University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

12-1-2007

Where's the Justice in Service-Learning? Institutionalizing Service-Learning from a Social Justice Perspective at a Jesuit University

Sondra Cuban

Jeffrey B. Anderson

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceslgen

Recommended Citation

Cuban, Sondra and Anderson, Jeffrey B., "Where's the Justice in Service-Learning? Institutionalizing Service-Learning from a Social Justice Perspective at a Jesuit University" (2007). *Service Learning, General*. 220.
https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceslgen/220

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Service Learning at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Service Learning, General by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

Equity & Excellence in Education, 40: 144–155, 2007
Copyright © University of Massachusetts Amherst School of Education
ISSN 1066-5684 print / 1547-3457 online
DOI: 10.1080/10665680701246609

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Where's the Justice in Service-Learning? Institutionalizing Service-Learning from a Social Justice Perspective at a Jesuit University

Sondra Cuban and Jeffrey B. Anderson

We attempt to answer *where* the social justice is in service-learning by probing *what* it is, *how* it looks in the process of being institutionalized at a Jesuit university, and *why* it is important. We develop themes about institutionalizing service-learning from a social justice perspective. Our themes were developed through an analysis of service-learning research focused on institutionalization and social justice, and a case study of a Jesuit university attempting to institutionalize it, including five faculty action research service-learning projects. From these themes, we share lessons that we learned from this experience.

THE QUESTIONS

We begin our story of institutionalizing service-learning from a social justice perspective at a university with a figurative query: "Where's the justice in service-learning?" This question reframes the discourse begun by Janet Eyler and Dwight Giles (1999) in their landmark book, *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning,* where service-learning encompassed multiple forms of knowledge, including social justice. We, like other authors in this issue, do more than *include* social justice. We focus on it as a process and larger effort within the service-learning field as well as parallel to it as an approach to socio-historical relationships. We come to this question assuming that social justice and service-learning are separate, inter-related approaches to education and to social change. We present here an approach to service-learning that combines with social justice, and we also focus on its potential for institutionalization in a university context.

Our literature review explores what service-learning is from a social justice perspective—its conceptual relationship and why it is important for institutionalization. Our case study examines these established concepts in a particular context, adding innovative aspects, to show how service-learning from a social justice perspective looks in the process of being institutionalized. Our themes and lessons emerged from our literature review and our case study. As part of our case study, we include an analysis of our experiences as service-learning faculty fellows doing action research at a Jesuit university (Seattle University) with a specific social justice mandate.[1] The themes derived from our study underscore the importance of having an explicit social justice worldview, the complexity of participant relationships, the myriad outcomes, and the fragile nature of service-learning relationships that exist between community programs and a university. Based on our research, our recommendations address a type of service-learning that goes beyond the better known approach to service-learning based on civic engagement models (that is, involving students in public contexts but not challenging them with social issues).

Defining the Terms: Institutionalization, Service-Learning, and Social Justice

For conceptualization purposes, it is important to define the terms—institutionalization, service-learning, and social justice:

Institutionalization. Elkholm and Trier (quoted in Pickeral, 2002) define institutionalization as "a developmental process that appears during and after the implementation of an innovation [and] is used in a routine manner... accepted by the users as something normal that is expected to continue" (p. 3). In this case, we are examining the exploration, implementation, expansion, and sustainability of service-learning as a university program (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Holland 2000).

Address correspondence to Sondra Cuban, 20 Dunbarton Road, Lancaster LA1 33X, UK. E-mail: s.cuban@lancaster.ac.uk

#7922

The focus is on the innovation—service-learning—as it diffuses throughout the university and formal curriculum to the point that it becomes a normal part of the culture, even enhancing it (Pontbriand, 2003; Pickeral, 2002). Shelly Billig (2002) depicts several stages of institutionalization that are helpful in presenting our research. First, an institution adopts an innovation (service-learning). Then, leaders implement it in different departments, ensuring that it permeates across a university. University members come to support it is a permanent feature, and it then embeds in normal university functions. She acknowledges its fragility (Billig Pickeral, 2002) and that the process is fraught with tensions, as numerous external and internal barriers come in to play.

