

## Reciprocity: Saying What We Mean and Meaning What We Say

**Lina D. Dostilio**

*Duquesne University*

**Sarah M. Brackmann**

*Southwestern University*

**Kathleen E. Edwards**

*University of North Carolina  
at Greensboro*

**Barbara Harrison**

*Brock University*

**Brandon W. Klierer**

*Florida Gulf Coast University*

**Patti H. Clayton**

*PHC Ventures, IUPUI*

*Reciprocity is a foundational concept in service-learning and community engagement, yet it is frequently referred to in the literature without precise conceptualization or critical examination, in effect suggesting a shared understanding of the concept among practitioners and scholars. However, understandings and applications of the term vary widely, and unexamined or unintentionally differing conceptualizations of reciprocity can lead to confusion in practice and can hinder research. This article examines meanings of reciprocity from multiple perspectives and highlights the larger implications of how we characterize the concept in research and practice, using the method of concept review. In this concept review we examine the ways in which the concept of reciprocity has been and could be produced and given meaning within the existing body of service-learning and community engagement literature and in other disciplines and epistemologies (e.g., philosophy, evolutionary biology, leadership, Indigenous meaning-making). Central to this concept review is the goal of distinguishing broad categories of meaning so that we and our community engagement colleagues might be able to make more explicit our position with regard to the specific meanings of reciprocity we intend, which in turn can inform our development of research constructs, practices, and interpretations.*

**Vignette 1:** Public schools in a particular community have been defined as under-performing according to standards established by the federal government. Due to budgetary constraints, the school district is limited in its capacity to offer additional academic remediation to students. Concurrently, education majors attending a nearby university seek opportunities for practical experience as teachers. School administrators and faculty members from the university recognize an opportunity to form a partnership. Faculty members coordinate students to organize and lead an after-school tutoring program throughout the school district.

**Vignette 2:** A coalition of individuals from various community and university entities are engaged in a health disparity research project. They recognize that their differing positionalities and experiences (e.g., social class, race, gender, community histories, organizational cultures) influence their perspectives and expectations of the collaboration and, therefore, that they may possess different perspectives on how to best accomplish the project. They intentionally consider each others' ways of thinking and acting and choose to conduct the project in a way that reflects the collective group's priorities and values. The process of consideration iteratively alters their process of engagement with one

another, outcomes of the research project, and meaning-making of their findings and future research and practice.

**Vignette 3:** Within a city and its surrounding townships rapid population growth has led to significant expansion of housing construction, commercial development, and creation of recreational amenities on previously undeveloped land. A group of community organization staff, residents, students, and university faculty who had been working together on various other projects realize they share a concern about the future of the area's natural open spaces. They begin to come together once a week to discuss the significance of those open spaces (e.g., historical, ecological, educational, spiritual, metaphorical). This combination of various perspectives, relationships to the area, and community building over time eventually move them in the direction of cataloguing the unique natural resources that will be lost without protection and developing land management protocols for these areas. As the group works together, meeting by meeting and year by year, an organizational identity emerges: an entirely new initiative that transcends the scope of the university, existing community organizations, or citizen groups. The members of the group experience transformation within their respective identities: some coming to consider

themselves political activists, some engaged scholars, and some community leaders.

*Reciprocity* is a foundational concept within service-learning and community engagement, yet it is frequently referred to in the literature without precise conceptualization or critical examination, suggesting a shared understanding of the concept that may, in fact, not exist and a “problematic lack of precision around... fundamental concepts” (Bringle & Clayton, 2012, p. 102). While there are elements of engagement that can arguably be called reciprocal within each of the three opening vignettes, applying the term without qualification or refinement to all three scenarios may be an indicator of and a contributor to conceptual and practical confusion.

Among community engagement practitioners and scholars, the term reciprocity appears to be what linguistic philosophers call a “premature ultimate,” a term “held in such reverence that its invocation effectively ends any further debate or critical analysis” (Brookfield, 2007, p. 64). Use of the term can, intentionally or unintentionally, elicit and refer to meaning that is assumed and unquestioned (Hessler, 2000). In such instances there is a risk of the concept being applied as dogma, in which case the vibrancy and robustness associated with it are diluted.

At the same time, the term reciprocity—as has been suggested regarding the term *civic engagement* (Berger, 2009)—can be cast so widely and so variously that it loses meaning. Understandings and applications of the concept of reciprocity may vary widely, distinctions among uses of the term may be overlooked, and this term may be easily conflated with others.

A particularly prevalent and problematic conflation occurs between the terms *mutually beneficial* and *reciprocal*, which are often used interchangeably and, we suggest, uncritically. One of the few examples of works that speak to this conflation, the *Democratic Engagement White Paper* (Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009), makes the claim that the concepts of mutuality and reciprocity emerge from and characterize distinct paradigms of engagement: technocratic and democratic. The white paper explicitly contrasts mutuality and reciprocity, defining the former as “each party in the relationship benefit[ing] from its involvement” (p. 8) and the latter as an epistemological position in which authority and responsibility for knowledge creation are shared—an orientation that the authors claim moves engagement from an approach of university expertise being used *for* communities to an approach of universities collaborating *with* communities. The white paper does not extend its examination of the concept of reciprocity to investigate the multiple uses of the term to which

Lowery et al. (2006) point and which the everyday experiences of many practitioner-scholars confirm. Rather than assuming that there is more of an established or agreed-upon framing of the concept than there really is or that the concept is either synonymous with or paradigmatically distinct from such related terms as mutuality, the field will benefit from deliberate examination of the meanings associated with reciprocity.

In this article we critically examine and seek clarity around meanings of reciprocity by reviewing conceptions of reciprocity within the service-learning and community engagement (SL-CE) literature and within an illustrative selection of disciplines and epistemologies (DEs) beyond the SL-CE literature, including, for example, philosophy, evolutionary biology, leadership, and Indigenous meaning-making. We explore the perspectives offered by the DEs with an eye to what light can be shed on the concept of reciprocity as we think about its use in our own field. The DEs provide various lenses through which to consider the conceptualization of the concept of reciprocity as it has been and can be informed by an array of knowledge traditions. The discussion here thus responds to, echoes, and further develops Lowery et al.’s (2006) call to service-learning practitioners and scholars to “extend their focus to encompass the many issues embodied in this concept... [and] to more clearly stipulate the theoretical perspectives grounding their [work]” (p. 56).

Guiding questions underlying this discussion include: (a) How has the concept of reciprocity been produced and given meaning within the existing body of SL-CE literature? (b) How has the concept of reciprocity been produced and given meaning in other DEs? (c) How can consideration of multiple perspectives on the concept reframe the way community engagement practitioner-scholars discuss elements of reciprocity? (d) What are the larger implications for community-engaged practice and research of recognizing the multiple ways meaning is attached to and produced through the concept of reciprocity?

This article introduces the method of concept review; describes the ways in which reciprocity has been conceptualized and discussed within SL-CE literature through a review of the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, the *Advances in Service-Learning Research* series, and other central texts; consults a variety of DEs to investigate potential theoretical underpinnings of the concept; brings these diverse conceptions into conversation with the SL-CE literature; and concludes with a discussion of implications.

## Method

We use the method of concept review to enhance clarity and intentionality in the use of reciprocity as a

central and critical term within SL-CE research and practice. Concept review, or conceptual analysis, provides a means to bring specificity to a phenomenon of interest—such as in Krebs' (1970) review of altruism—as well as to stimulate thought about the ways in which a term is used—such as in Baccarini's (1996) review of project complexity. Unlike the Krebs and Baccarini reviews, which provide a singular definition of the concept under analysis, this article does not position one conception, or interpretation, of reciprocity as true or inherently preferable. Rather, we seek to make explicit, by way of illustrative examples, the diversity of meanings contained within the term. Central to this analysis is the goal of distinguishing broad categories of meaning so that we and our colleagues in SL-CE might be able to make more explicit our positions as practitioner-scholars with regard to the specific meanings of reciprocity we intend, which in turn can inform our development of research constructs, our practices, and our understanding of alternative interpretations.

