

**How does the community experience collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships? A qualitative analysis of the perceptions of the university and the community.**

A Masterthesis by Tessa Houwing (4068874)

Supervisor: Tali Spiegel

Second reader: Zoltán Lippényi

Master: Contemporary Social Problems, Utrecht University

Date: August 14th, 2018



## Preface

The process of writing a Masterthesis comes with ups and downs, with the loss of logical reasoning, with deleting and adding the same phrases in the text, and, finally; with an end product. As the Dutch say: “*Met bloed, zweet en tranen.*” Luckily, during the past half year I have had a lot of support to be able to produce this thesis.

First of all, I would like to thank my thesis supervisor at Utrecht University, Tali Spiegel, for her guidance and support during the process of writing. Without any experience in qualitative research, I learnt a lot from your feedback and our conversations. I would also like to thank Dennis van den Berg, my internship supervisor at Kennisland, for the support during my internship as well as helping me out with my thesis. It has been a pleasure working at Kennisland during my internship and I left with a lot of great experiences.

Besides these great supervisors, I would like to thank my family, my friends, and especially my boyfriend for being able to deal with my stress during the past couple of months, and moreover: for helping me getting my mind of my thesis sometimes. Special thanks to Anne-Wil, for being my living and speaking priority list the past few weeks.

I hope that you will enjoy reading this thesis.

Tessa Houwing  
August 14th, 2018

## Summary

The connection between higher education and society has been stimulated by the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in the Dutch Strategic Agenda of Higher Education 2015-2025 (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, 2015). One way through which the connection between higher education and society can be established, is through university-community engagement (Winter, Wiseman & Muirhead, 2006; Benneworth, 2013). In university-community engagement, both universities as well as their larger communities engage in partnerships, university-community partnerships, based on an exchange of knowledge and resources (Boyer, 1996). University-community partnerships are collaborations between university partners and the community (Martin, Smith & Phillips, 2005; Judd & Adams, 2008; Strier, 2011). Most research on university-community partnerships has been focusing on the United States (for example, see: Martin, Smiths & Phillips, 2005; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; McNall, Reed, Brown & Allen, 2008). Therefore this study provides insight into university-community partnerships in the Dutch context, by looking into the different perceptions of involved actors concerning the experience of the community with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships. The perceptions of community partners, community members, project leaders/researchers, and students are included in this study. Secondly, this study distinguishes transactional and transformational university-community partnerships (Butcher, Bezzina, & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton, & Hatcher, 2012; Shalabi, 2013).

A qualitative research design enabled this study to analyze the different perspectives of the various actors on the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships. Twenty interviews were done with various actors from six different university-community partnerships, both transactional and transformational university-community partnerships.

The theoretical background of this study shows two main themes to be affecting the community's experience of collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships: outcomes of university-community partnerships and personal relationships between the university and the community. When relevant, pre-existing theories and concepts were applied to these themes, such as habitus and social capital.

In broad terms, the empirical findings of this study show that the community is perceived to experience their collaboration with the university rather positively. Both transactional and transformational university-community partnerships are perceived to be able to provide the community with useful and/or meaningful outcomes. Moreover, personal relationships are perceived to facilitate the collaboration between the university and the community. Although outcomes, boundaries between the university and the community, and the relationship between the university and the community are relevant in both transactional as well as transformational university-community partnerships, it is meaningful to distinguish between these two types of partnerships with regards to their working in both types of partnerships. Finally, perceptions of the university and the community

are mostly in line with each other. However, the university seems to be not informed about the most valued outcomes by the community in transformational university-community partnerships. Moreover, the boundaries perceived by the community between the university and the community appear to be misinterpreted by the university.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	7
2. Theoretical Background .....	11
3. Methodology .....	17
4. Findings .....	24
5. Discussion .....	32
6. Policy Recommendations .....	38
7. References .....	40

## 1. Introduction

Within the Dutch Strategic Agenda for Higher Education and Research 2015-2025 Jet Bussemaker, the former Minister of Education, Culture, and Science [ECS], pled for an increased connection between higher education and society (Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science, 2015). Knowing that students are the future leaders of society, the former Minister of ECS argued that students need to have a well-developed view and understanding of current relevant themes in society. During their education at universities, society can provide students with a rich learning environment to develop their view on society. By students stepping out of their comfort zone and into broader society, students can contribute to the process of solving social problems by means of their academic knowledge and skills. In order to stimulate the connection between society and higher education, regional collaborations between higher education and practice are stimulated within the Strategic Agenda for Higher Education and Research 2015-2025 (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, 2015).

Fundamental to universities' connection to society is the public nature of higher education (Boyer, 1996; Benneworth & Humphrey, 2013). Universities are public institutions and therefore receive public benefits, such as funding from the national government. It is through these funds that universities are able to perform their first and second mission: academic teaching and academic research (Pinheiro, Lango, & Pausits, 2015). In return for the public funds, universities also have a social responsibility towards society (Boyer, 1996; Benneworth & Humphrey, 2013). Universities are responsible for benefitting, not only their students and researchers, but also society. Universities' third mission therefore encompasses the creation of public benefits (Boyer, 1996; Pinheiro, Lango, & Pausits, 2015). When societal actors perceive universities as engaging in activities useful for society, universities have fulfilled their social responsibility.

Society's needs and expectations concerning higher education's third mission change over time (Roper & Hirth, 2005; Benneworth & Humphrey, 2013). Within today's knowledge economy, attending higher education is beneficial to the individual as attending higher education enables the individual to occupy higher positions within the job market (Boyer, 1996). A knowledge economy also implies that knowledge contributes to economic development and competitiveness (Benneworth, 2013). Here lies today's expectation of the public value of the university within the Netherlands, as shown in the Strategic Agenda for Higher Education and Research 2015-2025 (Ministry of ECS, 2015). Universities engaging in regional development by, for instance, contributing their knowledge and skills to current social issues, enlarges the economic growth within these regions (Winter, Wiseman, & Muirhead, 2006; May & Perry, 2013).

One way through which universities can engage in regional development, is through university-community engagement (Winter, Wiseman & Muirhead, 2006; Benneworth, 2013). Two approaches exist with regard to university-community engagement. Previous studies speak of a unilateral approach, where the university transferred its academic knowledge to the community, and a two-way approach, where the community and the university function as equal partners (Boyer, 1996;

Judd & Adams, 2008; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; Kline et al., 2018). Both approaches diverge from each other in their view of the community. Where the unilateral approach focuses on that university partners as the experts who fix communities' problems, the two-way approach uses communities' knowledge and expertise as an asset towards a collaborative partnership (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; Kline et al., 2018). Some studies consider the unilateral approach to be less successful concerning its impact on the community, due to that the two-way approach is expected to be better able to adapt university-community partnerships to the needs of the community (Judd & Adams, 2008; Benneworth, 2013). The last couple of decades, universities increasingly adopt the two-way approach when engaging with their communities (Boyer, 1996; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008).

In activities of community engagement both universities as well as their larger communities engage in partnerships, university-community partnerships, based on an exchange of knowledge and resources (Boyer, 1996). University-community partnerships are collaborations between university partners, either students and/or researchers, and the community, ranging from community members to community partners (Martin, Smith & Phillips, 2005; Judd & Adams, 2008; Strier, 2011). Community partners are employees at community-based organizations, such as social work organizations or churches, and differ from community members. Community members are individuals within a community, who are involved in the university-community partnership as an individual and not because of their connection to a community-based organization. The purpose of university-community partnerships is to address relevant (social) issues within the community (Martin, Smith & Phillips, 2005; Judd & Adams, 2008). In the process of addressing these issues, both the university and the community are supposed to benefit from the partnership. The community gains from the impact of the university-community partnership, whereas university partners gain a rich learning environment and/or input for their research (Martin, Smith & Phillips, 2005; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Judd & Adams, 2008; McNall, Reed, Brown & Allen, 2009).

Most research on university-community partnerships has been focusing on the United States (for example, see: Martin, Smiths & Phillips, 2005; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; McNall, Reed, Brown & Allen, 2008). It can be expected that the context of university-community partnerships affects the findings in different studies, because the nature of and the extent to which faculty engage in university-community engagement, depends on the institutional context that faculty work in (Ward et al, 2013). As well as the higher education institution, also the national policy context of university-community engagement is part of the institutional context. Since the national policy context of the Netherlands and the United States differ, this might lead to different choices faculty makes with regard to university-community engagement, and therefore it is important to study university-community partnerships in the Netherlands as well. Therefore, this study will look into university-community partnerships\* in the Netherlands, by answering the following question:



*How do different actors perceive the experience of the community with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships?*

In line with other studies (Skilton-Sylvester & Erwin, 2000; Strier, 2011), this study chose for a qualitative approach by interviewing community members, and community partners, as well as students and faculty; project leaders and researchers. The various perspectives on the community's\*\* experience of collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships allows this study to show whether there is consensus between the university\*\*\* and the community on the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships, or that there are some points where the university and the community diverge from each other. Moreover, this study is able to identify differences in experience in university-community partnerships between community partners and community members. By answering the research questions, this study is able to identify points of improvement for university-community partnerships.

