1997). *Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self*. State University of New York Press.
- Riddle, J. S. (2003). Where’s the library in service learning? Models for engaged library instruction. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 29(2), 71–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(02\)00424-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(02)00424-X).
- Riddle, J. S. (2010). Information and service learning. In M. T. Accardi, E. Drabinski, & A. Kumbier (Eds.), *Critical library instruction: Theories and methods* (pp. 133–148). Library Juice Press.
- Smedley-López, A. C., Johnson, H. R., & Amarante, A. (2017). SLICES: Critical theory as praxis and research-based service learning. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, 39, 176–191. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/90007879>.
- Sweet, C. A. (2013). Information literacy and service-learning: Creating powerful synergies. In L. Gregory & S. Higgins (Eds.), *Information literacy and social justice: Radical professional praxis* (pp. 247–274). Library Juice Press.
- Tewell, E. (2015). A decade of critical information literacy: A review of the literature. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 9(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2015.9.1.174>.
- Tinkler, B., hannah, c. l., Tinkler, A., & Miller, E. (2014). Analyzing a service-learning experience using a social justice lens. *Teaching Education*, 25(1), 82–98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2012.744742>.
- Ukpokodu, O. N. (2016). Realizing transformative learning and social justice education: Unpacking teacher education practice. In S. M. Tomlinson-Clarke & D. L. Clarke (Eds.), *Social justice and transformative learning: Culture and identity in the United States and South Africa* (pp. 113–142). Routledge.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237–269. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002237>.
- Zempter, C. (2018). Intercultural praxis in service-learning contexts. *Western Journal of Communication*, 82(5), 575–594. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2017.1416490>.

## Author Information

ANDREA E. BREWSTER is Assessment Manager for Undergraduate Studies at Santa Clara University. She earned her MA and PhD in Education from the School of Education and Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. Since 2010, she has facilitated Santa Clara’s Experiential Learning for Social Justice undergraduate core curriculum requirement; taught community service learning courses; and engaged in related curriculum development, research, and assessment projects. Her current scholarly interests involve assessing high-impact practices in undergraduate education and addressing equity issues in student success initiatives.

NICOLE A. BRANCH currently serves as the Co-Interim University Librarian and Associate University Librarian for Learning and Engagement at Santa Clara University. Nicole earned her Master's in Librarian and Information Science (MLIS) from San José State University. Prior to becoming a librarian, she worked for over a decade in non-profit organizations dedicated to educational justice. Nicole views librarianship as an extension of this work and is particularly invested in critical approaches to assessment that, she believes, have the potential to resist neoliberalism in higher education, re-center higher education in service of the public good, and validate the experiences and knowledge bases of underrepresented students.

JENNIFER E. NUTEFALL is the Dean of University Libraries at the University of Northern Colorado (UNC). She holds a BS in Journalism and MLS from Syracuse University and an MA in Education and Human Development from George Washington University. She founded the Colloquium on Libraries & Service Learning in 2014 and edited the book *Service Learning, Information Literacy, and Libraries*, which won the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) Rockman Instruction Publication of the Year Award in 2018. Prior to UNC she worked at Santa Clara University, Oregon State University, George Washington University, and the State University of New York College at Brockport.

# APPENDIX A: STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

[Interviews will be conducted by a member of the research team OTHER than the participant's instructor. Participants will be provided with a hard copy of their essay for reference.]

1. What was your community placement for this course?
2. What were the activities you engaged in?

## Transition to Assignment

3. How did you select your topic/focus for this assignment?
4. How relevant was the topic to your community placement?
5. In what ways did your community-based learning (CBL) experience inform this topic?
6. Describe your research process for this assignment.
7. What kinds of sources did you use for this assignment and how did you select them?
8. Were there sources of data (people, information, etc.) from your CBL site that you used in your assignment? If so, what were the sources and how did you use them?
9. What support did the class provide for doing this assignment (such as readings, in-class activities like brainstorming activities or peer review, instructor feedback, etc.)?
10. Which of these activities were the most useful and why?
11. Were there any parts of this assignment that were particularly challenging for you? Why, and what did you do to overcome these challenges?