This article follows the approach used by Rogers (2001) in his concept review of reflection. Rogers asserts that the frequency of references to reflection within educational practice and research does not translate to clear use of the term. He recognizes that multiple terms are used to describe reflective processes and that the term *reflection* is used interchangeably with other terms. This article similarly delves into select works in SL-CE to determine how the concept of reciprocity is represented within this literature.

Rogers (2001) examines a variety of theoretical perspectives on reflection to help bring forward similarities and differences across conceptions. In this article we consult a diverse group of DEs to perform the same function, not purporting to offer an exhaustive review but rather considering perspectives that are particularly salient to the concept of reciprocity as it is used within the SL-CE community of practitioner-scholars. The DEs used herein represent the disciplines and epistemologies of particular interest to the authors; by no means exhaustive of knowledge traditions, they serve to illustrate that the concept of reciprocity is characterized by multiple analytic considerations and frames of reference, and they provide insights into the complexities and nuances of its meanings across contexts. Our analysis of the DEs also includes disciplinary theories and epistemological understandings that do not explicitly use the term reciprocity but that embody elements of it or ideas related to it, which can provide additional, relevant nuances and insights.

Finally, acknowledging that reflection continues to be a challenging concept for educators to employ, Rogers (2001) leverages his concept analysis to draw out the implications of better understanding the term.

In this article we similarly consider implications of more intentionally defining and declaring our use of the term reciprocity.

In conducting this concept review, we used an iterative and inductive process to develop an organizing schema of orientations toward reciprocity. Our analysis of the literature utilized a constant comparative method (Merriam, 2009) whereby we simultaneously brought the SL-CE literature and the selected DEs into conversation with one another to generate themes. Although some researchers hold that constant comparative methods should be used only in grounded theory studies (e.g. Steinberg, Bringle, & McGuire, 2013), other researchers who utilize grounded theory (e.g. Charmaz, 2006) note that its methods can enhance other qualitative approaches. Merriam (2009) suggests that qualitative research is by its nature comparative research and, therefore, the constant comparative method is valuable more generally, beyond the realm of grounded theory, as a method of analysis in qualitative research.

Through a convergent process (Guba & Lincoln, 1981) of analyzing the SL-CE literature in conjunction with the DEs, we established a framework for categorizing reciprocity according to three orientations. These three orientations are distinct in many ways but are alike in that they each provide a particular interpretation that adds important and useful nuance to the meaning of the concept of reciprocity. We suggest that the term's meaning, without such nuancing, might be best captured by the image of a reciprocating saw: simple back and forth movement. We find this image a useful foil against which to explore enhanced meanings of the term because our conviction is that the term reciprocity is rarely intended to convey only this back and forth movement; rather, uses of the term generally have implied connotations, and these connotations are often divergent. We suggest, then, that particular meanings of reciprocity are best conveyed by introducing a descriptor or adjective that lends greater specificity and precision and thus clarifies one's intended meaning. The three distinct but related orientations we postulate and examine here are:

- *Exchange*. Participants give and receive something from the others that they would not otherwise have. In this orientation, reciprocity is the interchange of benefits, resources, or actions (as per vignette 1).
- *Influence*. The processes and/or outcomes of the collaboration are iteratively changed as a result of being influenced by the participants and their contributed ways of knowing and doing. In this orientation, reciprocity is expressed as a relational connection that is

informed by personal, social, and environmental contexts (as per vignette 2).

- *Generativity*. As a function of the collaborative relationship, participants (who have or develop identities as co-creators) become and/or produce something new together that would not otherwise exist. This orientation may involve transformation of individual ways of knowing and being or of the systems of which the relationship is a part. The collaboration may extend beyond the initial focus as outcomes, as ways of knowing, and as systems of belonging evolve (as per vignette 3).

In the next section we explore how the concept of reciprocity has been produced and given meaning within the existing body of SL-CE literature, as well as through the lenses of the three orientations.

### Reciprocity in the Service-Learning and Community Engagement Literature

A review of the SL-CE literature reveals multiple conceptions of reciprocity with varying levels of attention to their meaning. We reviewed articles in the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (1995-2011; referred to herein as *MJCSL*), the *Advances in Service-Learning Research* series (2002-2011; referred to herein as *Advances*), and other central works as a starting point for establishing how reciprocity has been used in the SL-CE literature.

Reciprocity is widely recognized as a core construct in service-learning, particularly in the area of community-university and community member-student partnerships (e.g., Billig, 2001; Schaffer, Williams Paris, & Vogel, 2003; Vernon & Foster, 2002) but also in other contexts, such as relationships between students and instructors (e.g., Pribbenow, 2005) and between research and practice (e.g., Giles, 2010; Stanton, 2000). Scanning early issues of *Advances* we find that many articles identify reciprocity as a feature of community engagement; rarely is the term explicitly conceptualized or critically examined, however. A scan of *MJCSL* confirms the frequent use of the term reciprocity or *reciprocal* without precise definition and often in conjunction with, or interchangeably with, the words *mutual*, *mutuality*, or *mutual benefit*.

Some authors more substantially frame the term. For example, looking at issues of *Advances*, we find reciprocity conceived of as an outcome, as a process, or as both. In the cases in which reciprocity refers to a type of outcome, the term is often used synonymously with mutual benefit. Elson, Johns, and Petrie (2007), for example, identify reciprocity as “one of the fundamental characteristics of SL...whereby students and community members both benefit from

their participation in the experience” (p. 66). In other instances, the term refers to qualities of relational processes. For example, Sandmann, Kliewer, Kim, and Omerikwa (2010) suggest that “reciprocity can be defined as the negotiated process of working *with* a partner as opposed to doing something *to* or *for* a partner [emphasis added]” (p. 5). And the term is used to refer to both outcomes and processes, and sometimes to an intermingling of the two. Gonsier-Gerdin and Royce-Davis (2005), for example, suggest that reciprocity is “inherent” (p. 54) in service-learning relationships and that “the reciprocity created through collaboration as colleagues alters the traditional teacher-student relationships” (p. 55). As another example, Warter and Grossman (2001) define reciprocity in terms of both bi-directionality of influence and mutuality of outcomes, stating that “a reciprocal relationship involves service participants and recipients mutually providing and receiving a service or educational experience” (p. 88).

Looking at issues of the *MJCSL*, we find reciprocity cast in terms of the university’s relationship with community organizations and, relatedly, the identity of community partners. Reciprocity is often contrasted with unidirectional service or charity. Kiely (2004) shows how one-way service differs from reciprocal relationships “in which students draw strength from and appreciate the knowledge, ability, and resilience” of the people with whom they are in partnership (p. 13). Dorado and Giles (2004) suggest that “reciprocity views the community as active partners in learning and serving, not just passive recipients of the service provided by service-learning students” (p. 32). Puma, Bennett, Cutforth, Tombari, and Stein (2009) similarly point to reciprocity being demonstrated by community partners in their “having choice in the level of involvement in the project and being fully engaged in the creation and critique of the knowledge created” (p. 43). Varlotta (1996) and Pompa (2002) conceptualize reciprocity in terms of being *with* rather than doing *for*. Several of the conceptions of reciprocity surfaced in this review imply that all partners in service-learning are affected by the others, suggest that all contribute to the work, and echo Sigmon’s (1979) positioning of all participants in service-learning as teachers and learners, servers and served (e.g., Marchel, 2003; Skilton-Sylvester & Erwin, 2000).

Throughout both *Advances* and *MJCSL*, understandings of reciprocity arise from and are given voice by each of the various constituents of community engagement (i.e., students, community organization staff, faculty, campus administrators/staff, community residents). Reciprocity is viewed as relevant in relationships between the full range of individuals and organizations and in a wide range of contexts, including partnerships, teaching and learning, and

research. Reciprocity is framed and structured in a variety of ways, including as a function of epistemology, identity, relationship qualities, and power.

With this general, illustrative review of the literature from *MJCSL* and *Advances* as background, we turn now to an examination of the uses of the term reciprocity in works that provide particular insight into the meanings of the concept, including but transcending these two collections. In particular, we consider these works in light of the orientations toward reciprocity identified within this article's organizing schema: exchange, influence, and generativity.