Previous work on university-community partnerships has identified two different types of university-community partnerships; transformational and transactional university-community partnerships (Butcher, Bezzina, & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton, & Hatcher, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). Transactional university-community partnerships are instrumental in nature, in the sense that a simple exchange between university partners and the community is central to the partnership (Bringle, Clayton & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). Within transformational university-community partnerships, both the university and the community change as a result of collaborating (Bringle, Clayton & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). A more thorough explanation of these types of partnerships will be provided within the theoretical background. Since the community gains different types of benefits from transactional university-community partnerships, and transformational university-community partnerships, this study also looks into whether there are differences with regard to the experience of the community in these two types of partnerships. This adds a sub-question to the main research question:

*How do different actors perceive the experience of the community with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships?*

*What are the differences in these perceptions between transactional and transformational university-community partnerships?*

\*= universities in this study are universities of applied sciences and academic universities

\*\*= when this study talks about 'the community' as an actor, both community partners and community members are meant.

\*\*\*= when this study talks about 'the university' as an actor, both students and researchers/project leaders are meant.

Another main contribution of this study is therefore that this study combines these two types of university-community partnerships, and that these partnerships are also from different universities. Previous studies on the community's perspective in university-community partnerships focused on one university-community partnership (Skilton-Sylvester & Erwin, 2000; Worrall, 2007; Strier, 2011; Reynolds, 2014), or on university-community partnerships at one university (Worrall, 2007; Tyron & Stoecker, 2008; McNall, Reed & Brown, 2009; Shalabi, 2013 Kline et al, 2018). Several (types of) university-community partnerships were included in this study, from five different universities. Hereby a more general image can be provided on the community's experience in university-community partnerships.

The structure of this study will be as follows. First, a theoretical background on university-community partnerships will be provided. Within this theoretical background, main insights from previous literature on factors that affect the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships will be discussed. Previous literature has not applied existing theories and concepts from the social sciences to university-community partnerships. When theories and concepts were considered to be useful for gaining more insight in the community's experience with regard to collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships, this study did use pre-existing theories and concepts. After this, the methodology section will elaborate on sampling, the participants within this study, ethics, data collection, data analysis, and reliability and validity. Subsequently, the findings of this study will be presented after the methodology. The findings will provide an answer to the question how different actors perceive the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships. The findings are separately discussed for transactional and transformational university-community partnerships. Finally, the discussion will reflect on the relation between previous studies and the findings of this study. Moreover, the strengths and weaknesses of this study will be discussed, as well as directions for future research and policy recommendations.

## **2. Theoretical Background**

This chapter provides a theoretical background on the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships. The implications of previous literature for this study will be discussed with regard to expectations, derived from previous literature and/or identified gaps. Two general themes were found in the literature to be affecting the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships. These are: 1) university-community partnerships and their impact on the community, and 2) personal relationships within university-community partnerships. This chapter will illustrate these two themes by discussing several factors that affect these themes.

### **2.1 University-Community Partnerships and their Impact on the Community**

#### **2.1.1 Beneficial Outcomes for the Community in University-Community Partnerships.**

The collaboration of the community with the university in university-community partnerships is supposed to be reciprocal; both parties are supposed to benefit from the partnership (Martin, Smith & Phillips, 2005; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Judd & Adams, 2008). From previous studies it becomes clear that community partners and community members differently perceive beneficial outcomes from their collaboration with the university in university-community partnerships (see, for example: Sandy & Holland, 2006; Strier, 2011). Community members perceive beneficial outcomes of university-community partnerships in two manners; personal gains and gains on a higher level (Strier, 2011). Personal gains for community members can be knowledge, training, empowerment, personal growth and expertise (Strier, 2011; Kline et al., 2018). Gains that express themselves on a higher level can be an increased societal awareness concerning the social issue addressed in the university-community partnership, as well as policy changes resulting from the university-community partnership (Strier, 2011; Reynolds, 2014).

Community partners emphasize the benefits for their community-based organization. Community partners emphasize the gained knowledge, provided services, but moreover community partners emphasize the economic benefits they receive from their participation in university-community partnerships (Sandy & Holland, 2006; Worrall, 2007; Tyron & Stoecker, 2008; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). Students provide community-based organizations with services of a low financial cost.

Based on these previous studies, it can be expected that community partners differently perceive their collaboration with the university in university-community partnerships than community members with regards to the beneficial outcomes.

**2.1.2 Benefiting the Community in University-Community Partnerships.** That university-community partnerships do not always succeed in benefiting the community becomes clear from recent literature (Tyron & Stoecker, 2008; Reynolds, 2014; Kline et al., 2018). These studies found that within some university-community partnerships, the community feels as having invested in the university-community partnership, but not receiving any benefit for it (Reynolds, 2014). This raises

the question to what extent university-community partnerships succeed in benefiting the community.

As mentioned in the introduction, university-community partnerships can follow a one-way or a two-way approach (Judd & Adams, 2008; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). Both approaches can be distinguished on the base of the direction of the flow of knowledge between the community and the university, which is why these approaches have been called one-way and two-way (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). Knowledge within the one-way approach of university-community engagement, is produced within the university and spread towards the community. The university in the one-way approach perceives itself as the expert, whereas the community is viewed as an 'empty vessel' with regard to knowledge (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). The two-way flow of knowledge stands for a continuous flow of knowledge between the university and the community (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). Both the university and the community take on the role of expert, which leads to both equally valuing academic knowledge as well as local community knowledge within the university-community partnership.

Previous studies have argued that a two-way approach towards university-community engagement, comparable with the two-way flow of knowledge, is considered to be more successful with regard to community impact than the one-way flow approach (Judd & Adams, 2008; Benneworth, 2013). They consider the two-way flow of knowledge as better able to adapt to the community's needs. Assuming that the adopted flow of knowledge within university-community partnerships affects the extent to which partnerships are able to meet the needs of community members, it can be expected that the mode of knowledge flow adopted by the university affects the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships.

**2.1.3 Transactional and Transformational University-Community Partnerships.** Weerts and Sandmann's (2008) flows of knowledge do however not distinguish between different types of partnerships. Although previous studies consider the two-way flow of knowledge to be better able to meet the needs of the community (Judd & Adams, 2008; Benenworth, 2013), the ability of university-community partnerships to meet the community's needs might work differently in different types university-community partnerships (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008).

As stated in the introduction, university-community partnerships can be either transactional or transformational (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). Both types of partnerships aim at satisfying the needs of the community as well as the university, but differ in several aspects. Transactional university-community partnerships are instrumental partnerships, in the sense that a simple exchange between university partners and the community is central to the partnership (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). The partnership is based on that the university and the community perceive each other as possessing something useful that they could benefit from (Shalabi, 2013). Both parties exchange these valuables with each other within the university-community partnership. Within transactional university-community partnerships specific tasks are completed, based on a short-term commitment.

Previous literature suggests that transactional university-community partnerships, due to the simple exchange (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013), are related to the more instrumental outcomes for community members and community partners, such as knowledge and training.

Transformational university-community partnerships are less defined and more flexible than transactional university-community partnerships with regard to the goals and process of the partnership (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). Therefore, a collaborative process exists within transformational university-community partnerships where both partners commit to each other on a long-term basis to addressing issues within the community. Through collaborating in transformational university-community partnerships, the university and the community engage in self-reflection; the university and the community learn from each others' perspectives, ways of knowing, and ways of doing. Consequently, new values and identities may develop during the partnership (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). Transformational university-community partnerships are therefore associated with making community impact, as well as the more complex outcomes for the community, such as personal development (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013).

In conclusion, transactional university-community partnerships are considered to be more simple and exchange-based than transformational university-community partnerships. The latter is perceived as being related to more complex outcomes for the community. Despite different outcomes and processes, the community is valued and the community is supposed to benefit from transactional as well as transformational university-community partnerships (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). Therefore it is expected that different types of university-community partnerships are perceived differently with regard to how these university-community partnerships are meeting the community's needs.

**2.1.4 Boundaries between the University and the Community.** Possible hindering the extent to which university-community partnerships are meeting the community's needs, are boundaries. A frequently used phrase to illustrate university-community partnerships is 'boundary crossing' (Skilton-Sylvester & Erwin, 2000; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Worrall, 2007; Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). Boundaries were mostly found to be relevant in literature concerning the perspective of community partners in university-community partnerships (Sandy & Holland, 2006; Worrall, 2007; Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). Community partners viewed the university and their community-based organizations as two different worlds, with different rules and norms that were bridged through university- spanning' community partnerships. Community members in the study of Skilton-Sylvester and Erwin (2000) perceived boundaries as the differences between students and the community members with regard to experiences in life, and their age, race, and socioeconomic class.

