This Is How We Change Things: Promoting Student Agency Through Service-Learning in First-Year Composition

David Williams

Introduction

During the Fall 2024 semester, my first-year composition (FYC) students were working on a service-learning (SL) project for Echoes and Reflections (ER), a professional development program that creates educational materials about the Holocaust. Our deliverable was an educational podcast about the Łódź Ghetto, one of the largest and longest-lasting ghettos in Nazi-occupied Europe. Social justice was the motivation behind our work, given that Holocaust knowledge continues to decline while white nationalist sentiment is steadily on the rise (Claims Conference, 2018; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2023). In early November, we had begun the script-writing phase of our project when a student approached me with a question. This student had been rehearsing their group's share of the podcast script and found that part of it sounded odd when verbalized. The script originally referred to the masses of people herded into the Łódź Ghetto as "residents," and this student wondered if "prisoners" would be more accurate.

This conversation illustrated the kind of self-awareness that FYC instructors long to see from our students. This student was thinking critically about the power of words to convey meaning. Would "residents" minimize the suffering endured by the Nazis' victims? How would this single word choice affect the audience's understanding of the Łódź Ghetto? (ER mostly shares their resources with secondary educators, whose students likely do not know much about the Holocaust.) Moreover, this student was reflecting on their and their groupmates' moral/ethical responsibilities as authors. Put simply, this question of "residents" versus "prisoners" demonstrated understanding of the rhetorical situation. The concern in that moment was not about a grade but, rather, the real-world impact that an act of composition could have— and it is this feeling of responsibility that I strive to instill in my students.

I think a great deal about the connection between composition and justice, how the former can be used in pursuit of the latter, but it is not always easy to make my students see that same connection. Teaching FYC is tough. I say that as someone who has taught the course enough times—seventeen sections in total—that by now, one would think I'd be able to do so in my sleep. But the reality is quite different. This course is a requirement for students, who often regard it as a box to be checked rather than a journey toward honing their unique authorial voices, a perception Duffy (2014) attributes to heavy partitioning between disciplines that "threatens to isolate us within increasingly specialized discourses that have little to say to one another" (p. 213). As someone who teaches at a primarily STEM institution, I know the struggle of trying to engage with

1

students who wonder what value, if any, composition holds for them and their academic/professional goals. Graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) can find ourselves deflated by this reality, as these teaching assignments can be invaluable career preparation. We want to feel like the work we do matters, especially in a time when the humanities are increasingly being devalued.

It is therefore surprising that research into the value of service-learning (SL) for writing curricula remains minimal (Iverson, 2019). Such a topic demands more extensive work than what I offer here. Nevertheless, I would like to draw from relevant scholarship and my own teaching experience to argue that service-learning offers a more enriching experience for composition students through "counter-normative pedagogy" (Carnicelli & Boluk, 2017, p. 131) that disrupts the structures and values of education and thus moves students to assume greater agency in their learning. While I also do not have space to explain and justify every detail of my course design, I focus specifically on the ways that SL challenges traditional classroom hierarchy. The result, I argue, is composition that students are more personally invested in and empowered by, which therefore has greater potential to fuel social change.

Justification

One possible reason SL is not featured more in scholarship about FYC pedagogy is that "service-learning" itself is not easily defined. Covering the term's history and myriad interpretations is beyond the scope of this writing, and I acknowledge that this lack of a "unifying framework" (Chong, 2014, p. 349) complicates matters like designing curricula and measuring course success. This can be particularly daunting for GTAs, who face the challenge of balancing their teaching duties with their own coursework and research. Rather than seek a conclusive definition or protocol for service-learning, I echo Cho See Chong's (2014) position that instructors should approach this form of education from "a philosophical stance" (p. 354), less as a set of rules and more as teaching grounded in ethical and moral concerns.

One description of service-learning I have found useful in this regard is that it is "a pedagogic approach that specifically encourages students as *socially responsible and active citizens* [my emphasis] to work in and with members of the community" (Asghar & Rowe, 2017, p. 118). This may not seem dissimilar from what FYC instructors are already trying to do. Many of us use community engagement as a framework for teaching composition. Before venturing into the world of SL, my students regularly wrote argumentative essays to tackle controversies ranging from gun violence to gender inequality in college sports. While such work remains vital, what sets service-learning apart is that working with an actual community partner can significantly bolster students' ability to develop empathy (Everhart, 2016), a worthwhile endeavor given that empathy among American college students has been steadily waning for decades now (Konrath et al., 2011). And if we are to encourage empathy in our students so that they may

2

serve their communities, we must (re)consider what sort of community we promote in the classroom and the university as a whole.