The idea of reciprocity is, in some of the foundational literature, posited as a fundamental condition of service-learning pedagogy. Though they do not use the term reciprocity here, Honnett and Poulson (1989) reflect the spirit of the concept in declaring that "service, combined with learning, adds value to each and transforms both" (p.1). The service focus benefits from the learning focus, and the learning focus benefits from the service focus; each focus shapes how the other is enacted; and their integration produces a new, synergistic whole that reflects a transformation beyond the norms that would otherwise hold. Thus, this early summary of principles of good practice in service-learning conceptualizes the pedagogy as reciprocal in accordance with all three of the orientations toward reciprocity that frame our concept review—exchange (parties benefit), influence (parties impact the work), and generativity (together the parties produce systemic change, create new value, and/or undergo transformation in their way of being). In both early (1979) and later (1996) work, Sigmon establishes the integration of identities and roles whereby

each participant is server and served, care giver and care acquirer, contributor and contributed to. Learning and teaching in a service-learning arrangement is also a task for each of the partners in the relationship...each of the parties views the other as contributor and beneficiary. (1996, p. 4)

Labeling this dynamic "a mutuality and reciprocity principle" (1996, p. 4), and perhaps thereby contributing to the conflation of these two terms, Sigmon here articulates mutual benefit (all are served, all are acquirers of care, all are contributed to), influence (all serve one another, all teach, all learn), and transformation (all understand themselves and one another in multi-faceted and non-hierarchical ways) as constitutive of reciprocity in service-learning. As a third example of implicitly or explicitly integrating two or more of these three orientations as their framework, Donahue, Bowyer, and Rosenberg (2003) describe reciprocity in a way that combines exchange for mutual benefit and transformation of individual

identities. They conceptualize reciprocity as the "constant interplay between giving and receiving, between teaching and learning" (p. 16) and suggest that transforming students' and partners' perspectives on false dichotomies (i.e., fortunate/unfortunate, privileged/underprivileged) leads to greater benefits for all involved: "When boundaries between providers and recipients become blurred, status differences are brought into greater balance ...and are less likely to stand in the way of mutual benefits, including mutual learning" (p. 25).

There are also takes on the concept of reciprocity in the SL-CE literature that seem to adopt one of these three orientations—exchange, influence, generativity—as primary. Kendall (1990), for example, defines reciprocity in service-learning clearly as "the exchange of both giving and receiving between the 'server' and the person or group 'being served'" (p. 21-22). Examining community-campus engagement more generally, Saltmarsh et al. (2009) make an explicit distinction between the exchange-based relationships of technocratic engagement, which they label mutuality, and the generative relationships of democratic engagement, which they label reciprocity:

Reciprocity signals an epistemological shift that values not only expert knowledge that is rational, analytic and positivist but also values a different kind of rationality that is more relational, localized, and contextual and favors mutual deference between lay persons and academics. (p. 9-10)

As a final example, building on the contrast Saltmarsh et al. (2009) draw between mutuality and reciprocity and the contrast Enos and Morton (2003) draw between transactional and transformational partnerships—the former involving mutually-beneficial exchange of goods and/or services and the latter involving mutual growth and change (of individuals and of systems)—Jameson, Clayton, and Jaeger (2011) pose a similar distinction between *thin* and *thick* reciprocity, linking the former to mutually-beneficial transactions and the latter to mutual transformation. Thin reciprocity, they suggest, is "grounded in a minimalist...understanding of the commitment to reciprocity that has become the standard for authentic engagement" (p. 263). Thick reciprocity

emphasizes shared voice and power and insists upon collaborative knowledge construction and joint ownership of work processes and products [and thereby] aligns well with ... democratic approaches to civic engagement [that] encourage all partners to grow and to challenge and support one another's growth. (p. 264)

Jameson et al. provide a sample community engagement scenario to suggest the ways in which thin and

thick reciprocity may co-exist and to explore possibilities for cultivating the latter from the former. They advocate for using (what is called here) generativity-oriented reciprocity to design partnerships in community-engaged scholarship. Their interpretation of reciprocity explicitly includes activating the potential for transformative learning (Cranton, 2006; Mezirow, 2000) that they suggest is inherent in positioning all partners as co-educators, co-learners, and co-generators of knowledge.

Thus, although the majority of the SL-CE literature takes reciprocity as a given and well-established concept and neither defines nor examines it, there are a handful of works that establish a particular interpretation and/or engage with the multiple potential meanings of the term. That subset of the literature, some of which we have considered here, suggests the possibility and potential utility of the organizing schema of exchange-oriented, influence-oriented, and generativity-oriented conceptions. In the following section we survey these perspectives on reciprocity in some depth, as they emerge in a range of DEs.

### Perspectives on Reciprocity: Disciplines and Epistemologies

In the October 2008 volume of *Educational Researcher*, a spirited debate was initiated by the proposition that clinical education research has a tendency to forego the disciplinary roots of its theoretical arguments and, as a result, positions various knowledge and concepts as innovations with disregard for their existence in other disciplinary spaces. This debate has relevance for research in SL-CE. Responding to Bringle's (2003; see also Clayton, Bringle, & Hatcher, 2013) assertion that theory from cognate areas can enrich understanding of research and practice in SL-CE, we draw upon a number of DEs that offer different ways to understand reciprocity so that we might reflexively examine our field's uses of the term.

Through examination of select, illustrative DEs we seek greater definition and depth to the organizing framework of exchange-oriented, influence-oriented, and generativity-oriented conceptions of reciprocity. Themes emerging from the literature within each section make visible certain analytic considerations—observations of varying dynamics or conditions affected by and contributing to reciprocity—that can inform both practice and further research into the concept of reciprocity. There are other analytic considerations beyond what are indicated here, but those represented are particularly salient to our field's conceptualizations of reciprocity.

#### *Exchange-Oriented Reciprocity*

Upon review of collective action, sociological, bio-

logical science, philosophical, and leadership theories, an exchange orientation becomes evident within some conceptualizations of reciprocity. A possible definition of exchange-based reciprocity is the interchange (or giving and receiving) of benefits, resources, or actions. The exchange can be affirmative or negative, and it may be equal or proportional (Aristotle, trans. 1999); further, it may be motivated by diverse interests (Gouldner, 1960). The works that inform the understanding of reciprocity as exchange-based include the logic of collective action (Olson, 1965), Tit for Tat strategy (Axelrod, 1984), Strong Reciprocity theory (Bowles & Gintis, 2011; Gintis, Bowles, Boyd, & Fehr, 2006), the Norm of Reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), the Theory of Inequity (Adams, 1965), Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), and various forms of biological symbiosis. The DEs we draw on in this discussion highlight three important ideas: (a) differing motivations exist for enacting reciprocity; (b) these motivations yield differing means of continuing reciprocity; (c) reciprocity can produce equitable interchanges but can also be maintained in inequitable conditions. Within each of these three ideas, an important analytic consideration emerges: reciprocity can be present at individual and/or collective levels.

Within an exchange-based orientation, the reasons for engaging in a reciprocal process or seeking a reciprocal outcome range from individual survival to collective action to contractual obligation. The logic of collective action (Olson, 1965), Norm of Reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), and Tit for Tat exchange strategy (Axelrod, 1984) suggest that the process of reciprocity is invoked to maximize individual gain while promoting collective action. Gouldner describes this process in terms of individual survival and collective stability. Individuals engage one another in reciprocal interactions to ensure their individual well-being as well as collective stability. Interacting reciprocally, in Gouldner's work, appears to be intentional as a means to protect oneself and social order. Within Gintis et al.'s (2006) theory of strong reciprocity, reciprocal interaction appears less intentional and people are cast as culturally predisposed to seek reciprocal interchange. LMX theory characterizes reciprocity as a byproduct of relationships in which contractual roles are fulfilled and surpassed.