These interpretations of boundaries indicate that boundaries are defined by the community as different life-worlds.

Deducing from these interpretations of boundaries, the perceived boundaries can be viewed as differing habitus between the community and the university (Bourdieu, 1979). Habitus are the norms and practices that distinguish different social groups within society (Bourdieu, 1979). Starting with community members, individuals in society are perceived to occupy different positions on the basis of their access to capital (Bourdieu, 1979; Cushion & Jones, 2006), for example economic capital, and cultural capital (education). The 21st century society is considered to be a knowledge society: education is the means to participate and have success in society (Benneworth, 2013). The higher one's education, the higher your income and consequently one's economic capital (De Gregorio & Lee, 2002). Higher educated individuals can therefore be viewed as part of the dominant class. The target group of university-community partnerships often contains community members with a lower socioeconomic status (Benneworth, 2013). In other words, in university-community partnerships the university and community members occupy different social positions in society. Consequently, using the concept of habitus, the norms and practices of community members and the norms and practices of the university diverge.

Boundaries can serve as facilitating separation and exclusion (Lamont & Molnár, 2002), and thereby hinder university-community partnerships from benefiting the community. When boundaries defined by habitus between community members and the university are not crossed within university-community partnerships, community members and the university hold on to their own habitus during the collaboration. This can be expressed through the university's tendency to value academic knowledge more than the community's local knowledge (Israel et al., 1998; Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008), and conflicting interests between community members and the university with regard to valuing academic achievements and community impact (Israel et al., 1998; Bringle & Hatcher, 2002).

Besides diverging habitus between community members and the university, habitus can also be related to institutions (Thomas, 2002). This implies that different institutions have different kinds of habitus. Since community partners are related to community-based organizations and university partners to higher education institutions, the habitus of the university and community partners differ. Therefore, boundaries of different norms and behaviors could be perceived as affecting community partners' as well as community members' experience of collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships.

## **2.2 Personal Relationships in University-Community Partnerships**

### **2.2.3 Developing Personal Relationships between the University and the Community.**

Strong personal relationships between university partners and the community have been related to facilitate boundary crossing between the university and the community (Skilton-Sylvester & Erwin, 2000; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; Shalabi, 2013). When developing personal

relationships, people exchange personal stories, experiences, and perspectives (Skilton-Sylvester & Erwin, 2000; Dostilio et al., 2012). In other words, when developing relationships, both the community and the university are required to ‘make space’ (Dostilio et al., 2012): to think outside of their own framework, in order to understand the other’s ways of knowing and doing. Developing personal relationships between the university and the community therefore enables the university and the community to learn about, and learn to acknowledge and value each other’s habitus.

Eventually this could lead to a changed habitus of both the university and the community. An example of an adaptation to each other’s habitus could be that the university and the community equally value each other’s knowledge, instead of only placing value on their own type of knowledge. This leads to the expectation that when strong personal relationships are present between the university and the community, the perception that the community experiences boundaries in university-community partnerships is less overt in respondents’ stories.

Since the university and the community more strongly and more intensively collaborate over a longer period of time in transformational than in transactional university-community partnerships (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013), it is expected that the development of personal relationships might be more able in transformational university-community partnerships than in transactional university-community partnerships.

**2.2.4 Personal Relationships and the Collaborative Process.** Several aspects characterize strong relationships in university-community partnerships, amongst others trust (Israel et al., 1998; Worrall, 2007; Tyron & Stoecker, 2008; Alcantara, Harper, & Keys, 2012; Reynolds, 2014) and commitment (Israel et al., 1998; Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2003; Judd & Adams, 2008; Strier, 2011). Trust between the university and the community and the community’s perceived commitment of the university can function as a reassurance for the community that they will not be exploited by the university. Thereby the community is stimulated to keep on investing in the collaboration.

Trust on itself involves handing over resources to others who can use these for their own good, for the trustor’s good or for both (Coleman, 1990). In other words, when the community trusts the university, the community will keep on investing in the partnership because they trust on the university to use the community’s investment for the good of their collaboration. Trust therefore has been found to be related to the community’s decision to enter or remain within a university-community partnership (Leiderman et al., 2003).

Commitment can be defined as the obligated feeling of an individual to engage in further action and originates from recurrent interaction (Coleman, 1990; McLure Wasko & Faraj, 2005). When the community perceives commitment from the university to the university-community partnership, this again functions as a reassurance for the community. The community has been found to value university partners being committed to the achievement of the mutually established goals (Leiderman et al., 2003). When perceiving the university as committed to the mutually established goals, the community might feel reassured of a beneficial return of their investment in the partnership.

In conclusion, strong personal relationships can be perceived as contributing to a positive experience of the community with their collaboration with the university in university-community partnerships, because personal relationships function as a reassurance for the community that their investment in the university-community partnership will be returned by the university.

Putnam (1993; 2000) defines this reassurance as social capital: aspects of social organization, such as trust, that further develop coordination and collaboration for the benefit of all involved partners. Social capital in university-community partnerships further develops coordination and collaboration, since social capital functions as a reassurance for the community to maintain their participation in the partnership. Due to social capital, the community is being reassured that their continuous investment in the partnership will be rewarded.

Putnam (1993; 2000) argues that aspects of social capital are interrelated and hard to separate. Perceiving that a university is committed to the university-community partnership, is likely to also involve trust that the university will commit itself to the partnership. The same interrelatedness can therefore be expected for aspects of strong personal relationships in university-community partnerships. An implication of the interrelatedness for this study could be that when the community expresses that they value the reciprocal relation with university partners, this statement could also give information about the extent to which community members trust university partners and perceive university partners' commitment.



### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Ethical Standards

Various ethical standards were met in this study: anonymity, confidentiality, consent and minimization of harm were taken into account. Anonymity was achieved through removing identifying information, for example names, from the citations that got into the report. Respondents were given pseudonyms. Therefore none of the results within this publication can be traced back to an individual respondent. Both the recordings and transcripts will be removed after the approval of this thesis. Minimization of harm was taken into account by project leaders who led university-community partnerships. When approaching project leaders for participation of their university-community partnership in this study, a frequently mentioned reason for rejection was that the community members within their partnership were members of a vulnerable community. Therefore the project leaders did not want to burden them with yet another interview. Anonymity and confidentiality were explained on the consent form respondents signed before the start of the interview. This was also stated to them explicitly to make sure no uncertainties existed. By ascertaining anonymity and confidentiality it was hoped that respondents felt free and safe to speak their minds, although most respondents replied by stating that they do not have any secrets. Respondents gave their consent for the interview, recording, and for using the interview for this study.

#### 3.2 Participants

The sample of this research consisted out of community members, community partners, students, and project leaders/researchers of university-community partnerships. Table 1 shows the division of respondents within the sample.

Table 1. Division of respondents within sample.

Respondents' Role	N
Community member	10
Community partner	2
Project leaders / researcher	5
Student	3
Total	20

Community partners (n = 2) were working at a community-based organization and gained income from their role in the community. In other words, other interests than solely their own were expected to be important in community partners' experience of university-community partnerships. Community members (n = 10) were individuals who were part of the target community of university-community partnerships. A target community could be a particular neighborhood, or people who are dealing with particular social problems, such as poverty. Community members participating in this study were dealing with one or more social issues, such as poverty, unemployment, and trouble speaking the

Dutch language. Students participating in this study either participated in a university-community partnership for a course (n = 1) or their internship (n = 2). Project leaders had various positions within the university, varying from researcher (n = 2) to exclusively project leader (n = 3). Respondents were collected from six different university-community partnerships. A description of respondents within the study can be found in Table 2.

On the base of community members' and community partners' experience with their collaboration with the university, this study distinguished university-community partnerships by whether they were transactional or transformational university-community partnerships (Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). Distinguishing factors were the community's perception of the gains they got out of the university-community partnership, as well as the extent to which the partnerships were collaborative.

**3.3.1 Transactional University-Community Partnerships.** A simple exchange between university partners and the community is central to transactional university-community partnerships (Bringle, Clayton & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). Three university-community partnerships were included as transactional university-community partnerships, as can be viewed in Table 3. One transactional university-community partnership was initiated by a civilian initiative, which was supported by universities' faculty knowledge. The other two transactional university-community partnerships were larger community-engagement organizations that were permanently located within their target neighborhood. These partnerships aimed at transferring knowledge of the university to the community, whilst students got acquainted with a to them, often, unfamiliar world of the community. The learning experience of students while helping the community was the exchange in service provisional university-community partnerships.

Services in this study were exclusively provided by students, with support of university faculty. Services within these organizations were: 1) students providing community members with legal or financial help during daily consultation hours, 2) students supporting children after school hours by learning activities with a playful nature. With regard to legal services students were able to give answers to questions and advise community members, but were not able to undertake legal actions for the community members. Project-based activities concerned activities such as students doing small researches commissioned by community partners.