Rethinking Authority in the Classroom

A Theoretical Foundation for SL Course Design

Like many of my colleagues, I cut my teeth on Paolo Freire's (2014) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, most notably his criticism of the "banking" model of education, which regards students as empty vessels to be filled with information by the teacher. The consequence of the banking model is that it disempowers students by undermining their agency and ignoring how knowledge is produced "through inventions and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other" (Freire, 2014, p. 72). In this learning environment, the teacher is the authority and sole bearer of wisdom. To upend this oppressive hierarchy, teachers' efforts "must coincide with those of the students to engage in critical thinking and the quest for mutual humanization" (Freire, 2014, p. 75). In short, teachers must view their students not as dependents but as partners on the journey toward greater knowledge.

SL pedagogy embodies Freire's (2014) educational philosophy because it challenges students and teachers alike to recognize dominant power structures at work both beyond and within the university. For service-learning to be transformative, those involved "need to be aware of the cultural, historical and political dynamics at work in any community practice and the university needs to recognize that sustained service learning will bring change to the institution, its practices and its beliefs" (Asghar & Rowe, 2017, p. 124). This awareness applies to instructors as much as it does to students (Carrington et al., 2015). SL does not just seek to benefit community partners; it challenges us to interrogate how we learn and what effect(s) said learning has on our potential as active and responsible citizens.

Teachers are not exempt from this challenge (Carrington et al., 2015), for when they "confront their narrowly defined pedagogical box, it is then they are able to consider new ways to change the structures and practices of organizations they are affiliated with" (Carnicelli & Boluk, 2017, p. 129). It is through such critical self-awareness that Henry Giroux's (1988) "language of possibility" (p. 98), knowledge production that prioritizes agency over existing power structures, is made possible. This self-awareness entails carefully considering how a class is structured, including the volume and design of assignments (Petersen & Henning, 2018). The goal of SL, after all, is for students to "create their own knowledge and apply theory to practice" (Asghar & Rowe, 2017, p. 119), and it is therefore essential that instructors create "generative spaces wherein students could fail and problem-solve" (Leon et al., 2017, p. 46). When we instructors remove ourselves from the picture, or at least minimize our presence, students' potential and initiative can be awe-inspiring. The kids are all right indeed.

Balancing Structure and Fluidity in Assignment Designs

Students who reflect on their SL experiences often mention the value of being able to "find their own success" (Leon et al., 2017, p. 51). Thus, if a SL project is too rigidly designed, this may lead students to "focus only on instructor needs and values rather than also considering community perspectives" (Shumake & Shah, 2017, p. 13). For my class, I scaffolded our project by dividing it into four phases, all group assignments: an action plan, essentially a written agreement among groupmates as to how they will work together over the coming months; an annotated bibliography compromised of sources outside of those offered by ER, a podcast script; and, of course, the deliverable: a 20- to 25-minute educational podcast that ER could offer as a teaching resource.

These core assignments provided a sense of linearity and pacing that my students found helpful, though I emphasized that we would stay flexible based on the needs of our community partner. If, for example, ER were to suggest edits to the podcast script assignment based on the content they normally produce, our class would discuss and likely implement those changes. Our work also fulfilled several common learning outcomes of FYC: accounting for multiple perspectives (action plan), using effective research methods (annotated bibliography), marrying information with creativity (podcast script), and engaging in multimodality (deliverable). Moreover, while ER requested a podcast mainly to appeal to younger audiences, podcasting also provides an opportunity to critically discuss this medium's ability to "resist traditional, exclusionary publishing norms and practices" (Woods & Wood, 2023, p. 2). If one aim of SL is to rethink education, then this revolutionary mindset can (and, I argue, should) be reflected in the assignments we offer our students.