Exchange-oriented reciprocity is enacted and sustained in a variety of ways. One explanation is that it is important for participants in an exchange to receive some form of incentive, value, or private good (Adams, 1965; Olson, 1965). Another explanation is that even when there is no personal gain, the presence of an authority (external to the individuals involved in the exchange) may drive reciprocal action. This

authority may be one that is coercive (Olson) or a recognized leader or authority figure (Graen & Uhl-Bein, 1995). Some of the selected DEs suggest that reciprocity is sustained or abandoned because we are predisposed to reciprocate someone else's desire to engage or disengage (Axelrod, 1984; Gintis et al., 2006). This predisposition is strong enough that when reciprocal norms are violated individuals will pursue punishment of the other or retribution (Gintis et al.). Similarly, evolutionary biology (e.g., Trivers, 1971) suggests that both reputation and the probability of future interactions can influence the likelihood of altruistic behaviors within pairs of interacting individuals and within larger groupings; upstream reciprocity occurs when an individual's helpful act leads to the recipient helping a third individual, and downstream reciprocity occurs when helping another makes it more likely to be helped by a third party in the future. Another impetus for enacting and sustaining reciprocity is the quality or closeness of relationships (Graen & Uhl-Bien). Within the LMX theory, leaders and followers may enact reciprocity to meet their contractual obligations but may also exceed those obligations when trust and loyalty are developed.

With regard to equity, exchange-based reciprocity seeks equitable exchange (Adams, 1965) but can also be maintained in inequitable conditions (Gouldner, 1960). Adams' Theory of Inequity explains that the input and output of the exchange between individuals must be both recognized and considered relevant to the individuals' continued well-being. Axelrod's (1984) Tit for Tat strategy implies that an individual will reciprocate based on the other's prior behaviors (whether that behavior has proven to be cooperative or disengaging), thus encouraging continued interaction based on expectation of future equity even in light of current inequity. From ecology, mutualism is a form of symbiosis in which both parties benefit, and it can take various forms: obligate (survival depends on exchange), facultative (exchange is helpful but not required for survival) forms, or commensalist, (one benefits without significant gain or harm to the other; the exchange lacks equity but can be maintained in the absence of competition for shared resources).

Most of the selected DEs place value on self-interest as a motivator of exchange-based reciprocity (Adams, 1965; Gintis et al., 2006; Gouldner, 1960; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Olson, 1965). Within these works there is a distinction between self interest that is concerned with private goods (Olson) and self interest that is focused on stability of the social order (Gouldner). There is a further distinction between interest that is self focused and that which is collective focused. Within the Norm of Reciprocity, Gouldner explores the role of interest, describing three forms of interest that are all relevant to an

understanding of exchange-based reciprocity: (a) self interest, (b) mutual interest, and (c) other interest. Self interest promotes a focus on self benefit (getting out more or at least the same as what one puts into the exchange without consideration of the other); mutual interest attends to assuring that both parties benefit, or receive mutual benefits; and other interest places primary focus on the other's benefit.

Within Indigenous epistemes, exchange is the minimum form of reciprocity. Because "Indigenous epistemologies live within a relational web... all aspects of them must be understood from that vantage point" (Kovach, 2009, p. 57). This relational web also expands our consideration of reciprocity from a focus primarily on individuals to a focus on more collective identities (e.g., families, tribes, nations) as well. Thus, within an Indigenous perspective, reciprocity "ensures an ecological and cosmological balance" (Kovach, 2009, p. 57) and so may appear different than a Western and positivist understanding of exchange orientation. Framed in a Western perspective, it may appear more akin to an influence or a generativity orientation, which will be discussed in the next sections.

Taken together, these elements of exchange-based reciprocity shape an understanding of the concept that is more nuanced than the simple give and take that we often ascribe to exchange. Though the primary focus is on interchange between individuals (whether it be for self benefit or for collective action), there are a range of factors that deepen and sustain the exchange. In addition to nuancing the exchange orientation of reciprocity, these DEs point to a particularly salient analytic consideration that must be taken into account when using or inquiring into the concept: reciprocity can be found at the individual and collective levels. As made clear in the preceding discussion, individual gain and collective stability can be achieved through exchange-oriented reciprocity (Axlerod, 1984; Gouldner, 1960; Olson, 1965).

### *Influence-Oriented Reciprocity*

When works from social-psychology, Indigenous epistemes, ethics, political philosophy, and feminist thought are brought into conversation with one another, the influence orientation of reciprocity emerges. Influence-oriented reciprocity is characterized by its iterative nature and by the condition of interrelatedness—personal, social, and environmental factors iteratively influence the way in which something is done. The analytic consideration brought forward by this orientation is that processes or outcomes (or both) can be influenced as a result of the iterative and inter-related interactions within a collaboration.

Bandura's (1977) *Reciprocal Determinism* suggests that a phenomenon of interest is produced when

personal, social, and environmental factors influence one another in a reciprocal process. Their reciprocal influence upon one another is not necessarily equal in force or stable over time. The interrelated influence between factors depicted within reciprocal determinism highlights the use of reciprocity to describe the influence of product (or outcome) as well as process. Reciprocal determinism rejects a linear cause and effect between factors and phenomena and embraces an interactive, interrelated influence in which the factors, each in a unique way, affect one another and the outcome, and the outcome affects the factors.

This interrelatedness is also present in Indigenous epistemologies. The concept of reciprocity within Indigenous meaning-making is firmly understood within a web of relationships that is holistically considered. Harris and Wasilewski (2004) describe a process by which North American tribes in the 1980s and 1990s collectively identified “four core values which cross generation, geography, and tribe... Relationship, Responsibility, Reciprocity, and Redistribution” (p. 492). These core values support and rely on each other in a dynamically iterative process for the purposes of allowing the community to continue. Therefore reciprocity cannot be separated from the individuals, families, communities, and generations or the time and place that provide it context and influence it.

Through the interrelatedness of a collaboration’s context, members’ positionalities, and ways of making meaning and the iterative effect they have on one another, either the process or outcome (or both) is influenced. This is the primary analytic consideration brought forward by influence-oriented reciprocity.

Rawls (1971, 1999) developed an account of reciprocity as a process in *A Theory of Justice*. The procedural expression of reciprocity inherent in Rawls’s theory is designed to “nullify the effects of specific contingencies which put men [sic] at odds, and tempt them to exploit social and natural circumstances to their own advantage” (p. 118). The understanding of reciprocity underlying the *original position* provides a space in which considered judgments about justice can be evaluated without bias: the *veil of ignorance* prevents knowledge of the identity of and consequences to the self. Feminist theorists have critiqued Rawls’s work for not seriously considering and accounting for the dynamics of identity politics. Young (1990) argues that Rawlsian accounts of justice fail to recognize and consider a number of elements critical to defining the requirements of justice. Young would consider and include factors associated with identity politics, or politics of inclusion, within the original position. Rather “than nullify(ing) the effects of specific contingencies” (Rawls, 1971, 1999, p. 118), Young (1990) calls for taking into

account the social embeddedness and relationality of these elements within the process of evaluating justice. Young’s feminist critique of Rawls’s work is focused on the procedural elements of the theory: a process characterized by such reciprocity does not necessarily lead to just outcomes.

Rawlsian conceptions of influence-oriented reciprocity are expressed in relation to value-neutral processes but have the goal of defining the requirements of justice. Articulated in the language of Rawls’s theory, individuals are not required to accept a universal conception of the good while developing considered judgments that will be used to articulate principles of justice. The desire to follow a value-neutral process is contrasted with Young’s approach to influence-oriented reciprocity. Young provides a conception of reciprocity that assumes the concerns of identity politics have been marginalized and require special attention when considering elements of justice. Bandura (1977) and Indigenous meaning-making embrace the interrelated influence inherent in all social interaction as the basis for explaining social motivation, network formation, and relationship functions.

Just as we observed in the exchange-oriented reciprocity section, the DEs discussed herein characterize influence-oriented reciprocity but also make visible a particular consideration for analysis: reciprocity can be present within a process, an outcome, or both; further, it can actually be a process or an outcome of engagement, depending on the type of interaction at play.

### *Generativity-Oriented Reciprocity*

Underpinnings of a third conception of reciprocity can be found in a review of emerging sciences (e.g., ecology, systems theory, quantum physics, chaos theory), non-Western epistemologies, and theory related to transformational learning. In this framing, reciprocity is not a characteristic of the exchange-based or influence-based interactions between and among individuals as traditionally constructed; rather, the concept refers to interrelatedness of beings and the broader world around them as well as the potential synergies that emerge from their relationships. The contrast between this orientation and previous orientations makes clear the analytic consideration that reciprocity can effect a change in what entities *do* or in what and how entities *are*.