Table 2. Respondents

University-Community Partnership	Respondent	Name	Role	Educational Background	Employment status at time of partnership	
University-Community Partnership	1.	Eva	Project leader / researcher	Higher educated	Academic researcher	
	2.	Petra	Project leader / researcher	Higher educated	Academic researcher	
	3.	Hank	Community member	Lower educated	Retired	
	4.	Nadia	Community member	Lower educated	Unemployed	
	5.	Fatima	Community member	Lower educated	Unemployed	
	6.	Bart	Community member	Lower educated	Unemployed	
	7.	Lucy	Community member	Lower educated	Full incapacity to work	
	8.	Tom	Community member	Unknown	Unemployed	
	9.	Donna	Community member	Lower educated	Full incapacity to work	
	3.	10.	Carl	Project leader / researcher	Higher educated	Academic teacher
		11.	Gabriella	Community member	Middle educated	Unemployed
		12.	Rick	Community member	Higher educated	Unemployed
	4.	13.	Jacky	Student	Higher educated	Student
		14.	Janine	Student	Higher educated	Student
		15.	Mary	Student	Higher educated	Student
		16.	Hannah	Project leader	Higher educated	Project leader
	17.	17.	Louise	Project leader	Higher educated	Project leader
		18.	Sara	Community member	Lower educated	Employed
		19.	Steven	Community partner	Higher educated	Employed
6.	20.	Walter	Community partner	Higher educated	Employed	

Table 3. University-Community Partnerships

<b>University-Community Partnership</b>		<b>Description</b>	<b>Duration</b>
Transformational	1	Research project aimed at improving socially excluded families' healthy lifestyle.	Several years
	2	Research project aimed at improving socially excluded families' healthy lifestyle.	Several years
	3	Students' project aimed at creating a value case for a social enterprise together with community members.	Ten weeks
Transactional	4	Larger community engagement organization where students provide sustained services within a neighborhood and work with community members through project-based activities.	Services were sustained throughout the year. Project-based activities lasted approximately ten weeks
	5	Larger community engagement organization where students provide sustained services within a neighborhood and work with community members through project-based activities.	Services were sustained throughout the year. Project-based activities lasted approximately ten weeks
	6	Civilian initiative supported by university's knowledge and help	Several years

**3.3.2 Transformational University-Community Partnerships.** Transformational university-community partnerships are characterized by a closer collaboration between the community and the university (Bringle, Clayton & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). University partners and the community within transformational university-community partnerships together give shape to the goals and process of the partnership. Defining for transformational university-community partnerships is that besides an exchange between university partners and the community, new values and identities may develop during the partnership due to the close collaboration between both partners.

Three transformational university-community partnerships were a part of this study, as Table 3 shows. Within faculty involvement initiatives, faculty's research was combined with a community project. Involved in these university-community partnerships were PhD-candidates, researchers, and local partners such as the municipality.

### **3.3. Procedure**

The starting point of constructing the sample was the selection of relevant university-community partnerships. Previous literature indicates that the community is more positive about their collaboration with the university in university-community partnerships when a certain degree of reciprocity is present (for example, see: Judd & Adams, 2008; Strier, 2011), such as partnerships where students as well as the community benefit from the university-community partnership. Since the aim of this research is to gain useful insights into how the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships can be improved, a sense of reciprocity was used to select relevant university-community partnerships. This criterium downsized the population for the sample, since a large number of university-community partnerships are not reciprocal, or appeared to be less reciprocal than they claim.

Searching for university-community partnerships that met the criterion of reciprocity was done by convenience sampling. The researcher's network was used for contact details of project leaders of relevant university-community partnerships, the internet was used as well to look for partnerships. The contact was often with the project leader of a university-community partnership, since it was expected that they could reach the community more easily. The contact with project leaders often led to a rejection for participating in the study. Of the 28 studies approached, 22 declined participation in the study or did not respond. The most frequent reason for rejection has been stated in the section on ethical standards, namely the minimization of harm of vulnerable community members. However, project leaders were helpful in providing contact details of other project leaders of other university-community partnerships. Besides that, when project leaders rejected their community members' participation in this research, project leaders were asked whether they themselves would want to participate in the study; one project leader agreed to this.

The same question was asked to project leaders when they did allow their community members' to participate in the study; five project leaders agreed to this. In all cases, the project leaders of the partnerships selected community members and community partners. Project leaders approached

the community themselves to ask whether they wanted to participate in this study. Petra, a project leader, said:

*“I will try to not selectively pick respondents for you, but I will select the respondents by whether I think they can tell you something more about their experience in the partnership than just stating that it has been fun.” - Petra*

Petra also offered community members participating in her partnership a voucher of twenty five euros in return for participating in this study. Other respondents from other university-community partnerships in this study did not receive a voucher in return for their participation.

### **3.4 Data Collection**

Interviews took mostly place in a face-to-face context (n = 18), with the exception of two interviews with community partners that were done over the phone. The average time of the interviews was 54 minutes. The location of the interviews varied: some took place in a café, some in the town hall, and some - when applicable - in the building that was owned by the university-community partnership. It was always checked whether the location was convenient for respondents.

The purpose of the interviews was to gather information on the experience of the community with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships. Therefore the setup of the interview was partly inductive: community members and community partners were asked to tell about the partnership. Depending on their stories, elements of the university-community partnership were discussed. Based on previous literature however, some themes were made sure to be covered within the interviews. These were the description of the university-community partnership itself, the relationship between the community and the university, the gains the community perceived to have gotten out of the university-community partnership, and the reason why the community got involved within the partnership. The interviewer asked for more information and examples when needed. The partly inductive nature of the interviews with the community produced differences in the discussed themes between interviews.

This study provides multiple perspectives on the community's experience with their collaboration with the university within university-community partnerships. During the interviews with the university partners, the same themes as in the interviews with the community were covered. Additionally, university partners were also asked about more general themes in working with the community, since the university partners were expected to be able to provide a context to the community's experiences. In addition to the community's interview themes, therefore, these interviews also covered what university partners thought was important in working with the community, what did and did not work in working with the community according to them, and what they learnt about working with the community.

### **3.5 Data Analysis**

Before data analysis started, all interviews were verbatim transcribed. Data analysis started directly after the collection of the data. Following the advice of Hennink, Hutter, and Bailey (2011), analyzing the data started with a pre-analysis of six selected interviews that were expected to represent the variation of data in the study. These were the interviews with Gabriella, Steven, Eva, Lucy, Mary, and Sara. These six interviews were analyzed by hand, with the purpose of getting feeling for the relevant themes in the data. Codes did not emerge from this analysis, rather particular themes that were considered to be important to pay attention to within the actual analysis. Analyzing by hand meant that notes were written within the sidelines representing a theme or particular situation, such as 'relationship' or 'benefits'.

After the pre-analysis of these six interviews, the actual analysis of the interviews started. For coding and analyzing the interview data, the software program Nvivo 11 was used. Analyzing the data was based on an inductive as well as deductive nature. However, the literature review already provided some initial codes. For example 'trust', 'community's benefits', 'perceived status differences' and 'perceived commitment'. These themes were confirmed by frequent occurrence in the data. The inductive coding was based on the principles of open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The process evolved towards a combination between axial coding and open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Codes that inductively emerged from the data were 'meaning of the partnership' and 'lower threshold'. Using the coded data, patterns were identified by defining differences between respondents and between contexts. After the patterns were identified, the process of selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) started where existing categories were integrated within theoretical themes, such as 'sense of purpose'. The results section will further elaborate on this.

## 4. Findings

This chapter will provide the findings of this study that answer the research question: *“What are the perceptions of different actors on the community’s experience with collaborating with the university within university-community partnerships?”* As discussed previously, this study distinguished transactional and transformational university-community partnerships. Therefore, the findings will be discussed separately for both types of university-community partnerships, starting with transactional university-community partnerships.

### 4.1 Transactional University-Community Partnerships

**4.1.1 Perceptions on Benefiting the Community.** The utility of the benefits gained from transactional university-community partnerships was perceived by both the university and the community as contributing to the community’s positive experience of collaborating with the university (n = 7). Sarah, a community member, as well as Steven and Walter, community partners, indicated that they participated in transactional university-community partnerships, because they perceived the partnerships as a means in order to gain either knowledge or services (n = 3). Sarah was a member of a group of women who gathered weekly for training sessions about healthy lifestyles. Students’ provided one of these sessions. Sarah explained why she agreed on participating in this collaboration:

*“That’s exactly what we’re looking for! We’re looking for people who can tell us more about how to adopt a healthier lifestyle!”* - Sarah

Knowledge and services gained from transactional university-community partnerships were perceived by the community as useful, because they contributed to the achievement of the goals of the community (n = 3). Walter, a community partner, expressed the most pragmatic view with regard to transactional university-community partnerships. His civilian initiative wanted to apply for several subsidies, but in order to apply for subsidies, reports and research was needed. Walter considered university partners as a useful partner to contribute to the subsidy applications by filing reports and doing research:

*“I mean, I’m just looking at whether they, as researchers, can gain knowledge from it, and that in return we don’t have to write a report. We can simply focus on the content then. They can gain knowledge and perhaps, well, in return they can do the dirty work for us.”* - Walter

The fulfillment of their need for knowledge and services by transactional university-community partnerships was perceived by the university as well as the community to contribute to the community’s positive experience with collaborating with the university (n = 7). In conclusion, both perceived the utility of the community’s benefits gained from their participation in transactional



university-community partnerships as central to the positive experience of the community with collaborating with the university:

*“What we stand for is of course to bring the knowledge of students to the neighborhood, and that’s useful for the neighborhood.”* - Louise (project leader)

**4.1.2 The Lower Threshold of Transactional University-Community Partnerships.** Using the utility framework to explain the positive experience of the community, raised the question why the community chose for transactional university-community partnerships over professional organizations. Especially the transactional university-community partnerships that were part of larger community-engagement organizations, offered services and knowledge to community members that could also be offered by professional organizations.