Owing to the need for flexibility, instructors using SL in the classroom should be prepared to act more as facilitators than authorities. Admittedly, this dynamic can be difficult for GTAs. I often find myself battling the familiar sensation of "academic guilt" and questions over whether I am doing enough for my students. However, reduced authority can benefit instructors as much as it does students. Burnout among graduate students remains a significant concern, one linked to higher levels of stress, anxiety, depression, and cynicism (Allen et al., 2022). Assuming more facilitative roles in the SL classroom can ease some of the immense pressure GTAs feel. More importantly, this shift can help them "reconnect with the idea of being learners" (Leon et al., 2017, p. 53), further eroding the teacher-student hierarchy and producing a more genuinely collaborative learning experience.

Day-to-Day Interactions

My 75-minute class sessions were usually divided into periods for class discussions and group work. We would spend about 45 minutes discussing the assigned readings on a given day. These readings mostly consisted of accounts from Holocaust survivors,

4

eyewitnesses, and others with personal connections to this event. They include seminal titles like Primo Levi's *Survival in Auschwitz* and Art Spiegelman's *Maus*, and lesser-read works—at least, for first-year college students—by authors like Charlotte Delbo, Tadeusz Borowski, and Zofia Nałkowska. The main purpose of these discussions was to get my students to think about the Holocaust foremost on a human level and encourage critical thought. Additionally, while SL allows students to direct their learning, asking first-year students to confront a difficult subject like the Holocaust unassisted is a dicey proposition. As the instructor, I still need to know when and to what extent to be a guiding hand.

This goes likewise for technical instruction, as many of my FYC students have little to no experience in podcasting. While Clemson University offers a comprehensive module for learning Adobe Audition, the audio-editing app used to create our deliverable, I devoted several class periods to explaining/demonstrating this app's interface and various functions. Like many educators, I am keenly aware of the disempowering effects of the digital divide and do not presume that all students have the confidence or prior experience to jump right into multimodal composition. Like any educator, my primary aim is to create an equitable learning environment by equipping every student with the tools to succeed, and this remains true in an SL course.

After our discussions, students would convene in groups for the remainder of the day. Each class was divided into four groups, comprised of four to five students, a decision reflecting the belief that "before [students] can serve the community, they have to learn first how to serve each other" (Petersen & Henning, 2018, p. 443). While I remained available to answer questions and offer advice upon request, how groups used this time was left to them, whether it was to continue discussing that day's reading, make progress on the current phase of our project, or troubleshoot a problem. Put otherwise, students were given time and space to assume agency by directing their learning, an approach they initially found intimidating but ultimately embraced. It was during these meetings that students were challenged most to exercise critical thinking and problem-solving; and they regularly exceeded my expectations in doing so. They proposed and debated ideas; organized meeting times outside of class; negotiated team roles; displayed leadership when those more versed in digital creation helped their less experienced peers; and exercised democracy by voting on the next steps in their work. My SL experience showed me that when students are tasked with finding their own answers, as opposed to having answers supplied to them, they are ready to meet the moment. Most importantly, this time allowed students to "develop genuine relationships and […] engage in meaningful dialogue" (Asghar & Rowe, 2017, p. 123) by encountering diverse perspectives, a crucial step toward producing a more empathetic and responsible citizenry. As proud as I was of my students' work, I was equally thrilled to see friendships and feelings of accountability form amongst them.

My students' autonomy also applied to correspondence with the community partner, as they communicated directly with ER to ask questions about the project and receive

5

feedback on three of their core assignments: the annotated bibliography, the script, and the deliverable. Naturally, this only occurred after students consented to share their work, and communication was entirely online, given that ER does not have physical offices. This was yet another significant change for my students, many of whom are used to producing writing that never leaves the classroom. Involving the community partner in the creative process helps students realize the true value of their work, which is that it has life and impact beyond the university and is not intended to meet the instructor's expectations only. My students were elated by the compliments provided by ER on their scripts, including praise for the maturity they displayed in writing about such a difficult subject. Moments such as these can inspire untold levels of confidence in learners.