In “Towards an Ecological Worldview,” Sterling (1990) summarizes western civilization’s contemporary shift from the paradigm of modern science (i.e., Cartesian, Newtonian) to the ecological paradigm (see Tarnas, 1991 for a similar discussion). The modern scientific worldview is grounded in hierarchical dualism—which privileges mind over body, thought over feeling, quantitative over qualitative, humans



over nature; it is mechanistic, atomistic, positivist, reductionist, and focused on instrumental value. The emerging ecological worldview, in contrast, challenges the separation between knower (subject) and known (object) assumed in the modern model and posits instead that reality is fundamentally relational and web-like. According to Sterling, “Developments at the leading edges of physics, mathematics, chemistry, biology, and neurophysiology are giving rise to a new holistic science which extends the common idea that ‘everything is related’ to a degree that stretches comprehension” (p. 81). The ecological paradigm is one of integration and “systemic synergy” (p. 82). Rather than being understood in terms of linear cause and effect only, phenomena are understood to be constitutive of each other and the broader, dynamic systems of which they are a part and comprise. From quantum particles to global ecosystems, relationships “may be described in terms of processes of co-definition, synchronism, dynamic balance, and synergism” (p. 81). This perspective suggests that reciprocity is best understood not as a relationship between atomistically-construed individuals engaged in a utilitarian calculus of costs and benefits but rather in terms of the transformative power of relationality and the co-construction of emergent systems of collaboration.

Similar to this emerging ecological paradigm, non-western epistemologies also provide insight into the understanding of reciprocity as generative. In many Indigenous cultures, there is no conception of the self as an individual, separate from other individuals: “We can only be a ‘self’ in a community. We are simultaneously both autonomous and connected... We have to let the realities of others into our conceptual and emotional spaces and vice versa” (Harris & Wasilewski, 2004, p. 495). The purposes for enacting reciprocity suggest that the process allows for the potential that new levels of understanding can be opened up, ones that could not exist except within reciprocal relationality to each other (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 2001). Objects, people, and forms of knowledge are not conceived of atomistically, but rather in relation to each other (Wilson, 2008).

The concept of “making space” can enhance reciprocal relationality and, thus, generativity-oriented reciprocity, especially for SL-CE relationships understood within contexts of power, privilege, and oppression. Steinman (2011) applies this concept—originally theorized within the reconciliation efforts of the Canadian government and First Nations—to service-learning as a way to move relationships from being understood by what we *do* together to being understood by how we *are* together. Making space “requires [those with privilege] to think outside of frameworks that structure their own thoughts and experiences and

yet regarding which, prior to the encounter [with marginalized individuals and groups], they are not even aware” (Steinman, 2011, p. 11). This new way of *being* can contribute to authentic relationship-building that honors people’s multiple forms of meaning-making, traditions, and cultures instead of rendering them invisible, manipulating them to fit within dominant paradigms, or merely acknowledging them. The potential of reciprocity within these new spaces is generativity-oriented in that it opens the possibility for new and different ways of being, processes, and outcomes to emerge.

This conceptualization in terms of generativity also can be further enriched through the lens of transformational learning theory. Through generative experiences, such as those of co-construction and exposure to multiple worldviews, participants may engage with new ways of thinking or being that may challenge or confront previously held ideas and convictions, cause them to question their assumptions and perspectives, and lead to new understandings and actions (Cranton, 2006). As a result of transformational experiences the “order may be disturbed, and...new relationships, identities, and values may emerge” (Enos & Morton, 2003, p. 24). Transformational experiences can involve an incremental process of change that results in the conclusion that “I was a different person then” (Cranton, p. 71). Transformation of identity (at some level) may then be an outcome of generativity, in that a generativity-orientation to reciprocity enables individuals to learn about and honor each other’s diverse perspectives and ways of knowing and/or doing. A generative approach to reciprocity extends beyond the task at hand in an open-ended manner; identities and ways of being in relationship, commitments to each other, processes of collaboration, and envisioned outcomes evolve. Something greater than each respective entities’ potential impact is created, synergistically.

In sum, generativity-oriented reciprocity emerges within the domain of a worldview in which objects, people, and forms of knowledge exist fundamentally in relation to one other. Power, privilege, and oppression are actively and intentionally considered within this orientation. This form of reciprocity can lead to transformation and second-order change within individuals, systems, and paradigms. From these characteristics emerge the key analytic consideration: Generative reciprocity can affect not only the doing of engagement (as in influence-oriented reciprocity) but also the *ways of being* related to engagement.

### *DE Summary*

As a result of consulting disciplines and epistemes outside of SL-CE literature, the categories of exchange-, influence-, and generativity-oriented

reciprocity become more robustly defined. Particular analytic considerations that are important to take into account when conceptualizing, enacting, and investigating reciprocity are made visible, including the ways in which reciprocity can be sought at the individual or collective levels; how reciprocity can be enacted as a process, an outcome, or both; and its role as a tool to realize alternative ways of being as well as doing.

### Analysis: Conceptions of Reciprocity

Drawing upon the review of extant SL-CE literature, we conclude that to this point reciprocity has been largely undefined or not located within any particular conception, with the exception of a few key works. Turning to a select group of DEs, we trace a divergence of conceptions of reciprocity. When brought into conversation with one another, the SL-CE literature and illustrative DEs supply an organizing framework that draws out different orientations within the concept of reciprocity. Upon revisiting the DEs, a few analytic considerations are made visible. Here, we return to the vignettes offered at the start of the article and use these as a means to synthesize the learning we accrue from the SL-CE and DE reviews.

*Vignette 1.* The configuration of the partnership described in Vignette 1 captures exchange-orientations to reciprocity, primarily because the way participants behave and the services offered remain largely unaffected by the collaborative relationship or the unique experiences and perspectives of other participants. The faculty and students provide tutoring that is conceived and conducted solely by their own frame of reference, as does the school district when it seeks a solution (academic remediation) that is uninformed by any other paradigm or collaborative experience. Students have a place to develop and hone teaching skills, and the community partner has the capacity to offer tutoring in return.

The vignette is most easily explained as embodying the common conception of reciprocity portrayed in the SL-CE literature. Given only the information provided in the vignette, it could well be an example of the ways in which reciprocity is potentially conflated with mutual benefit. Turning to the DE review, we can complicate the example (in at least one way) by suggesting that should the tutoring services be found to be less helpful than intended or the after-school program found to offer a poor learning experience for college students, inequity within the exchange will occur. Does this appearance of inequity mean that reciprocity is not present? According to the review of DEs that contribute to the exchange orientation, inequity and reciprocity can co-exist within an exchange-orientation, at least within the short-term. Perhaps if the example in this vignette is part of a long-term partnership, we need to consider questions

such as the following: To what extent and on what terms is such inequity legitimately included within our understanding and practice of reciprocity? What tolerance of an inequitable interchange is appropriate in the arc of a broader relationship that is more equitably reciprocal in the long term?

*Vignette 2.* Within the second vignette, we see a more complexly engaged partnership. The conditions included in Vignette 2 highlight how influence-oriented reciprocity can include the processes and outcomes of collaboration being iteratively informed by interrelated factors. Influence-orientations to reciprocity involve mechanisms to define the engagement process and core elements of knowledge production. The SL-CE literature and DE review deepen our understanding of influence-oriented reciprocity to include two potential applications: influence on process and influence on outcome. Within the vignette, participants recognize the different perspectives and contexts represented within the group and by honoring these, design the process they use, the meanings they make, and the products they produce to reflect those diverse perspectives and contexts.

*Vignette 3.* The outcome of vignette 3 is that the participants of the partnership create something entirely new from their engagement than was conceivable from within their individual perspectives. Generativity-oriented reciprocity can create anew (be it new endeavors or paradigms). Based on an epistemology of co-production of knowledge, this orientation toward reciprocity is built upon a commitment to relationality that works to honor in a deep way the worldviews, traditions, and various cultures of all members of the partnership (as in influence-oriented reciprocity, but here toward the partners' ways of being in addition to their ways of doing). This effort toward authentic being paves the way for previously inconceivable ways of engaging to emerge.

The additional elements necessary for a generativity-oriented reciprocity include a broader conceptualization of relationships, as well as processes, that include the co-definition of issues to be addressed and resulting synergistic co-generation of knowledge. Partners engaged in generativity-oriented reciprocity consider the systems of power in which they are embedded and recognize that those systems construct the differences of identity and privilege that they experience.