The university and the community (n = 6) compared transactional university-community partnerships with professional organizations during their interviews. In these comparisons the university, and Steven, a community partner, used the phrase ‘a lower threshold’ (n = 5). In a broad sense the interpretations of a lower threshold meant that the community perceived transactional university-community partnerships as more accessible than professional organizations.

*“I strongly believe that students are more accessible to community members. We’re trying to lower the threshold for our services as far as possible.”* - Hannah

In other words, the community was not only perceived as experiencing collaborating with the university in transactional university-community partnerships positively because of their utility, but also because of their higher accessibility in comparison with professional organizations.

For community partners, the higher accessibility of transactional university-community partnerships was perceived by community partners as well as project leaders in a financial manner (n = 3). Services from transactional university-community partnerships were less expensive than services from professional organizations. Steven, a community partner, indicated that his organization was not able to afford services from professional organizations. He positively experienced collaborating with the university in transactional university-community partnerships, because these enabled his organization to make use of services in an affordable manner:

*“We are able to study certain things and get help, without hiring employees or paying work hours for it. That’s very nice in the community setting. So actually, we can do things that we would otherwise not be able to pay.”* - Steven, community partner

In conclusion, transactional university-community partnerships were considered to be a more accessible form of service provision to the community than professional organizations, and thereby contributing to a positive experience of the community with collaborating with the university in transactional university-community partnerships. For community members, another lowered threshold was perceived as contributing to the community's positive experience with collaborating with the university. The next section will look into this.

**4.1.3 The Personal Approach of University-Community Partnerships.** The personal approach of the services of transactional university-community partnerships was considered to be the main factor by the university and the community that made collaborating with the university in transactional university-community partnerships accessible for community members (n = 6).

Mary and Janine, students, and Steven, a community partner working with community members, indicated that community members were ashamed of their situation and therefore were uncertain about making use of either transactional university-community partnerships or professional organizations (n = 3). Mary, a student providing legal and financial services to community members, expressed that because of the development of personal connections with students, community members felt less ashamed when making use of students' services:

*"We have tried to send community members through to professional organizations, but because they know everyone here... They just feel comfortable here. Everyone knows their story, so they don't have to tell that again, which lowers the threshold for them."* - Mary, student

In other words, personal connections between students and community members were perceived by the university as well as a community partner as decreasing community members' shame and uncertainty in making use of services (n = 3). Collaborating with the university in transactional university-community partnerships was in this sense perceived to be positively experienced by community members due to the factors that enabled transactional university-community partnerships to build personal connections.

The permanent location of the transactional university-community partnerships within the community was perceived by project leaders and students as an enabler for the community to develop personal connections with the university (n = 3).

*"Our philosophy is that people can just walk in here, especially with regard to the consultation hours. Yesterday someone came in here, because her child needed to use the toilet, haha. You know? So, we really try to be that. That people find it easy and fun to just stop by."* - Louise, project leader

Moreover, during the transactional university-community partnerships, students were perceived by Steven, as well as the university, as being more flexible during their collaboration than professional organizations, which contributed to the development of personal connections according to them (n = 4). Examples of the flexibility were the university had frequent contact with the community (n = 2), took their time to help the community (n = 2), and had personal conversations with the community (n = 3). Sarah, a community member, described that the students, who gave her a training on a healthier lifestyle, came by several times to talk to her and her weight loss group in order to develop a specialized training. Consequently, she experienced the training provided by the students more positively than a training provided by a professional:

*“[Sarah talks with a clear sense of frustration in her voice here] There was this woman who was super, super, super thin and we weren't allowed anything by her. No meat, no fish, no eggs. (...) It wasn't fun. I'm sure she was a vegetarian or something! [The frustration ended] I didn't have that with the students. (...) They showed more understanding of us and how they could help us. They had a respectful attitude.” - Sarah*

In conclusion, the personal connections between community members and the university were perceived by the university as well as a community partner, working with community members, to improve the accessibility of services for community members. Services contributed to the achievement of community members' goals. Transactional university-community partnerships enabled the development of personal connections between the university and community members more than professional organizations. This led to the perception that collaborating with the university in transactional university-community partnerships was more accessible for the community than collaborating with professional organizations.

#### **4.1.4 Perceived (in)equality within transactional university-community partnerships?**

The university (n = 3) indicated that they perceived a clear exchange between community members and students facilitated an equal relationship between community members and students, and that this was the second factor contributing to community members' positive experience of collaborating with the university in transactional university-community partnerships. In the clear exchange, students were gaining learning experiences, and community members were receiving students' knowledge in return.

*“Well, we are still learning a bit as well. It doesn't matter to us if someone doesn't know something. And when you're seeing a professional, then people might think that that's different. Which probably isn't the case, but maybe that's a reason.” - Mary, student*

Contrary to this statement however, were project leaders' and students' (n = 4) indications that community members were mostly not aware of students' learning process. Janine, a student, told that even when community members were aware of her being a student, community members still perceived her as a professional. Hannah, a project leader, explained why.

*“A lot of parents know, but they still view us as professionals. It doesn't matter whether you have your first week of school, or have been a professional teacher for years. Community members view students as knowledgeable, as people who know what they're doing.”* - Janine

*“(…) Community members tend to that rather quickly, that they perceive people from outside their community as professionals.”* - Hannah

The tone of project leaders and students indicated that they did not see community members' of students as professionals as something rather important of the community's experience with collaborating with the university. However, in the case of Janine, a student, this led to community members making use of students' services with wrong or even too high expectations of the service. She frequently experienced that community members expected her service to improve children's grades. Janine's case was however the only case where respondents indicated community members entering with the wrong expectation.

## **4.2 Transformational University-Community Partnerships**

**4.2.1 Benefiting the Community** The collaboration with the university in transformational university-community partnerships was positively experienced by community members because the partnership provided community members with 'a sense of purpose' (n = 8). Being in the situation community members were in, community members indicated that they felt an urge to have a purpose in life (n = 8). Rick, a higher educated and middle-aged community member, was unemployed at the time he participated in the partnership:

*“If you're unemployed, then you're also looking for some sort of position of value for yourself, to make yourself feel good. And honestly, that is connected to each other: meaning something for your community, also makes that you feel better about yourself.”* - Rick

University-community partnerships provided Rick and other community members with an opportunity to have a sense of purpose in life. 'A sense of purpose' is a broad concept, but it reflects the various manners community members defined their purposes. One definition of a sense of purpose, was to mean something to other people (n = 3). Lucy was an unemployed community member, who spent her time at home taking care of her children. When asking why the partnership was important to her, she

answered by saying that she wanted to help other people who were in a situation comparable to hers. The replacement activity Lucy found when she quit the partnership confirms that Lucy really wanted to help other people:

*“To be occupied with the people. Not just for me, but also for the older people. Now I’m a volunteer for older people, I play bingo with them.” - Lucy*

Community members Hank, Tom and Nadia appreciated the partnership, because it gave them a useful activity to spend their time on (n = 3). All three were unemployed and longed for an activity to be able to be useful. The partnership gave Bart and Fatima the opportunity to raise awareness on people within a situation of poverty (n = 3). Only Gabriella mainly participated in the partnership to invest in her personal development.

Project leaders Eva and Petra however emphasized that personal gains, such as knowledge (n = 1), and personal development (n = 1) were the outcomes of their partnerships that they perceived to be contributing to community members’ positive experience with collaborating with the university (n = 2). In contrast, Carl, a project leader, argued that because of participating in his partnership was a personal process to community members, personal development of community members happened as a side-effect.