Service-Learning. There are many approaches to and definitions of service-learning. These definitions are framed through a number of conceptualizations that range in breath, depth, and outcomes for participants (Butin, 2004). We can imagine these conceptualizations as grains on a spectrum, ranging from thin to thick consistencies (Morton, 1995), rather than as a black or white dichotomy (e.g., social change vs. charity). In this case, we are noting two ends of the continuum from *social change* (which is considered to be political) to *charity* (which is considered to be technical) conceptualizations, at either end of the scale to highlight their different implications for practice.

Technical conceptualizations of service-learning are common. The focus is on changing the attitudes and behaviors of students to better fit with academic purposes, a thinly-grained consistency for service. Students may volunteer at a soup kitchen for a semester to learn about general issues of homelessness and to satisfy course requirements for community service. Service-learning, in this sense, has been defined as a

> credit-bearing, educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility. (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995, p. 112)

Service-learning, through the technical conceptualization, pays surface attention to social problems and is experienced by volunteer and recipient as charity. Participants volunteer service through an agency, and they do not analyze the complex conditions, causes, and consequences of issues, such as homelessness (Kahne & Westheimer, 1996). This technical conceptualization can also be seen as a form of noblesse oblige (Brown, 2001), in which universities adopt service-learning as a culturally enlightened activity that gives them a "human face" with lip service to community service (Zlotkowki, 1999). The technical conceptualization is highly palatable to university administrators because it promotes a type of hyper-pragmatism that avoids power issues and can attract a range of sponsors (Scott, 2004).

A political conceptualization, at the opposite end of the spectrum, is thick or dense by comparison because it addresses both surface and underlying societal problems. This approach to service-learning entails correcting power imbalances, taking the perspective of and advocating for marginalized groups, and harnessing resources for social change with universities as major change agents (Butin, 2004). In addition, politically-conceptualized service-learning projects collectively engage participants in solving social problems at a systemic level, rather than holding individuals personally accountable and proposing a one-time, short-term, band-aid approach (Kahne & Westheimer, 1996). Students and faculty together critically analyze social issues, such as homelessness, with the dual purposes of understanding and contributing to socio-political changes, while proposing aid for homeless communities (Wade, 2007, this issue). Yet, this political conceptualization may conflict with the market-driven, accountability pressures on universities that (1) avoid power analyses, (2) are entrenched in a status quo, and (3) prioritize individual effort (Apple, 1999; Hessler, 2000; Vogelsang & Rhoades, 2004). According to Boyle-Blaise et al. (2006), only 1% of all service-learning activities take this political perspective.

Social Justice. Our social justice perspective focuses on the Jesuit understanding of social justice[2] but also includes the civil rights perspective of social justice because of its influence on contemporary Jesuits and service-learning participants. Social justice, for the Jesuits, focuses on social class inequities: putting the needs of the poor and vulnerable first, transforming the role of the economy to better serve people, emphasizing the right of all people to be treated with dignity and to engage in productive work with decent and fair wages, and to organize and join unions. Social justice, in this Jesuit understanding, requires community participation, solidarity with other humans, and care for the earth (U.S. Catholic Bishops, 1999, p. 1).

This Jesuit perspective is closely related to but not exactly the same as the Civil Rights Movement, which centered social justice as an effort to overcome systemic race inequalities, illustrated most lucidly by Martin Luther King. In 1963, King wrote in, *Letters from Birmingham Jail*:

> Justice too long delayed is justice denied.... Perhaps it's easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say, "Wait." But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim... when you see the vast majority of your twenty million Negro brothers smothering in an airtight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society... then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait. (p. 334)

Social justice educators, Adams, Bell, and Griffith (1997), define "a socially just society"

> as one in which the distribution of resources is according to need so that all members have their basic needs met. In addition, all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure, are able to develop their full capabilities and are capable of interacting democratically with others. All people also have a sense of their potential and actual power as well as a sense of social responsibility toward others and society as a whole. (p. 3)

They apply the concepts of social justice to social justice education by emphasizing principles of personal safety in interpersonal relationships, attention to the here and now, sensitivity to group dynamics, use of students' viewpoints to launch dialogue, and fostering social awareness and social action (Adams, Bell, & Griffith, 1997) Although the university where this study takes place is strongly influenced by the Jesuit concepts of social justice, these civil rights-based concepts have a stronghold in the College of Education, and this is evidenced in some of the faculty fellow action research projects with their attention to race and gender (to be discussed).