The vignettes illustrate the characterizations of the different orientations toward reciprocity examined in this article but do so merely as an exercise to highlight the distinctiveness of each. Actual SL-CE collaborations likely embody more than one orientation, whether concurrently or throughout the evolution of a partnership. Reciprocity may be enacted in different ways at varying levels of a coalition or organiza-

tion, and the larger map of interactions (e.g., the overall relationship between a university and the surrounding community or between an academic department and an community organization) might be evaluated differently than a subset of the relationships comprising it (e.g., those between faculty and students in a particular course or between students and community partners in a particular semester's service-learning project) with respect to the orientation toward reciprocity embodied therein. For example, exchange-oriented reciprocity may exist within a small unit of a much larger collaboration that values and pursues generativity-oriented reciprocity.

The framework offered here does not preference one orientation over another but instead recognizes different elements of each. We expect that individual scholar-practitioners may note examples of all three within their practice and scholarship; may have a preference for one over the others, which may evolve over time; and may even feel inclined to advocate for one orientation over another. Encouraging and facilitating this sort of clarity of meaning and preference is exactly the purpose of this article.

Bringing the three orientations into conversation with one another highlights potential challenges or limitations of each and yields cautionary suggestions that should perhaps be taken into account when evaluating the appropriateness and implications of each orientation. We briefly note here, as a basis for further investigation, examples of the potential risks associated with embracing any of these orientations toward reciprocity uncritically.

Exchange-orientated approaches based on mutual benefits and responsibilities may provide valuable services and outcomes for stakeholders and participants but are not likely to conceive of, or achieve, transformative goals. Exchange-oriented reciprocity does not necessarily invite knowledge of the others with whom one interacts and thus may allow anonymity when such is not desired. It does not invite consideration of whether expanded roles and identities are or should be at stake in a relationship. An issue of potential concern to SL-CE practitioner-scholars is the risk of an unsatisfactory level of inequity in exchange-based reciprocity. Relationships of trust, strong mechanisms to facilitate honest communication regarding costs and benefits, and taking into account the power dynamics that can inhibit truth-telling are needed for exchange-oriented reciprocity to be conducted with integrity.

With regard to the influence orientation, the emphasis placed on quality of process may obfuscate realization of mutually beneficial outcomes. Consideration of multiple, interrelated factors and openness to them changing the processes and outcomes of collaboration can take significant time. It is possible to con-

sider and discuss a collaborative process at such length that useful and valuable outcomes are not attained. The influence orientation also involves considering each participant's positionality and experiences so that what is produced and how collaboration proceeds is shaped accordingly; an uncritical approach to this would be employing a simplistic appreciation of diversity and overstating the depth of one's consideration of multiple perspectives as shapers of what is done together. To enact the influence orientation critically, and with integrity, one must take the personal and interpersonal risks associated with trying to understand difference and allowing it to meaningfully influence the process, interactions, outcomes, and meaning-making of the collaboration.

Feminist theory and Indigenous epistemology provide perspectives that caution against idealizing the mutual transformation and co-creation invited by the generativity-oriented conception of reciprocity. Young (1990) points to the "assimilationist ideal" held within approaches to work that do not value group differences (p. 163). Similarly, Jones and Jenkins (2008) assert the importance of acknowledging and contending with the "indigene-colonizer hyphen": whereas "colonizer peoples assert the *us* [emphasis added] in a shared modern life, Indigenous peoples—as a matter of political, practical, and identity survival as Indigenous peoples—insist on a profound difference at the Self-Other border. The hyphen is nonnegotiable" (p. 475). To postulate mutual transformation with authenticity (Haig-Brown & Archibald, 1996), it is imperative to avoid thinking of transformation in terms of sameness and to approach co-creation of knowledge with awareness of the distinct epistemologies that influence individuals' and groups' values regarding and approaches to knowledge creation. The practice of and commitment to "making space" can be one way of avoiding asking "[partners] to fit within our cultural paradigm—to have the intercultural dialogue on our terms" (Regan, as cited in Steinman, 2011, p. 11), which is key to enacting generativity-oriented reciprocity with integrity.

## Implications

As SL-CE theory and practice matures there will be more opportunities to consider the assumptions underlying core concepts of the field. To date, there has not been an intentional effort to maintain a consistent theoretical or practical expression of reciprocity. Our concept review offers three orientations to reciprocity that can bring specificity to articulations of the types of reciprocity observed or pursued within practice and research. The following section considers some of the implications of this framework for theory and practice.

### *Implications of Worldviews and Power Within Conceptions of Reciprocity*

Identifying these various orientations toward reciprocity disrupts the assumption of a shared understanding and practice of reciprocity within SL-CE. The ecological and Indigenous epistememes within the generativity-oriented concept of reciprocity particularly call attention to the significance and importance of being aware of our own worldviews and the systems of power within which we engage with others. For practitioner-scholars committed to fostering influence- or generativity-oriented reciprocity, it is necessary to seek understanding of reciprocity from multiple perspectives, rather than assuming a Western-normed worldview. For example, reciprocity is deeply embedded in Indigenous paradigms, which hold relationships as central to any work with and within Indigenous communities; this is in contrast to Indigenous scholars' encounters with traditional, Western, and positivist academics—experiences in which relationships are often one-dimensional, unilateral, or completely unacknowledged in the act of scholarship (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Smith, 1999). Related to varying worldviews, reciprocity must also be considered within systems of power—both historical and contemporary—since issues of power and privilege are relational (Carjuzaa & Fenimore-Smith, 2010).

Indigenous and ecological epistememes also expand our ways of thinking regarding the three orientations because they disrupt the traditionally linear, anthropocentric, and time-limited ways of approaching reciprocity. These worldviews call for us to augment our understandings of relationality to encompass relationships with the natural world and cosmos (Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2009; Kovach, 2009; Pidgeon & Cox, 2002) and consider current relationships in light of the historical significance of past actions, such as relationships between Indigenous communities—as well as other marginalized communities—and colonizers (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Jones & Jenkins, 2008). Additionally, their emphases on systems-oriented thinking and being involved in different levels of scale (Kahn, 2009)—person to person, community to community, communities to natural world, individuals to past and future persons—challenge us to explicitly name the level(s) at which we are practicing, claiming, verifying, or investigating reciprocity.

### *Implications for Conceptualizing Democracy and Community Engagement Scholarship*

Democratic practice relies on relationships that enable interactions that can be characterized as being equal and defined in relation to fair terms. In many circles of political theory, democratic relationships

are described in terms of reciprocity. The recognition, by Saltmarsh & Hartley (2011), that the engagement movement has lost momentum reflects the current limitations of how theoretical concepts of reciprocity are applied in practice. Although often an assumed goal, by most accounts SL-CE practice has failed to reform representative models of democracy and larger democratic institutions outside of the academy (Barber, 2012; Berger, 2011; Saltmarsh & Hartley; Saltmarsh et al., 2009). Saltmarsh and Hartley argue that one of the major weaknesses of SL-CE strategies intended to redesign democratic practice is that they inappropriately depoliticize engagement by defining the activity in terms of volunteerism and service. By removing political contestation from SL-CE there is no way to articulate or critique the structural mechanisms that contribute to public problems. Depoliticized SL-CE strategies, designed to reform representative models of democracy, shift the focus from addressing the systemic problems of society to developing specific skill sets or volunteer proclivities in a service context.

The orientations of reciprocity outlined in this article create a specific space of critique. Interpersonal relationships inform the basic structure and organization of democratic practice. The limitations of representative models of democracy are now being openly discussed and identified in the SL-CE literature (Barber, 2012; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011). Not only can exchange-orientations, influence-orientations, and generativity-orientations to reciprocity provide the basis of critique but they can also direct the analytical tools associated with developing alternative models of democratic practice.

### *Implications for Research*

Reciprocity is not only applicable to individuals, organizations, and the relationships among them; it is also relevant to the knowledge products created. In this way, reciprocity, or lack thereof, between research and practice within SL-CE is also worth examining (Stanton, 2000). In Stanton's experience, research rarely has been cited as influencing practice to any extent, but he suggests that they ought to inform each other. Stanton recommends that researchers and practitioners work more closely together because the integration of practitioner knowledge and researcher knowledge will not only enhance each other's work but also research and practice itself.