That said, I would caution instructors to think ahead about maintaining healthy communication in SL classes. A good first step is to consider the community partner one plans to work with. I admit to having had an advantage in this regard. ER is an educational program whose members understand the unique dynamics of working with students, namely the importance of providing supportive and constructive feedback. While direct contact with community partners can result in heightened feelings of community, empathy, and responsibility (Everhart, 2016), the simple reality is that not all community partners are experienced in working with students. In those cases, instructors need to be prepared to act as intermediaries. This could be as simple as intervening if a partner offers excessively critical feedback that may discourage students. (One strategy to avert this situation is to request that feedback be sent directly to the instructor, who then relays it to the class. Those moments present a challenge that any instructor is familiar with: balancing honesty and support in sharing feedback.) While we should recognize that young people are resilient, lest we revert to the banking model of education, we are still obligated as educators to advocate for our students.

Challenges

Though I have described some of the ways that SL can enhance FYC courses, there are numerous challenges that instructors should be aware of and ready to face. First and foremost are the "ethical complexities" (Hammersley, 2012, p. 179) of SL, namely its potential for reinforcing harmful power dynamics, including a perceived division between haves and have-nots (Asghar & Rowe, 2017; Salter & Halbert, 2019; Santiago-Ortiz, 2019). Without persistent critical reflection by both students and instructors, SL can quickly devolve into a hierarchical activity resembling little more than charity. This is especially true of SL in a university classroom, as "the mere option of being able to take part in service-learning in a university context already creates a hierarchical relationship that places knowledge, power, and choice of service site with those who possess university resources" (Santiago-Ortiz, 2019, p. 45). And even the word "service" itself is laden with assumptions about the division of power (Hammersley, 2012). Those engaged in SL must therefore be willing to question their own agenda so that their work remains non-exploitative (Asghar & Rowe, 2017; Salter & Halbert, 2019; Santiago-Ortiz,

6

2019). Who/what am I doing this for? Is everyone benefiting? Am I respecting the agency of the community partner or undermining it? As Erin Brock Carlson (2023) urges, adopting an "embodied philosophy" (p. 177) of comradeship—i.e., a commitment to valuing all voices/perspectives/needs—is the deciding factor as to whether nonprofit work benefits all parties rather than just those with institutional leverage.

One possibility for encouraging critical reflection among students is incorporating it into one's course design (Asghar & Rowe, 2017; Everhart, 2016; Jacoby, 2015). Outside of my students' core assignments, they also maintained reflection journals that they added to biweekly. These journals were graded based on volume and completion to encourage honest responses, and each entry was preceded by a prompt consisting of one to two open-ended questions. (I do not recommend posing more than that, otherwise students may feel like their reflections are too instructor-driven.) For example, one question I asked my students was: "How have your prior views about writing education been challenged, if at all, by your service-learning experience?" While the measurable value of reflection in SL is a matter of debate (Chong, 2014), I have found that this practice creates a cognitive space wherein students can tie their personal experiences to their learning, exercise their critical voices, and continue polishing their writing skills. For any instructors who may consider assigning reflection journals for their SL students, a helpful collection of sample questions can be found in chapter two of Barbara Jacoby's (2015) *Service-Learning Essentials: Questions, Answers, and Lessons Learned*.

Ethical concerns over SL apply to the volume of labor, as well. The life of a college student is busy enough as is, and loss of time for other schoolwork can negate the benefits of service (Chong, 2014). While I care deeply about the work in my FYC course, I respect that my students have numerous academic commitments and factor this into how much they are asked to do. While any teacher worthy of the title shares this concern, I argue that it is felt most acutely in FYC courses, which are largely populated with first-year students who are still adjusting to college life while managing heavier workloads than they have had before. Put simply, while SL allows students to exercise autonomy in their education, if they are saddled with too much work, the negatives of their SL experience can very quickly outweigh any positives.

The question of labor does not apply only to the students, though. While involving community partners in the actual work of an SL project is key for reciprocity and respect (Shumake & Shah, 2017), instructors should remember that these partners have their own workloads. ER, for example, is a program run mostly by teachers, all of whom have their own students to teach, lesson plans to create, and assignments to grade. My students provided updates to ER and received crucial feedback on their work, but we mostly operated independently. Overburdening community partners can undo much of the goodwill in SL (Shumake & Shah, 2017), so instructors should carefully discuss expectations and responsibilities with community partners to ensure "openly negotiated, reciprocal, mutually beneficial relations" (Cushman, 1999, p. 332) between all involved.

7

Students should be included in these negotiations, providing yet another opportunity to directly shape the project they are engaged in.