These social justice ideals aligned well with the roots of service-learning in social movements (Hessler, 2000) as distinct from the tradition of service-learning with roots in civic engagement, as discussed above. Civic engagement, currently popular in government agency agendas focusing on student "character development," is often not problematized for its general focus or its conformist outcome of becoming a "good citizen." This model, commonly expressed in terms such as: "Citizenship Education," "Civic Engagement," and "Social Responsibility" (Brown, 2001; Howard, 2003), is often confused with social justice because it shares participatory characteristics and uses democratic rhetoric embodied in the political conceptualization. Yet, a social justice perspective in service-learning, as we shall see, is occupied on the opposite end of the continuum.

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND SERVICE-LEARNING: PRINCIPLES AND PEDAGOGY FROM THE LITERATURE

There is a small body of literature linking social justice to service-learning. This literature situates service-learning as an instrument of social justice, a means toward an end, with outcomes geared toward transforming systems and activating the social citizenship of disenfranchised groups (Butin, 2006a; Keith, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 2005; Vogelsang & Rhoades, 2004). Examples focus on questioning and addressing gender, race, and class inequities, challenging dominant assumptions about power, leadership, and democracy, and establishing community voice in the process of radical social transformation (Bickford & Reynolds, 2002; Rimmerman, 1997; Wade, 2001; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

We have drawn upon three social justice service-learning frameworks to structure our service-learning conceptualization: Wade (2001), Brown (2001), and Westheimer and Kahne (2004). Wade's (2001) model presents eight important principles of social justice service-learning that takes into account all of the stakeholders, and highlights its value-based, activist nature within classrooms and communities. Brown's (2001) approach locates service-learning as a Freirean "pedagogy of hope" in which experience is tied to critical analyses of systemic issues and power "of deeply embedded roots of racism, discrimination, violence and disempowerment." (quoting Leistyna & Woodrum in Brown, 2001, p. 20). Westheimer and Kahne (2004) have focused on justice-oriented citizenship. This model seeks to critique, change, and address systemic social problems. The authors conclude that it is less important to ask whether democratic values are being prized; of far greater importance is to question the kinds of values that are promoted in practice.

This body of literature is important for its focus on integrating social justice principles and pedagogy into service-learning. At the same time, although these three models describe the dimensions of social justice in terms of general principles and apply them to service-learning pedagogy and social movements, they give insufficient attention, in our view, to specific contexts (i.e., the type of learning situation) and to actors' identities within organizations. Furthermore, they assume that a social justice perspective automatically leads to desirable political outcomes (Vogelsang & Rhoades, 2004). Donahue (2000) has shown that with teachers in pre-service training, political conceptualizations of service-learning may offer more ambiguity in practice. He notes that concepts such as responsibility, participation, service, and empowerment are problematic and can have different meanings for different audiences in different situations. Therefore, a contextualized view of social justice as an approach to service learning is important. We return to that after examining what we mean by the "institutionalization" of a social justice approach to service-learning.

Institutionalization Literature: Mainstreaming Service-Learning

Scholars have proposed three models for institutionalizing service-learning into universities: Furco's (2002a, 2002b, 2003) self-assessment model, Holland's (2000, 2004a, 2004b) engagement model, and Zlotkowski's (1999) dimensional model, all of which help to conceptualize the formal stages and the organizational backing that is needed to embed service-learning. These models, however, do not address the social justice outcomes discussed above.