The orientations to reciprocity outlined in this article can provide a framework by which to identify and express reciprocity in engaged scholarship. First, the three orientations to reciprocity can be used as a foundational reference point to delve into more complex theoretical problems. For example, Sandmann et al. (2010) cite the need to develop the philosophical

relationship between partnerships and the requirements of justice. The orientations to reciprocity can augment an account of partnerships that can be included within a larger theory of justice by specifying the orientation that may best serve philosophical ideals of justice. With regard to the connection between engaged scholarship and applied justice-learning (Butin, 2007), our framework can allow scholar-practitioners to invoke and apply a particular orientation of reciprocity to projects related to engaged scholarship and justice-learning. Second, the orientations to reciprocity outlined in this article can be used as a reference point for various approaches and methods within engaged scholarship. An ongoing challenge in our field is articulating and evaluating the methodological rigor of various forms of engaged scholarship. Our framework provides engaged scholars the basic mechanisms to cite various orientations to reciprocity in their own work.

The review of conceptions of reciprocity and related ideas undertaken here suggests various avenues for future research. The three orientations toward reciprocity sketched here can serve as constructs to ground further inquiry, functioning as either dependent or independent variables in investigations of the role of reciprocity—variously conceived—in partnership processes and outcomes, at multiple levels. For example, which orientation is most frequently adopted in SL-CE in general or among particular populations (e.g., institution types, stakeholder categories, experience levels, disciplinary affinities)? What specific variables—personal, organizational, political, social, economic, cultural—predict and shape adoption of each orientation? In what specific ways does each orientation encourage and inhibit related values, such as authentic engagement with multiple perspectives or sense of personal and social responsibility? What partnership outcomes are most valued in each orientation? Similarly, the particular elements of each (e.g., the various motivations for and equity dynamics of exchange-oriented reciprocity) and the analytic considerations that emerge from each (e.g., the enactment of reciprocity as either or both process and outcome in the influence orientation) can serve as constructs, with researchers asking, for example, about the conditions under which each is salient and the reasons why particular types of outcomes might be correlated with each.

Questions such as the following might be asked regarding the relationships among the three orientations: Under what conditions do elements of more than one orientation co-exist—within or across levels of organization—and with what consequences—for the individuals involved, the partnership, and the outcomes? What tensions are introduced by such co-existence, and how are they navigated? What factors

stimulate a shift from one orientation to another, and what determines whether that process is abrupt or gradual, embraced or resisted? For example, does the primary orientation toward reciprocity shift the longer the relationship is in place, the more institutionalized SL-CE becomes, and/or the better resourced the collaboration becomes?

This concept review draws on a variety of DEs, but other bodies of theory might also be particularly relevant to further refinement of conceptualizations of reciprocity. Additional perspectives on ethics, learning processes, and other theory on both interpersonal and interorganizational relationships might contribute important nuances to this discussion. We also recommend further exploration of DEs that have been traditionally marginalized in the academy and that attend especially to power dynamics and other dimensions of partnerships that need greater acknowledgment (e.g., queer theory, postcolonial theory, feminist philosophy, critical race theory). Phenomenological perspectives and methods of inquiry may also yield key insights into how individuals experiencing various dimensions of partnerships make meaning of the possible orientations to reciprocity.

Heeding Stanton's (2000) call for an integrative approach to research and practice could lead to a generativity-oriented reciprocal relationship. Giles (2010) refers to the field's "aspiration" for increased reciprocity between research and practice, suggesting that there is room for improvement (p. 217). A concept review such as this is a tool for both researchers and practitioners to locate themselves in their approaches to reciprocity, becoming more aware of their orientation toward practicing reciprocity. It might also assist practitioners and researchers in evaluating the degree to which they have integrated research and practice.

## Conclusion

In this article we have shared a concept review of reciprocity informed by both SL-CE literature and illustrative examples of DEs outside of the field. We began by invoking the image of a reciprocating saw to illustrate the potential simplicity of the term and suggested that practitioner-scholars in community-campus engagement rarely, if ever, intend to evoke merely back and forth movement. In contrast, Chrislip and Larson (as cited in Lowery et al., 2010) offer the metaphor of a "kaleidoscope lens" as useful in understanding the various meanings associated with the term reciprocity. Both metaphors, the simplicity of the reciprocating saw and the complexity of the kaleidoscope, illustrate why it is necessary to say what we mean and mean what we say when discussing, practicing, and investigating reciprocity. For this reason we have sought to develop working cate-

gories of various conceptualizations of reciprocity, inclusive of exchange-oriented, influence-oriented, and generativity-oriented. The orientations toward reciprocity described in this article can provide practitioner-scholars with language that enables us to articulate our particular meaning(s) of reciprocity as we continue to develop critically reflexive practices, partnerships, and research.