*“Personal development is just a side effect. I don’t give therapy. (...) Entrepreneurship is simply a very personal process.” - Carl*

#### **4.2.2 Perceived (Power) Differences Between the Community and the University.**

Contrary to the value community members put in transformational university-community partnerships, in all three transformational university-community partnerships community members expressed and the university perceived community members’ hesitant attitudes towards the collaboration with the university (n = 6). Rick, a community member, had difficulty with sharing influence with students with regard to his concept for a social enterprise (n = 1). Other community members were expressing skepticism about the partnership (n = 4), or showed a ‘see-before-believing’ attitude (n = 1). Donna, a community member, described her thoughts about the first activity she organized within the partnership:

*“It was a great success, despite my skepsis beforehand: ‘Oh, I hope that it’s going to work out..’” - Donna*

Community members related their hesitant attitude towards transformational university-community partnerships to perceived differences between themselves and the university (n = 6). Differences were

interpreted by community members as different live experiences (n = 2), different norms (n = 3), and different valued behaviors (n = 1). Community member Rick explained his perception of the differences between himself and the students he collaborated with.

*“It was just reality. They didn’t live in this neighborhood. To them it was a course in which they were interested. Interested in how things went in this neighborhood. Right? They had to pretend they were social entrepreneurs, but it actually was some sort of role play. You could say. And you can simply step out of a role.” - Rick*

Although the university as well perceived that community members perceived differences between the university and the community, community members’ hesitant attitude was not related to the differences, but perceived as ‘self-protecting behavior’, by project leaders (n = 2). Carl, a project leader, expressed that community members’ commitment to university-community partnerships had been exploited before:

*“They [community members] have seen so many people come and go. Students interview them, leave, and they never see something back from it. They don’t believe in it anymore.” - Carl*

Combining the statement of Carl with community members’ self-protecting behavior, it can be concluded that the university perceived the community as feeling the urge to protect themselves against possible exploitation by the university. In other words, the perception of community members’ self-protecting behavior indicated experienced that the university perceived power differences to be affecting the community’s attitude towards collaborating with the university. Community members however emphasized differences in lives and particular valued attitudes between themselves and the university in relation to their hesitant attitudes.

**4.2.3 Connecting to the University.** Nonetheless, personal connections were perceived as decreasing the behavior stemming from the hesitant attitude of community members, according to community members as well as project leaders (n = 9). Personal connections were perceived by Petra, a project leader, as enabling community members to quicker commit themselves to the partnership, than when community members collaborated with someone whom they did not know. In Petra’s university-community partnership, one group was led by Petra, and the other group was led by a partner who was familiar to the community members:

*“What I’ve learnt (...) is that you shouldn’t send people there whom they don’t know. If you have to, go there together with someone else whom they do know. Because if [name partner] would have been in charge of both groups, I’m sure that my group would have accomplished more.” - Petra*

Three main factors were perceived to be stimulating or hindering community members' personal connections with the university. Community members Bart, Fatima, Lucy, and project leader Eva mentioned that acknowledgement of community members as individuals within the partnership stimulated increased their trust in the university (n = 4). Acknowledging community members made community members felt appreciated, and viewed as a person instead of a participant. A lack of acknowledgement was the reason why Fatima told in a frustrated manner about the university-community partnership, her trust was damaged after not feeling acknowledged for her efforts to organize a flea market:

*“There were pictures within the newspaper of people who didn't have anything to do with the flea market. We were not on those pictures, while we were the ones who organized it. I would have wanted that. After all, it was my idea. And then suddenly it was like: ‘No, that was not your idea.’ Of course it's my idea!”* - Fatima

Secondly, following from conversations and activities that stimulated the interchange of perspectives and experiences, community members experienced and were perceived by the university as experiencing a smaller distance between themselves and university partners (n = 4). Eva, project leader, expressed that it was sharing these personal stories and experiences that helped her in gaining trust from community members:

*“Those are the little things through which you get to know one another. Mention differences, without letting them be problematic differences. Like: ‘Oh, that's different. I've never thought about it in that way.’ You need to share personal information if you want to break down their walls.”* – Eva

Thirdly, the university showing to community members that they were committed to the partnership was stimulating trust (n = 4). Transformational university-community partnerships were impacting community members lives, while the impact of the partnerships for university partners remained to their work. Therefore, community members found it important that university partners showed that they were willing to put as much effort as community members themselves in the partnership (n = 4). Hank, a community member, was very positively surprised about his collaboration with Petra, his project leader. He described an unexpected positive relation with Petra, because Petra had been working on the same tasks as him in the university-community partnership:

*“Yeah well.. In first instance, you always think: ‘Yeah, those people come and they bring something up, but when something needs to be done then you don't see them.’ You know?”* - Hank

## 5. Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to look into the perspectives of several actors on the community's experience with collaborating with the university within university-community partnerships. Using a qualitative approach, this study interviewed community members, community partner, project leaders/researchers, and students to answer the research question. Moreover, this study looked into differences with regard to the perceptions of the community's experience between transactional and transformational university-community partnerships (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013). Finally, an important element of this study's design was to incorporate transactional as well as transformational university-community partnerships.

Although both gains and relationships were found to affect community members' experience with collaborating with the university in transactional as well as transformational university-community partnerships, when distinguishing between transactional and transformational university-community partnerships, this study discovered that both mechanisms work differently in both type of partnerships. In this chapter, the main findings of this study will be discussed and linked to the literature review of chapter two. Differences or communalities between previous studies and this research will be looked into and, if possible, explained. Moreover, this chapter contains the discussion of the strengths and limitations of this study, suggestions for future research as well as policy recommendations following from this study's findings.

One of the main strengths of this research was that this research contributed to the literature on university-community partnerships by adding research on the Dutch context. Most research on university-community partnerships has been done in the United States States (for example, see: Martin, Smiths & Phillips, 2005; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; McNall, Reed, Brown & Allen, 2008). The next section will look into the findings considering the perspectives of different actors on the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships in the Netherlands.

The most valuable finding of this study is that the community experiences, and is perceived by the university to experience, their collaboration with the university in university-community partnerships in the Netherlands rather positively. This was due to both transactional and transformational university-community partnerships providing the community with beneficial outcomes. This study therefore suggests that the university's partnerships with the community consider the benefits the community gains from the partnership.

This study firstly concludes that transactional as well as transformational university-community partnerships provide the community with benefits by fulfilling needs of community members. However these needs differ per partnership. The community and the university perceive transactional university-community partnerships as a means to achieve the community's goals or fulfill a need; transactional university-community partnerships are considered to be useful by the



community. Transformational university-community partnerships are experienced as meaningful; community members are provided with an opportunity to mean something to themselves or others.

Previous studies considered the two-way approach towards university-community engagement as being more able than the one-way approach to fulfill the community's needs (Judd & Adams, 2008; Benenworth, 2013). This study concludes that the one-way approach, in transactional university-community partnerships is able to fulfill the community's needs. Weerts and Sandmann (2008) did not distinguish between types of university-community partnerships in the ability of the flows of knowledge to meet the community's needs. This study did, and found that the one-way flow of knowledge (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008) was, unconsciously, adopted in transactional university-community partnerships. Transactional university-community partnerships with community members unconsciously adopted the one-way flow of knowledge, while thinking that transactional university-community partnerships were adopting the two-way flow of knowledge. The university perceived the transactional university-community partnerships as contributing to an equal relationship between community members and the university because of the two-way knowledge flow: students learnt from community members, and community members gained knowledge from students. However, community members were often unaware of the learning process of students, resulting in the adoption of the one-way flow of knowledge in transactional university-community partnerships with community members.

The usage of the one-way flow of knowledge did not negatively affect the perception of the extent to which transactional university-community partnerships with community members were fulfilling community members' needs in university-community partnerships. In other words, the one-way flow of knowledge was also perceived to be fulfilling the community members' needs. The mechanisms behind the flows of knowledge in different types of university-community partnerships can be explained further by future research in order to establish what flows of knowledge in what type of university-community partnership is best able to fulfill the community's needs.

A second conclusion is that, in line with Skilton-Sylvester and Erwin (2000), this study found that community members were perceived by the university as well as community members themselves to experience boundaries between themselves and university partners. In contrast with previous literature, this study did not find boundaries to be affecting the experience of community partners in collaborating with the university (Sandy & Holland, 2006). Future research could therefore look into in what specific university-community engagement context community partners experience boundaries between themselves and the university.

Boundaries between community members and the university were not specifically caused by university partners being related to a university, but to a broader sense of differences between the university and community members that could be identified as habitus (Bourdieu, 1979). Differences in habitus worked in a different way in transactional and transformational university-community partnerships. In transformational university-community partnerships, differences in habitus were

characterized by different life experiences, different valued behaviors and norms. Differences in habitus were perceived by the university and community members to hinder the collaboration with the university for community members, because community members themselves acted hesitantly when making use of transactional university-community partnerships. In transactional university-community partnerships, the different social positions of community members and the university caused community members to feel ashamed of their situation when collaborating with the university.