Andrew Furco's model focuses on the degree to which service-learning is institutionalized in universities. It focuses heavily on the strategic coordination needed to accommodate service-learning at different stages of institutionalization (Gelmon, Sherman, Gaudet, Mitchell, Trotter, 2004). These stages of institutionalization intersect with dimensions of a service-learning system that impact the likelihood that service-learning will be institutionalized. Some important dimensions are: Philosophy and Mission of Service, Institutional Support, and Community Participation and Partnerships. Although at more advanced stages of institutionalization, the Furco model contains drawbacks (e.g., emphasizing breadth over depth) and gaps (e.g., neglecting contextual factors. See Butin, 2006a; Gelmon et al., 2004), it has potential for including a social justice perspective.

Holland's (2000, 2004a, 2004b) institutionalization matrix builds on Furco's framework but goes one step further to highlight democratic notions of the engaged campus and pedagogy in higher education. She also develops Furco's community partnership dimension, deepening his ideas of voice.

Zlotkowski's model (1999) emphasizes democratic aspects of Holland's framework, such as reciprocity and the common good, and the model moves beyond generic civic engagement to focus on social practices. His main rationale for service-learning is that the "social imperative for service has become so urgent that the university cannot afford to ignore it" (p. 81). Still, he pays little attention to the actual supports and competencies needed to sustain service-learning institutionally or what its full integration would look like in practice.

The institutionalization literature points to the importance of strong infrastructural supports for service-learning, especially if we are to take a social justice perspective. It also references the internal and external barriers that prevent university faculty from implementing service-learning, whether from a technical perspective of civic engagement or from a political perspective of social justice education.

Barriers that Prevent Service-Learning from a Social Justice Perspective from Being Institutionalized

Internal Barriers. Studies have shown that university faculty lean toward the academic (that is, technical or civic engagement) outcomes of service-learning (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Ward, 1998). Faculty may adopt it because they see service-learning as a more effective way to help students develop academic skills, not for the positive values it has for broadening students experience or linking them to social change in communities (Lisman, 1998). Extrinsic faculty rewards like grants, scholarly publications, leadership, and salary incentives may be more critical for untenured faculty, many of whom are motivated by a mix of professional objectives and academic prestige. Moreover, logistical issues may facilitate the adoption of civic engagement (see Abes et al., 2002; Gelmon et al., 2004; Holland, 1997, 2003; O'Meara, 2003; Ward, 2003). Challenges for faculty to adopt a social justice perspective on service-learning might include resistance to a social change framework, lack of commitment to goals, restrictions on the use of external funding, the university priority given to research over service, and a prescribed curriculum (Adams et al., 1997; Wade, 2001). Furthermore, a social justice approach would assume that faculty had competencies in social analysis and activism (see Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

Other internal barriers involve administrators who worry about the university image, status, and marketing issues. They might not want to advertise service-learning, as it is considered to be "touchy-feely" and does not fit with conventional university notions of "excellence" (Butin, 2004; Hessler, 2000). Or, service-learning may sound too militant and reinforce a mutinous perception as a "counter-normative pedagogy" (Howard, 2003, p. 1), polluting liberal academic environments and instilling politically-based dispositions in students (Butin, 2004; Westheimer, 2006; Wilson, 2005). Proponents may soften the tone so as not to attract critics and be perceived as trying to turn universities into "movement halfway houses" (Snarr, 2003, p. 1). One leader, for example, recommends focusing on the "less provocative concept of community as a way to depoliticize service-learning and smooth its introduction into schools" (Donahue, 2000, p. 447). A technical conceptualization of service-learning as civic engagement may be promoted as a result of these barriers.