## Social Justice and Future Impact

CSL courses include learning goals related to social justice. Now we will focus on that aspect of the CSL experience.

12. What is your definition and/or understanding of social justice?
13. How did producing this assignment impact your understanding of the social inequality in the community?
  - a. Probe: How did producing this assignment change your feelings about social inequality?
14. How do you think you have changed as a result of this course?
  - a. Probe: Can you provide a specific example where you feel you behaved differently because of your experience in this course?

15. How has this course and community-based learning experience impacted your sense of purpose (e.g., clarification of skills, abilities, values, professional or personal pursuits)?

## Document-Based Portion

Essays will be marked with specific areas for the student to re-read and elaborate on.

16. Interviewer will also ask global questions about
  - a. the essay relating to students' choices about sources, social justice, and the research process, and
  - b. what the student learned from these specific sources, including what (if anything) they've applied to other contexts (either inside or outside school).

# APPENDIX B: STUDENTS' SOCIAL JUSTICE LEARNING OUTCOMES IN CONNECTION WITH COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING PLACEMENTS IN EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE (ELSJ) UNDERGRADUATE CORE CURRICULUM COURSES

## Santa Clara University

		Charity/personal responsibility (1)	Social awareness/personal participation (2)	Social justice/engaging in social change (3)
Ethic of service	Service orientation (perception of relationship) “VIEW OF SERVICE”	Values charity: give back to community; do <i>for</i> others [e.g., “give back to the community,” “serve as mentors”]	Values caring: compassion and empathy; do for, but are in relationship with, others [e.g., “I have learned compassion should be the underlying basis of teaching regardless of any circumstances”]	Values social justice: systemic change, work in solidarity [e.g., “create change by working with people who come from different situations and socioeconomic status, and gaining respect for these individuals”]
Awareness of self and others	View of the other (attitudes toward those served; beliefs about individuals/groups; approach to community service) “VIEW OF OTHERS”	Demonstrates deficit view of others: less fortunate, disadvantaged [e.g., “good to learn about disadvantaged communities”]	Views others as individuals, each with own story, not stereotypes [e.g., “(the experience) really removes stereotypical ideology; the community members were different than I thought”]	Views others as equals; community members are seen as strengths and resources; connected to others [e.g., “taught me a lot about being a positive and motivated individual; . . . insight into the quality and worth of others’ lives”]
	Diversity “VIEW OF GROUP DIFFERENCES”	Indicates everyone is the same <i>or</i> everyone has individual differences; no analysis of group-level privilege/marginalization [e.g., “everyone has the same chances in life; I’m lucky to have what I do”]	Acknowledges group differences with respect to privilege/marginalization [e.g., “my university education is a privilege; socioeconomic status impacts opportunities”]	Understands group differences with respect to privilege/marginalization [e.g., “I realized that I pay lower prices as a consumer due to unfair labor practices in the developing world”]

Awareness of social issues	View of social justice (situating the locus of the problem) “UNDERSTANDING THE PROBLEM”	Identifies individual responsibility; if everyone just tried harder; “pull oneself up by the boot straps”; blame the victim [e.g., “the kids are going to be a product of their parents’ influence. Despite that, they are good kids. They all have the potential to overcome their economic handicap”]	Recognizes the need to protect and ensure basic rights for all [e.g., “learned that these are hardworking people but are in the situation they’re in due to a variety of external factors”]	Examines policies and practices that maintain and reproduce the status quo that favors certain groups at the expense of others [e.g., “I have learned that the root of many societal problems comes from oppression and the inability to acquire wealth which presents future generations with a lack of opportunity”]
	View of social action (responding to community challenges/issues) “TAKING ACTION TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM”	Increase resources [e.g., “many of these students do not have access to quality resources”]	Treat people fairly and increase opportunities [e.g., “a quality education will open up more opportunities in life for these children”]	Examine causes of injustice and work for social change [e.g., “we begin to question the existence of such a huge disparity”; (CBL) challenges us to do something about the inequalities that we are witnessing and learning about”]

---

Note: This rubric draws heavily from Cipolle (2010, pp. 51–52) and Tinkler et al. (2014) but also draws from Mitchell (2008), Westheimer and Kahne (2004), and Morton (1995).