A third conclusion of this study is, as the literature review suggested, that personal relationships were perceived by the university and community members to be the key to cross the boundaries experienced by community members (Skilton-Sylvester & Erwin, 2000; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; Shalabi, 2013). This study adds to the literature that relationships are not only central in transformational university-community partnerships, but also in transactional university-community partnerships. Explanatory for the importance of personal relations in transactional university-community partnerships is that transactional university-community partnerships are perceived to fulfill needs and goals of community members, that could also be fulfilled by professional organizations. Transactional university-community partnerships are perceived by the university and community members to distinguish themselves from professional organizations by the personal approach and the development of personal relations. Within transformational university-community partnerships, creating personal connections was important in order to stimulate community members' commitment to the partnership.

As suggested by Putnam (1993; 2000) all sorts of factors within personal connections were interrelated and characterizing strong relationships, such as trust and commitment. Future studies that apply theories of social capital to university-community partnerships, can contribute in providing more in-depth explanations of the working of personal connections within university-community partnerships.

Another research aim of this study was to look into where the perceptions of actors diverged with regard to the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships. The perceptions of the university and the community with regards to the community's experience with collaborating with the university diverged on two themes in transformational university-community partnerships. In line with the literature (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011; Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2012; Shalabi, 2013), some project leaders perceived community members to gain personal development and knowledge from their participation in their transformational university-community partnership. The community members in transformational university-community partnerships in this study however, perceived the outcome of their collaboration with the university as an opportunity to (re)gain a sense of purpose in their lives. Personal development is however perceived by community members as a side-effect of their participation in transformational university-community partnerships.

The diverging perceptions of project leaders and community members on this theme of the community's experience with collaborating with the university, could indicate that project leaders are not informed on community members' experiences with collaborating with the university in transformational university-community partnerships. This did not affect the community's experience in collaborating with the university in this study. However, it can be expected that in order to be able to fully meet community members' needs in transformational university-community partnerships, it is important for project leaders to be aware of community members' experiences and expectations with the collaboration with the university in university-community partnerships.

The second point on which the university's and the community's perception diverged in transformational university-community partnerships, was related to perceived boundaries. In line with Skilton-Sylvester and Erwin (2000), this study found that community members perceived boundaries between themselves and the university in transformational university-community partnerships in line with the concept of habitus (Bourdieu, 1979). The community perceived the university as different on the basis of norms, life experiences, and valued work. The university however perceived the community's experienced boundaries in terms of power differences. This study did not find any explanation for these different perspectives, and therefore future research is needed to further look into explanations of these diverging perceptions of boundaries.

Concerning the perception of community members compared with community partners, a fourth conclusion that can be drawn from this study. Community members and community partners experience and perceive their collaboration with the university in university-community partnerships in a different way. Whereas community members participate in university-community partnerships for their own purpose, community partners have to take into account an organization that is connected to them. Consequently, community partners perceived university-community partnerships mainly as financially beneficial means to achieve their goals. This study therefore suggests that future research on university-community partnerships explicitly distinguishes studying community members or community partners in order to clearly define the mechanisms that are important for both community members and community partners.

This research comes with strengths and limitations, which will be discussed within this section. Several limitations were identified with regard to the data collection. Two interviews were conducted over the phone. This might have hindered the openness of the respondents, since the length of both interviews was somewhat shorter than the length of the interviews that were conducted in person. The researcher reviewed literature on university-community partnerships, which together with the findings of this study pled for mutual beneficial collaborations between the university and the community. This study however did not provide any direct gain to the community, such as knowledge or personal development. To compensate for the lack of benefits, the researcher herself applied gained knowledge on factors facilitating a good collaboration between the university and the community during the interviews. Interviews therefore always started with some small-talk and sharing of

personal stories and experiences between community members and the researcher in order to develop a connection between the researcher and the respondent.

Two respondents in this study were speaking German, but indicated that they were able to understand Dutch. The researcher understood German and therefore the researcher was speaking Dutch to the community members, while the community members were answering in German. During the interview, some misunderstandings took place. Most misunderstandings were however noticed by either the community members or the researcher. Moreover, a native German speaker transcribed these two interviews. Therefore the influence of this problem is expected to have been limited.

In qualitative research it is important to reflect on reflexivity (Hennink, Hutter, & Bailey, 2011). The researcher's subjectivity might affect the research process as well as how respondents react to the researcher. The researcher being a university student could have affected the researcher's judgement with regard to reliability of statements from the university and the community. The researcher noticed the tendency to trust the judgement of university partners more than the judgement of community members. Noticing this while analyzing the data made the researcher aware this bias and enabled the researcher to deliberately analyze the data from a neutral perspective. Another consequence of the researcher being a student at a university, was that some community members perceived her as a university partner connected to the university-community partnership they were in. Although the researcher explicitly stated that this was not the case and always explained that this study was independent from the university-community partnership, some community members' answers indicated that they did not completely understand it. This is expected to have affected some community members' responses in that community members might have held back information relevant to this research with regard to social desirability.

Finally, the issues with regard to representing the research population will be discussed. The division of respondents between university-community partnerships in this study was somewhat uneven. This might have resulted in a difference of reliability of information between the university-community partnerships. With regard to, community members within university-community partnerships however, the researcher valued the amount of community members more than the division of the community members over the university-community partnerships. This was due to that community members were hard to reach for the researcher. Therefore the number of twelve community members included in the research is considered to be a strength of this study.

Although this study comes with a number of limitations, a major strength of this study is that this study was able to fill a gap within the literature. Most research on university-community partnerships has been done in the United States States (for example, see: Martin, Smiths & Phillips, 2005; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; McNall, Reed, Brown & Allen, 2008), whereas this study provided information on the Dutch context. Secondly, this study provided the perspective of the university as well as the perspective of the community. For three university-community partnerships this study succeeded in interviewing both the involved university partners as

well as community members or community partners. This contributed to the reliability of the information, since these perspectives gave the researcher a broad context in which the answers of respondents could be understood. These perspectives also enabled this study to compare the answers of both the community and the university, and to see whether and, when applicable, why these diverged. Moreover, this study contained two types of university-community partnerships, with multiple university-community partnerships per type included in the sample. This contributed to the validity of this study; by determining patterns and themes in these several university-community partnerships, the results of this study can be assumed to be applicable to other university-community partnerships as well.

This study started with the question how different actors perceive the community's experience with collaborating with the university in university-community partnerships. This study concludes that a distinction should be made between transactional and transformational university-community partnerships with regards to this question. Although the main themes found to be relevant in both partnerships are the same, the mechanisms appeared to work differently. A major factor affecting the perception that the community experienced their collaboration with the university in a positive manner, was the ability of both transactional and transformational university-community partnerships to meet the community's needs. Besides outcomes, personal relationships were also perceived to be contributing to a positive experience of the collaboration with the university by the community. Although this study came with some limitations, this study provided useful information with regards to the longed connection between higher education and society (Ministry of ECS, 2015). Future research can focus on continuing to research university-community engagement in the Dutch context, by using the suggestions provided in this study.

## 6. Policy Recommendations

Within The Netherlands, regional collaboration between university partners and the community is stimulated by the Ministry of ECS (Ministry of ECS, 2015). By engaging in regional development, students and researchers are provided with a rich learning and/or research environment, whilst the local region surrounding the university benefits from the involvement of universities in addressing (social issues) within these regions. One way through which universities can engage in regional development, is through university-community partnerships (Boyer, 1996; Martin, Smith & Phillips, 2005; Judd & Adams, 2008). Besides answering the research question, this study also aimed to look for manners to improve university-community partnerships in order to enhance community members' experience with collaborating with the community. Two main policy recommendations resulted from the findings of this study.

### 6.1 Keep up the good work: benefiting the community in university-community partnerships

One of the main findings of this study was that the community tends to experience their collaboration with the university in university-community partnerships rather positively. University-community partnerships were able to provide the community with beneficial outcomes from their participation. The main mechanism behind the positively perceived outcomes for the community, was that the community perceived university-community partnerships to fulfill their needs; whether it was knowledge and services in transactional university-community partnerships, or the urge for a sense of purpose in life in transformational university-community partnerships. In other words, university-community partnerships in the Netherlands succeed in benefiting the community in university-community partnerships. Therefore, one of the main policy recommendations of this study for the community is to keep on collaborating with the community as is being done now.

However, the university's perception with regards to beneficial outcomes of transformational university-community partnerships diverged from community members' perception of beneficial outcomes. Whereas the university perceived personal development and knowledge to be important outcomes community members gained from collaborating with the community, the community perceived the opportunity to (re)gain a sense of purpose in their lives provided by transformational university-community partnerships as the most important beneficial outcome of collaborating with the university. Personal development was perceived as a side-effect.

Although this did not have any effect on the community's experience with their collaboration with the university in this study, this finding indicated that community members and the university entered the partnership with diverging expectations of the partnership. Discussing expectations have been found to be contributing to the effectiveness of university-community partnerships in benefiting both the university and the community (Martin, Smith & Phillips, 2005). Thereby, this study makes a small and feasible recommendation to the university to invest in collecting the community members' experiences and expectations beforehand as well as during the partnership. This could simply be done by asking community members once in a while about their experiences and expectations of the

partnership. By collecting the community's experiences and expectations, the university can reflect on whether the goals of the partnership are still aligned with the community's expectations. Thereby, university-community partnerships will be even better able to adapt to the community's needs.