Finally, whether an instructor pursues SL pedagogy depends partly on the institution in which they work. I am fortunate that Clemson University has the infrastructure in place to support such endeavors. This includes Adobe Creative Cloud accounts created for all students, which make multimodal SL projects that much more feasible by removing potential resource barriers. (However, even at schools that offer ample creative/learning resources, it bears repeating that instructors should be wary of potential gaps in general digital literacy across different demographics.) Additionally, as a past recipient of the Pearce Center Service-Learning Fellowship and current member of the university's Client-Based Program, I have often benefited from a healthy support system of like-minded colleagues. I do not presume that all universities similarly value service-learning, and further research must be done as to how this dynamic impacts not only instructor efforts but student preconceptions about SL education.

However, institutional support goes beyond funding and resources, as "[university] environments that offer and appreciate the *nuances* [my emphasis] of engaging in service-learning activities are better equipped to match the individual readiness" (Caspersz & Olaru, 2017, p. 696). Specifically, it is important to support SL without imposing rigid institutional designs. Public engagement that depends solely on institutionally formed initiatives increases the chances that "adolescents will be tamed and disciplined rather than empowered and skilled" (Amnå, 2012, p. 612). In short, supporting instructors and students also means allowing them to work without being subjected to strict institutional oversight. Only then will it be possible for students' transformations to be earned rather than dictated to them from above.

Conclusion

These challenges notwithstanding, I maintain that service-learning's benefits make it an ideal approach to teaching FYC. Through community engagement, students fulfill the learning objectives of FYC by practicing purposeful and audience-driven writing; developing greater rhetorical awareness; and exercising critical thinking and reflection (Dorman & Dorman, 2023; Brack & Hall, 2023). Just as important, SL education has been shown to reduce prejudice, promote multicultural knowledge, enhance leadership skills, and increase levels of civic responsibility (Asghar & Rowe, 2017; Caspersz & Olaru, 2017; Tinkler et al., 2017). If we want our students to view composition as one way to create a more just society, as opposed to something they do in exchange for a grade, we ought to strive for those same results. But for this to happen, we must first be willing to rethink how composition is taught; and service-learning is one pedagogical philosophy that "because of its incongruence with traditional pedagogies can disrupt the norm of individualism, teacher control and student passivity" (Carnicelli & Boluk, 2017, p. 132). While considering the power (im)balance between university and community is an important component of SL, I contend that we must also address this same dynamic

within academia itself. As Elizabeth Wardle (2009) suggests, perhaps our goal should be to "no longer ask FYC to teach students to write in the university and instead construct FYC to teach students about writing in the university" (p. 767). Are we going to teach FYC to empower students as agents of change, or will we maintain the status quo and our place in it as authorities?

This question is never far from my mind. For most of my students, FYC is their all-important introduction to college-level writing. This class can shape how they think of composition for years to come, an important consideration given that composition is a skill that spans across all disciplines. I have had more than a few students confide in me that they are not excited for my class at first, and when I ask why, the near-unanimous reply is that they were discouraged by how they were taught to write growing up. I am never offended by my students' honesty. Quite the contrary, I welcome it as a call to action, to not repeat the mistakes of the past. While service-learning is not to be undertaken lightly, it allows FYC to transcend the typical expectations of writing instruction and produce compositions that speak more to "the values of connections, reciprocities, and interdependencies among peoples" (Duffy, 2014, p. 217). This is the sort of composition that matters to me, and as I have seen firsthand, it is what matters most to my students, too. Our students are ready and mature enough to go into the world and heal it. As instructors, we can help make their journey possible and join them along the way.

References

Allen, H. K., Lilly, F., Green, K. M., Zanjani, F., Vincent, K. B., & Arria, A. M. (2022). Graduate Student Burnout: Substance Use, Mental Health, and the Moderating Role of Advisor Satisfaction. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 20(2), 1130–1146. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00431-9

Amnå, E. (2012). How is civic engagement developed over time? Emerging answers from a multidisciplinary field. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(3), 611–627.

Asghar, M., & Rowe, N. (2017). Reciprocity and critical reflection as the key to social justice in service learning: A case study. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 54(2), 117–125. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2016.1273788

Brack, G. W., & Hall, L. R. (2023). Combining the classroom and the community: Service-learning in composition at Arizona State University. In L. Adler-Kassner, R. Crooks, A. Watters (Eds.), *Writing the Community* (pp. 143-152). Routledge.