# APPENDIX C: STUDENTS' SOCIAL JUSTICE LEARNING OUTCOMES IN CONNECTION WITH COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING PLACEMENTS IN CSL COURSES

## Emblematic Quotations from the Data Set

	Charity/personal responsibility (1)	Social awareness/personal participation (2)	Social justice/engaging in social change (3)
Service orientation (perception of relationship) “VIEW OF SERVICE”	Values charity: give back to community; do <i>for</i> others “So, I think it is about going out, reaching out, kind of giving back to the community, serving.”	Values caring: compassion and empathy; do for, but are in relationship with, others “I can . . . actually dedicate my life into doing something that can impact, can improve the issue and also [address] a health area that I felt like needed some improvement.”	Values social justice: systemic change, work in solidarity “But when you’re with people and you make personal connections and you realize the intricacies of how policies are affecting them or how their environment is impacting them, that’s when you begin to I think want to make the move to make the change, instead of just want that change.”
View of the other (attitudes toward those served; beliefs about individuals/groups; approach to community service) “VIEW OF OTHERS”	Demonstrates deficit view of others: less fortunate, disadvantaged “I didn’t feel like I was stereotyping, but I did go in with preconceived notions and [I] think they were negative.”	Views others as individuals, each with own story, not stereotypes “I feel like my experience there opened me up to, I guess, the real humanity that I felt there and . . . there were definitely instances where I felt like I really felt with these people and the pain that they were going through.”	Views others as equals; community members are seen as strengths and resources; connected to others “During that first week because we did a little brainstorm, the first day of class, of what older people are. And a lot of people said things like slow. . . . So then you know you kind of get a sense like, oh, they are not as useful. That’s like you know what came up, like not as useful. But that’s completely wrong. And that’s something that I definitely learned from this.”
Diversity “VIEW OF GROUP DIFFERENCES”	Indicates everyone is the same <i>or</i> everyone has individual differences. No analysis of group-level privilege/marginalization “I would talk to my mom about the class and she was like, yeah, stop complaining, you’re lucky.”	Acknowledges group differences with respect to privilege/marginalization “I have a list of privileges, but if they just had one or two of those privileges, they could have probably not been in that position.”	Understands group differences with respect to privilege/marginalization “[A] lot of elderly people . . . it’s easy for them to be abused, even in their home situations or even at a place like this. I don’t think that they were being abused there, but there’s definitely places [where] that happens at and it’s really good to be aware of that. . . . [Before taking the class] I had never really thought about how social justice applied to the elderly.”

<p>View of social justice (situating the locus of the problem) “UNDER-STANDING THE PROBLEM”</p>	<p>Identifies individual responsibility; if everyone just tried harder; “pull oneself up by the boot straps”; blame the victim N/A</p>	<p>Recognizes the need to protect and ensure basic rights for all “I’d say [social justice is] a term for equalizing, like, facets of society for everyone” and “You’re going to different schools with different resources and it’s unfortunate that something that’s meant for everyone, that’s provided for everyone, is so different for everyone.”</p>	<p>Examines policies and practices that maintain and reproduce the status quo that favors certain groups at the expense of others “I think my in conclusion was that tracking can be a really good idea and has the potential to have large benefits for students across the board, but given some of the realities of the U.S. education system and abuse in society in general, namely the issue of difference races [not being] equally represented in the teaching community, and we have racial biases that [have] consequences for students.”</p>
<p>View of social action (responding to community challenges/issues) “TAKING ACTION TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM”</p>	<p>Increase resources “[I]t doesn’t have to be the parent, but there should be ways in which students have access to resources.”</p>	<p>Treat people fairly and increase opportunities “[I] didn’t know if they’re getting actual emotional and mental help. And so that was one issue, one part that I felt like maybe there was a need for. Having that kind of mental health component for these people that just went through a really traumatic experience. So I think it has changed me, kind of like seeing that there’s other paths.”</p>	<p>Examine causes of injustice and work for social change “[W]e want to help people. Wanting to do something that that isn’t just about making myself feel better about myself, but really empowering the people around me . . . that’s what social justice is, empowering people around us.”</p>

---

Note: This rubric draws heavily from Cipolle (2010, pp. 51–52) and Tinkler et al. (2014) but also draws from Mitchell (2008), Westheimer and Kahne (2004), and Morton (1995).