## References

- Adams, S. J. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- American Educational Research Association. (2008). *Educational Researcher*, 37(7), 397-458.
- Aristotle. (1999). *The Nicomachean ethics*. (Terence Irwin, Trans.). New York: Hackett.
- Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Baccarini, D. (1996). The concept of project complexity—a review. *International Journal of Project Management*, 14(4), 201-204.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barber, B. (2012). Can we teach civic education and service-learning in a world of privatization, inequality, and interdependence? *Journal of College and Character*, 13(1), 1-10.
- Berger, B. (2009). Political theory, political science, and the end of civic engagement. *Perspectives on Politics*, 7(2), 335-350.
- Berger, B. (2011). *Attention deficit democracy: The paradox of civic engagement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Billig, S. H. (2001). Adoption, implementation, and sustainability of K-12 service-learning. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 245-267). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2011). *A cooperative species: Human reciprocity and its evolution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bringle, R. G. (2003). Enhancing theory-based research on service-learning. In S. H. Billig & J. Eyler (Eds.), *Deconstructing service-learning: Research exploring context, participation, and impacts* (pp. 3-21). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Bringle, R. G., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Civic education through service-learning: What, how, and why? In L. McIlraith, A. Lyons, & R. Munck (Eds.), *Higher education and civic engagement: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 101-124). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brookfield, S. (2007). A critical theory perspective on faculty development. *To Improve the Academy*, 25, 55-69.
- Butin, D. (2007). Justice-learning: Service-learning as justice-oriented education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40, 1-7.
- Camacho, M. (2004). Power and privilege: Community service learning in Tijuana. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(3), 31-42.
- Carjuzaa, J., & Fenimore-Smith, K. (2010). The give away spirit: Reaching a shared vision of ethical Indigenous research relationships. *Journal of Educational Controversy*, 5(2). Retrieved from <http://www.wce.wvu.edu/Resources/CEP/eJournal/v005n002/a004.shtml>
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: SAGE.
- Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (Eds.). (2013). *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment* (Vols. 2A & 2B). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Cranton, P. (2006). Fostering authentic relationships in the transformative classroom. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 109, 5-13.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. (2009). Critical pedagogy: An introduction. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed., pp. 1-20). New York: Routledge.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2008). Critical methodologies and Indigenous inquiry. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 1-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Donahue, D. M., Bowyer, J., & Rosenberg, D. (2003). Learning with and learning from: Reciprocity in service learning in teacher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 36, 15-27.
- Dorado, S., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (2004). Service-learning partnerships: Paths of engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, 11(1), 25-37.
- Elson, D., Johns, L., & Petrie, J. T. (2007). Jumpstart's service-learning initiative: Enhanced outcomes for at-risk children. In S. Billig & S. Gelmon (Eds.), *From passion to objectivity: International and cross-disciplinary perspectives on service-learning research* (pp. 65-87). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Enos, S., & Morton, K. (2003). Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In B. Jacoby and Associates (Eds.), *Building partnerships for service-learning* (pp. 20-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Giles, D. E., Jr. (2010). Journey to service-learning research: Agendas, accomplishments, and aspirations. In J. Keshen, B. Moely, & B. Holland (Eds.), *Research for what? Making engaged scholarship matter* (pp. 203-221). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Gintis, H., Bowles, S., Boyd, R., & Fehr, E. (2006). Moral sentiments and material interests: The foundations of cooperation in economic life. Boston: MIT Press.
- Gonsier-Gerdin, J., & Royce-Davis, J. (2005). Developing advocates and leaders through service-learning in preservice and inservice special education programs. In S. Root, J. Callahan, & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Improving service-learning practice: Research on models to enhance impacts* (pp. 37-57). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-177.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Haig-Brown, C., & Archibald, J. (1996). Transforming First Nations research with respect and power. *International Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 9(3), 245-267.
- Harris, L. D., & Wasilewski, J. (2004). Indigeneity, an alternative worldview: Four Rs (relationship, responsibility, reciprocity, redistribution) vs. two Ps (power and profit). Sharing the journey towards conscious evolution. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 21, 489-503.
- Hessler, H. B. (2000). Composing an institutional identity: The terms of community service in higher education. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, 4(3), 27-42.
- Honnet, E. P., & Poulsen, S. J. (1989). *Principles of good practice for combining service and learning* [Wingspread Special Report]. Racine, WI: Johnson Foundation
- Jameson, J. K., Clayton, P. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2011). Community engaged scholarship as mutually transformative partnerships. In L. Harter, J. Hamel-Lambert, & J. Millesen (Eds.), *Participatory partnerships for social action and research* (pp. 259-277). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Johnson, A. (2006). *Privilege, power, and difference* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill
- Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2008). Rethinking collaboration: Working the Indigene-colonizer hyphen. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 471-486). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kahn, R. (2009). Towards ecopedagogy: Weaving a broad-based pedagogy of liberation for animals, nature, and the oppressed people of the earth. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed., pp. 522-540). New York: Routledge.
- Kendall, J. C. (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service* (Vol. 1). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.
- Kiely, R. (2004). A chameleon with a complex: Searching for transformation in international service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(2), 5-20.
- Kirkness, V. J., & Barnhardt, R. (2001). First Nations and higher education: The four R's - respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. In R. Hayoe & J. Pan (Eds.), *Knowledge across cultures: A contribution to dialogue among civilizations* (pp. 75-92). Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong. Retrieved from <http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/IEW/winhec/FourRs2ndEd.html>
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Krebs, D. L. (1970). Altruism-an examination of the concept and a review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 73(4), 258-302.
- Lowery, D., May, D. L., Duchance, K. A., Coulter-Kern, R., Bryant, D., Morris, P. V., & Bellner, M. (2006). A logic model of service-learning: Tensions and issues for further consideration. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12(2), 47-60.
- Marchel, C. (2003). The path to altruism in service-learning classes: Big steps or a different kind of awkwardness? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(1), 15-27.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009) *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3-33). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Olson, M. (1965). *The logic of collective action: Public goods and the theory of groups*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Pidgeon, M., & Cox, D. (2002). Researching with Aboriginal peoples: Practices and principles. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(2), 96-106.
- Pompa, L. (2002). Service-learning as crucible: Reflections on immersion, context, power, and transformation. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(1), 67-76.
- Pribbenow, D. A. (2005) The impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. 11(2), 25-38.
- Puma, J., Bennett, L., Cutforth, N., Tombari, C., & Stein, P. (2009). A case study of a community-based participatory evaluation research (CBPER) project: Reflections on promising practices and shortcomings. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(2), 34-47.
- Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1971).
- Rogers, R. R. (2001). Reflection in higher education: A concept analysis. *Innovative Higher Education*, 26(1), 37-57.
- Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (2011). *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). *Democratic engagement white paper*. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Sandmann, L. R., Kliever, B. W., Kim, J., & Omerikwa, A. (2010). Toward understanding reciprocity in community-university partnerships: An analysis of select theories of power. In J. Keshen, B. Moely, & B. A. Holland (Eds.), *Research for what? Making engaged scholarship matter* (pp. 3-23). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

- Schaffer, M. A., Williams Paris, J., & Vogel, K. (2003). Ethical relationships in service-learning partnerships. In S. H. Billig & J. Eyler (Eds.), *Deconstructing service-learning: Research exploring context, participation, and impacts* (pp. 147-168). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Sigmon, R. L. (1979). Service-Learning: Three principles. *Synergist*, 8, 9-11.
- Sigmon, R. L. (1996). An introduction to service-learning: Or, an open letter to college and university leaders committed to creating conditions for students to contribute and learn. In R. Sigmon & Colleagues (Eds.), *Journey to service-learning: Experiences from independent liberal arts colleges and universities* (pp. 3-7). Washington, D.C.: Council of Independent Colleges.
- Silkton-Sylvester, E., & Erwin, E. (2000). Creating reciprocal learning relationships across socially-constructed borders. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, 65-75.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. New York: Zed Books Ltd.
- Stanton, T. K. (2000). Bringing reciprocity to service-learning research and practice [Special issue]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Fall, 119-123.
- Steinberg, K. S., Bringle, R. G., & McGuire, L. E. (2013). Attributes of high-quality research on service learning. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment* (Vol. 2A, pp. 27-53). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Steinman, E. (2011). "Making space": Lessons from collaborations with tribal nations. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 18(1), 5-18.
- Sterling, S. R. (1990). Towards an ecological worldview. In J. R. Engel & J. G. Engel (Eds.), *Ethics of environment and development: Global challenge, international response* (pp. 77-86). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Tarnas, R. (1991). *The passion of the western mind: Understanding the ideas that have shaped our world view*. New York: Random House.
- Trivers, R. L. (1971). The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *Quarterly Review of Biology*, 46, 35-57.
- Varlotta, L. (1996). Service-learning: A catalyst for constructing democratic progressive communities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 3, 22-30.
- Vernon, A., & Foster, L. (2002). Community agency perspectives in higher education: Service-learning and volunteerism. In A. Furco & S. Billig (Eds.), *Service learning through a multidisciplinary lens* (pp. 153-175). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Warter, E. H., & Grossman, J. M. (2001). An application of developmental-contextualism to service-learning. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 83-102). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Black Point, Nova Scotia: Fernwood.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

## Authors

LINA D. DOSTILIO (dostilioL@duq.edu) is the director of Academic Community Engagement at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, PA and a visiting scholar with the New England Research Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) on the Next Generation Engagement project. Her areas of research include democratically-engaged partnerships and reciprocity. She convened the reciprocity thinking and writing group that produced this article.

SARAH M. BRACKMANN (brackmas@southwestern.edu) received her doctorate from The University of Georgia's Institute of Higher Education where she was a graduate assistant in the Office of Service-Learning. She currently directs Southwestern University's Office of Civic Engagement. Her research focuses on the institutionalization of community engagement and the public good of higher education.

KATHLEEN E. EDWARDS (keedwar2@uncg.edu) is a Ph.D. student in Educational Leadership and Cultural Foundations at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG). Her scholarly interests attend to the cultural foundations of popular education and the democratic potential of community engagement as well as exploring and bringing non-Western and critical perspectives to bear on traditional conceptions and practices of service-learning and community engagement.

BARBARA A. HARRISON (barbara.a.harrison@gmail.com) is a Ph.D. candidate in the Faculty of Education at Brock University in St. Catharines, Ontario. Her research interests focus on elements of community engagement, including faculty learning and models of community engagement.

BRANDON W. KLIEWER (bkliewer@fgcu.edu) is an assistant professor of civic engagement and director of the American Democracy Project at Florida Gulf Coast University. He is currently working on a series of journal articles related to the normative foundations of community engagement as well as a book project that develops a liberal defense of mandatory public service laws. Brandon's larger research agenda looks at the intersection between the normative foundations of public administration, civic engagement, and democratic theory. Brandon holds a Ph.D. from The University of Georgia in political science.

PATTI H. CLAYTON (patti.clayton@curriculumengagement.com) is an independent consultant and practitioner-scholar (PHC Ventures), a senior scholar with the Center for Service and Learning at IUPUI, and a visiting scholar at UNCG. She co-developed with students and faculty a research-grounded critical reflection and assessment model (the DEAL Model) and currently focuses on faculty learning and "co-" roles; she is co-editor of *Research on Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Assessment* (Stylus, 2013) and co-author of student and instructor versions of the service-learning tutorial *Learning through Critical Reflection*.