Carlson, E. B. (2023). "Who Am I Fighting For? Who Am I Accountable To?": Comradeship as a Frame for Nonprofit Community Work in Technical Communication. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *32*(2), 165–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2022.2085810

Carnicelli, S., & Boluk, K. (2017). The promotion of social justice: Service learning for transformative education. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 21, 126–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2017.01.003

Carrington, S., Mercer, K. L., Iyer, R., & Selva, G. (2015). The impact of transformative learning in a critical service-learning program on teacher development: Building a foundation for inclusive teaching. *Reflective Practice*, 16(1), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2014.969696

Caspersz, D., & Olaru, D. (2017). The value of service-learning: The student perspective. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(4), 685–700. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1070818

Chong, C. S. (2014). Service-learning research: Definitional challenges and complexities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 15*(4), 347–358.

Claims Conference. (2018). New Survey by Claims Conference Finds Significant Lack of Holocaust Knowledge in the United States. Claims Conference. https://www.claimscon.org/study/

Cushman, E. (1999). The Public Intellectual, Service Learning, and Activist Research. *College English*, *61*(3), 328–336. https://doi.org/10.58680/ce19991123

Dorman, W., & Dorman, S. F. (2023). Service-learning: Bridging the gap between the real world and the composition classroom. In L. Adler-Kassner, R. Crooks, A. Watters (Eds.), *Writing the Community* (pp. 119-132). Routledge.

Duffy, J. (2014). Ethical dispositions: A discourse for rhetoric and composition. *JAC*, 209–237.

Everhart, R. S. (2016). Teaching Tools to Improve the Development of Empathy in Service-Learning Students. Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement, 20(2), 129–154.

Freire, P. (2014). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (30th Anniversary Edition). Bloomsbury.

Giroux, H. (2024). Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning. Bloomsbury.

Hammersley, L. (2012). Community-Based Service-Learning: Partnerships of Reciprocal Exchange?. Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 14(3), 171–184.

Iverson, C. (2019). The Long-Term Effects of Service-Learning on Composition Students. Reflections: A Journal of Public Rhetoric, Civic Writing & Service Learning, 19(2).

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

Konrath, S. H., O'Brien, E. H., & Hsing, C. (2011). Changes in dispositional empathy in American college students over time: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review: An Official Journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology,* 15(2), 180–198. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310377395

Leon, K., Pinkert, L. A., & Taylor, K. T. (2017). Developing accounts of instructor learning: Recognizing the impacts of service-learning pedagogies on writing teachers. *Composition Studies*, 45(1), 39–58.

Petersen, N., & Henning, E. (2018). Service learning and the practice of social justice and care. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 28(4), 436–448. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2017.1418697

Salter, P., & Halbert, K. (2019). Balancing classroom ready with community ready: Enabling agency to engage with community through critical service learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 47(1), 5–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2018.1497771

Santiago-Ortiz, A. (2019). From Critical to Decolonizing Service-Learning: Limits and Possibilities of Social Justice–Based Approaches to Community Service-Learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 25(1). https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcsloa.3239521.0025.104

Shumake, J., & Shah, R. W. (2017). Reciprocity and power dynamics: Community members grading students. Reflections: A Journal of Public Rhetoric, Civic Writing & Service Learning, 17(2).

Southern Poverty Law Center. (2023). The Year in Hate and Extremism 2023. *Southern Poverty Law Center*. https://www.splcenter.org/resources/guides/year-hate-extremism-2023/

Tinkler, B., McGann, G., & Tinkler, A. (2017). Learning from each other: Using a service-learning citizenship course to promote intercultural understanding. *Intercultural Education*, 28(5), 447–455. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2017.1335861

Wardle, E. (2009). "Mutt Genres" and the Goal of FYC: Can We Help Students Write the Genres of the University? *College Composition & Communication*, 60(4), 765–789. https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc20097196

Woods, C., & Wood, S. A. (2023). Podcasts in rhetoric and composition: A review of The Big Rhetorical Podcast and Pedagogue. *Computers and Composition*, 67(2).