# APPENDIX D: ACRL FRAMEWORK EMBLEMATIC QUOTATIONS

ACRL frame	Emblematic quotation
Authority is constructed and contextual	I think it's really important to kind of moving from like our common mindset, especially I think here at Santa Clara, of us going into communities and helping them because we have more resources and we know more and we think differently about the world is a better way to do it. But I think that actually going out in the communities and seeing that they're doing a lot of things that are benefiting them that we wouldn't even think of, I think it's very powerful, especially when looking at the future, how we want to improve social inequalities, it's not us just like sitting in a classroom brainstorming ideas that we think is going to impact the community. But really going out in the community and testing it out and seeing if it's actually beneficial or if they have better ways that they're doing things that is{~?~WU: Replace with [are]?}{~?~AB: Please leave as is. It is quoted material.} actually improving their outcomes, more than what we as researchers, or we as students, or we as scholars would think would be appropriate. —Student 18
Information has value	We found the best luck doing searches that involve political reform. So all you know, “I was in the room when they decided to vote on this bill legalizing dying in Colorado” or California. So those were the primary sources but it limited us because we only saw the political side of it and we never saw the personal side of it and it's a very personal, intimate decision. So it's kind of strange that we can't find primary sources about such a topic. —Student 8 So, I mean, I used our library catalogs and databases, but I mean it, there's not a ton of research on invasion communities specifically because they're kind of a . . . Governments don't want to recognize them. So it's not like . . . it was really hard to find one specifically in Ecuador, but there have been successful invasion communities that have gained their land rights. So I based some of my analysis off of those successful amazing communities and how that can be carried over to help out with the situation in Ecuador. —Student 12
Research as inquiry	So it started with referencing. You know what sorts of tracking we already knew of and this primarily from what we have experienced . . . what we've seen happen. And then just doing, you know, Googling around trying to find what different things classify . . . so what different programs will look like. And then from there, looking at, looking up articles on both sides. Those that were pro-tracking and those against, and looking at some of the issues that they were weighing in on, then once we got a good sense for the issues that were at hand looking, to see if there were any pointers to studies or statistics to back up how those issues play out beyond just, you know, a person's impression of what, there's a good thing. —Student 6

# APPENDIX E: INFORMATION SOURCE TYPES

## EMBLEMATIC QUOTATIONS

Information source	Emblematic quotation
Outside sources	Okay, my small group members and it kind of started with just like doing general like watching videos on YouTube that other people have made. . . . So kind of gauging like how people, other people shared that story and then figuring out like a fun way to have like the actual kids from the community involved . . .—Student 19
Assigned course materials	We don't wouldn't have the concepts we would be like details for yeah the concepts we would be tested on later like all the information we got was from his lecture, but like he almost never went into the actual content. —Student 3
Own reflection	That's a pretty good outline of what he expected that this was a reflection on what we had learned and said to like tie it back to our textbook. —Student 9 I think the reflection was pretty helpful for getting me to gather my thoughts together because after the eight weeks, I think. Yeah. After the eight weeks of doing this experience, I felt like there was so much that happened and I was just normally frazzled at the end of it, but just needed time to process what happened. —Student 17
Community authority	Kids don't really care as much. And so it's hard to get an opinion from that. That's why we really use the parents there as a resource because they see the most besides like the teachers. —Student 19
Community members as exhibits/units of study	I kind of like struggled with like the balance between like being like a scientific observer and just being like a person that these people were talking to. So like I feel like that was my main struggle. —Student 4