External Barriers. External barriers to the adoption of a social justice orientation to service-learning involve community-based agencies. Although there are some studies of community-based perceptions of service-learning projects (Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray, 2001; Holland & Gelmon, 2003; Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, n.d.; Strand, Marullo, Stoeker, Cutforth, & Donahoe, 2003), scholars have not paid as much attention to the impact of service-learning on community partners or service-learning as part of a holistic community studies project (Butin, 2006b). The issues have not been well conceptualized and deficit assumptions abound about who the "community" is and the appropriateness of their "needs" to the skills and resources of universities (Brown, 2001). Sometimes called "collaborative" in practice, service-learning partnerships may result in one-way exploitative relationships, especially when agencies train students who accrue cultural capital for their resumes and move on to the next course, leaving the community services agencies with a labor shortage. Yet, from the university perspective, community-based agencies are being served well through student volunteerism (Brown, 2001). Although the small body of community-oriented research has helped to embed service-learning in larger university goals and in interdisciplinary curriculum that extend beyond its walls, researchers have concentrated on academic outcomes and competencies of students that range from critical thinking to personal development (Eyler et al., 2001; Wade, 2001). Largely neglected have been the experiences of community workers, the development of their competencies and skills, and other issues in their organizations and communities. These types of barriers are difficult to break.

Due to the issues and concepts discussed (and not discussed) in the literature, we decided to study these issues through a case study approach, in order to learn more about the process of institutionalizing service-learning using a social justice perspective at a university that was already familiar with social justice as part of its religious mandate. Although Seattle University was interested in institutionalizing service-learning with social justice, there was no compass to guide the process. However, the proponents of service-learning at the university had Jesuit resources, best practices, some leadership in service-learning, and community members who were willing and interested in engaging in it.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CASE STUDY

We present a "snapshot" of a Jesuit university, Seattle University, attempting to institutionalize service-learning from an explicitly social justice perspective to illustrate its process and conditions. While certain aspects of the institutionalization literature (e.g., infrastructural supports and barriers) and the social justice literature (e.g., the focus on community participation, social transformation, and empowerment) were useful for analyzing how these components were put into motion at our university (for example, identifying and explaining the role of the Center for Service or the mission and philosophy), we base much of our case study on action research, an approach more compatible with the social justice service-learning values we endorse (Lytle, 1997; Strand et al., 2003). Action research, like service-learning, uses collaborative-based methods to empower people to take action on social problems that affect their daily lives and develops new knowledge and practices in the process of making change. We include five action research projects in our case study to illuminate the range of issues involved in this process and to view service-learning institutionalization issues in fresh and close-up ways. We develop themes about institutionalizing service-learning from a social justice perspective, from our case study, and from our literature review.

In our presentation of the data, we use a case study approach to demonstrate a comprehensive view of a complex problem (Yin, 1994). Case studies, due to their descriptive and evaluative nature (Yin, 1994), are able to address the "why and how" of a particular phenomenon—in this case, the institutionalization of service-learning from a social justice perspective at Seattle University. Critical cases (Seidman, 1991), or instrumental case studies (Berg, 1998; Stake, 1995), offer opportunities to see nuanced processes and to understand how events unfold under special circumstances; in this case, a Jesuit university wrestling with institutionalizing service-learning from a social justice perspective.

Case studies, when embedded with action research, offer intimate views of the actors experimenting with service-learning projects (Lytle, 1997). Five action research projects of service-learning Faculty Fellows were included in the case study in order to present a more personalized process view of institutionalizing service-learning from a social justice perspective.

We used Strauss and Corbin's (1990) grounded theory to develop themes about institutionalization. First, we conducted a literature review and identified general issues about institutionalizing service-learning from a social justice perspective (as discussed above). Then, we developed a case study of Seattle University based on the compatibility of its core mission to a social justice orientation for service-learning and an analysis of the elements of service-learning institutionalization found in the literature review. After that, we examined five recent action research projects by College of Education Faculty Fellows as examples of this university's specific initiatives so that we might gain insight into the process of institutionalizing social justice-oriented service-learning. These sources were all re-contextualized into larger themes and lessons about institutionalizing service-learning from a social justice perspective. We present our themes and lessons at the conclusion of this study.

The Jesuit Social Justice Background for Service-Learning

Jesuit priests founded Seattle University in Seattle, Washington, in 1891 to instill a Jesuit education into a fast growing northwest populace and to participate in the city's development and governance. Like many of the other 28 Jesuit colleges in the U.S., Seattle University has a small student body to keep with its purpose to educate for personal, social, and spiritual development.