## **6.2 Make room for personal connections in university-community partnerships**

Another finding of this study was that personal connections between the university and the community contributed to the collaborative process between the community and the university. Personal connections were developed through activities and conversations that enabled the interchange of perspectives and experiences between the university and the community. At the beginning of university-community partnerships however, personal connections were not yet established and therefore community members engaged in hesitant attitudes towards the partnership. In order to facilitate a collaborative process from the start of the university-community partnership, this study recommends the university to include time and space at the beginning of university-community partnerships for the establishment of personal connections.

When including time and space in the program of university-community partnerships, perceived boundaries between the community and the university can be crossed at the beginning of university-community partnerships. Therefore, hindrance of the collaborative process due to perceived boundaries by community members is minimized. Transactional university-community partnerships appeared to be quite effective in this already, with, for example, larger community-engagement organizations' permanent location within their target community. For transformational university-community partnerships, this could be done through a couple of meetings at the beginning of the partnership in which the university and the community have conversations and do activities that encourage 'making space': community members and the university learning about each other's habitus through activities and conversations that stimulate the interchange of perspectives and experiences (Dostilio et al., 2012).

A clash between the university structures such as educational terms and research subsidies limited to a particular time frame could be expected, and the inclusion of room and time for developing personal connections in university-community partnerships can be expected. University-community partnerships are sometimes under time pressure, and therefore have to function in a limited time frame. However, since the development of personal connections facilitates the collaborative process in university-community partnerships, it might be that the achievements of goals in university-community partnerships goes faster when personal connections are established firstly.

## References

- Alcantara, L., Harper, G. W., Keys, G. B. (2015). ““There’s Gotta Be Some Give and Take””: Community Partner Perspectives on Benefits and Contributions Associated with Community Partnerships for Youth.’ *Youth & Society*, 47(4), 462-485.
- Benneworth, P. (2013). ‘University Engagement with Socially Excluded Communities.’ In P. Benneworth (Ed.), *University Engagement with Socially Excluded Communities* (pp. 3-32). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Benneworth, P. & Humphrey, L. (2013). ‘Universities’ Perspectives on Community Engagement.’ In P. Benneworth (Ed.), *University Engagement with Socially Excluded Communities* (pp. 165-188). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Blamey, A., & Mackenzie, M. (2007). Theories of change and realistic evaluation: peas in a pod or apples and oranges?. *Evaluation*, 13(4), 439-455
- Boyer, E. L. (1996). ‘The Scholarship of Engagement.’ *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 1(1), 11-20.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). ‘Symbolic Power.’ *Critique of Anthropology*, 4(13-14), 77-85.
- Bingle, R. C., Clayton, P., & Price, M. (2012). ‘Partnerships in Service Learning and Civic Engagement.’ *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, 1(1), 1-20.
- Bingle, R. C., & Hatcher, J. A. (2002). ‘Campus-Community Partnerships: the Terms of Engagement.’ *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(3), 503-516.
- Bruning, S. D., McGrew, S., & Cooper, M. (2006). Town–gown relationships: Exploring university–community engagement from the perspective of community members. *Public Relations Review*, 32(2), 125-130.
- Butcher, J., Bezzina, M., Moran, W. (2011). ‘Transformational Partnerships: A New Agenda for Higher Education.’ *Innovative Higher Education*, 36(1), 29-40.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge (MA), United States: Belknap Press.
- Cushion, C., & Jones, R. L. (2006). ‘Power, Discourse, and Symbolic Violence in Professional Youth Soccer: The Case of Albion Football Club. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 23(2), 142-161.
- De Gregorio, J. & Lee, J. (2002). ‘Education and Income Inequality: New Evidence from Cross-Country Data.’ *Review of Income and Wealth*, 48(3), 395-416.
- Dostilio, L. D., Harrison, B., Brackmann, S. M., Kliewer, B. W., Edwards, K. E., Clayton, P. H. (2012). ‘Reciprocity: Saying What We Mean and Meaning What We Say.’ *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 19(1), 17-32.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2011). *Qualitative Research Methods*. London, United Kingdom: SAGE Publications.



- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). 'Review of Community-Based Research: Assessing Partnership Approaches to Improve Public Health.' *Annual Review of Public Health, 19*, 173-202.
- Judd, A. H., & Adams, M. H. (2008). 'Lessons Learned from a Decade in a University-Community Partnership: Keys to Successful Engagement and Outreach.' *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(3), 117-128.
- Kline, C., Asadian, W., Godolphin, W., Graham, S., Hewitt, C., & Towle, A. (2018). 'From "Academic Projects" to Partnership: Community Perspectives for Authentic Community Engagement in Health Professional Education.' *Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-Engaged Research, Teaching, and Learning, 4*(1), 79-96.
- Lamont, M. & Molnar, V. (2002). 'The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences.' *Annual Review of Sociology, 28*, 167-195.
- Leiderman, S., Furco, A., Zapf, J., & Goss, M. (2003). Building partnerships with college campuses: Community perspectives. (Monograph: A publication of the Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education's Engaging Communities and Campuses Program). The Council of Independent Colleges.
- Martin, L.L., Smith, H., & Phillips, W. (2005). 'Why Are Innovative University-Community Partnerships Important?' *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal, 10*(2), pp. 2-15.
- May, T., & Perry, B. (2013). 'Translation, Insulation, and Mediation.' In P. Benneworth (Ed.), *University Engagement with Socially Excluded Communities* (pp. 199-221). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- McLure Wasko, M. & Faraj, S. (2005). 'Why Should I Share? Examining Social Capital and Knowledge Contribution in Electronic Networks of Practice.' *MIS Quarterly, 29*(1), 35-57.
- McNall, M., Reed C. S., Brown, R., & Allen, A. (2009). 'Brokering Community-University Engagement.' *Innovative Higher Education, 33*, 317-331.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science. (2015). '*De Waarde(n) van Wetenschap: Strategische Agenda Hoger Onderwijs en Onderzoek 2015-2025.*' Retrieved from: <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/beleidsnota-s/2015/07/07/de-waarde-n-van-weten-strategische-agenda-hoger-onderwijs-en-onderzoek-2015-2025>.
- Pinheiro, R., Langa, P. V., & Pausits, A. (2015). 'The Institutionalization of Universities' Third Mission: Introduction to the Special Issue.' *European Journal of Higher Education, 5*(3), 227-232.
- Qiaoming Lui, A. & Besser, T. (2003). 'Social Capital in Community Improvement Activities by Elderly Residents in Small Towns and Rural Communities.' *Rural Sociology, 68*(3), 343-365.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). 'The Prosperous Community.' *The American Prospect, 4*(13), 35-42.

- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York (NY), United States: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.
- Reynolds, N. P. (2014). 'What Counts as Outcomes? Community Perspectives of an Engineering Partnership.' *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 21(1), 79-90.
- Roper, C. D., & Hirth, M. A. (2005). 'A History of change in the Third Mission of Higher Education: the Evolution of One-Way Service to Interactive Engagement.' *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 10(3), 3-21.
- Sandy, M. & Holland, B. A. (2006). 'Different Worlds and Common Ground: Community Partner Perspectives on Campus-Community Partnerships.' *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13(1), pp. 30-43.
- Shalabi, N. (2013). 'Exploring Community Partners' Perspectives of the Nature of Service-Learning Partnerships in Egypt.' *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 1(1), 80-91.
- Skilton-Sylvester, E. & Erwin, E. K. (2000). 'Creating Reciprocal Learning Relationships Across Socially-Constructed Borders. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7(1), 65-75.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Strier, R. (2011). The construction of university-community partnerships: Entangled perspectives. *Higher Education*, 62(1), 81-97.
- Thomas, L. (2002). 'Student Retention in Higher Education: The Role of Institutional Habitus.' *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(4), 423-442.
- Tyron, E. & Stoecker, R. (2008). 'The Unheard Voices: Community Organizations and Service-Learning.' *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(3), 47-59.
- Ward, E., Buglione, S., Dwight, E. G., & Saltmarsh, J. (2013). 'The Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement.' In P. Benneworth (Ed.), *University Engagement with Socially Excluded Communities* (pp. 165-188). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Weerts, D. J. & Sandmann, L. R. (2008). 'Building a Two-Way Street: Challenges and Opportunities for Community Engagement at Research Universities.' *The Review of Higher Education*, 32(1), 73-106.
- Winter, A., Wiseman, J., & Muirhead, B. (2006). 'University-Community Engagement in Australia: Practice, Policy and Public Good.' *Education, Citizenship, and Justice*, 1(3), 211-230.
- Worrall, K. (2007). 'Asking the Community: A Case Study of Community Partner Perspectives.' *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(1), 5-17.