With its Catholic service ethic, Jesuit intellectual traditions, and commitment to social justice ideals, the university offered fertile ground to develop an interdisciplinary social justice agenda through service-learning, providing students and faculty with opportunities to address social inequities and engage in community-based advocacy with local organizations. The mission of the university focuses on a number of Jesuit values, such as care, diversity, faith, and academic excellence with justice leadership as a priority. The unification of service-learning under the mission is not uncommon in Catholic Jesuit schools (Battistoni, 2003). For all these reasons, we decided to use the Jesuit concepts of social justice as our major framework.

The service-learning rationale extends from Jesuit leaders who, for decades, have called for a restructuring of higher education to focus on justice issues, particularly poverty. These universities promote justice education, which is at the core mission of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits). Jesuits believe that service-learning "offers a potent and engaged pedagogy consonant with the long and successful history of Jesuit education, consistent with the central tenets of Ignatian spirituality, and compatible with the Jesuit focus on educating students for a just society" (Fleming, 1999, p. 7). Particularly, Jesuit education uses experiential education in order to fully engage students in changing social structures, "liberat[ing] the oppressed" (Arrupe, 1973, ¶1), and cultivating a character of "men-and-women-for-others" (¶2).

The Center for Service and Community Engagement

Although service-learning had become an integral part of this university's academic curriculum over the past 15 years, its increased institutionalization was advanced through its Center for Service and Community Engagement (Center). The Center's purpose is directly tied to this university's mission—encouraging students to question and reflect on their assumptions, and to become advocates for the many surrounding community-based organizations in the Seattle region. The Center also establishes community partnerships, supports faculty to implement service-learning, and gives all university members leadership opportunities in service-learning.

The Center director reports directly to the Provost's office and develops and administers service-learning opportunities for university and community participants. During the 2004–2005 year, the Center focused on developing best practices, giving workshops, making placements, and hosting community discussions. Many of these discussions related to a university-community collaboration between the university and Tent City 3, an encampment of homeless activists and residents who lived on campus for one month. The role of the Center is critical to an understanding of the social justice orientation to service-learning at Seattle University, as well as its institutionalization.

The College of Education as a Model and Leader of Service-Learning on Campus

The university's survey of the level of commitment to social justice curricula and faculty development and research among the Colleges started an important conversation about its level of integration and interest, related to instituting a five-year plan for social justice education. The College of Education (COE), noted themes of collaboration, diversity, and global perspectives that pervaded all of their programs. All programs within the College of Education were viewed as exploring social justice, and it was something that faculty wanted to develop more fully (Schmitt & Guest, 1999). COE faculty developed a task force in 2000, which organized a day- long workshop on faith and justice with the President sharing his vision and experiences with his life in justice and prompting questions that COE faculty could ask each other and students. The COE also developed a definition of social justice and a mission statement that were aligned with the university mission.

In 2003–2004, COE faculty created a social justice course with a strong service-learning component. Many faculty members in the College soon offered courses with elements of service-learning. This interest was facilitated by the Academic Service-Learning Faculty Fellows (ASLFFP) program of the university whose aim was to implant social justice and service-learning, across the College of Education and all university-wide Colleges and Programs.

Academic Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program (ASLFFP)

Based on the Eastern Michigan University model, ASLFFP was created to improve the quality of service-learning at Seattle University and link it to social justice through a Faculty Fellowship program. ASLFFP's proponents argued for the need of a critical mass of faculty support to enhance the social justice aspect of academic culture in the university. The term "academic" signals the program's institutionalization aim. Since ASLFFP was organizationally supported by the Provost's office, the program has high visibility on campus, as well as having access to liberal funding to support Fellows' professional development needs. ASLFFP also coordinated activities with the Center.

Each year, a group of full-time faculty members across various Colleges were (and continue to be) selected as Faculty Fellows. Fellows receive a $1,000 stipend as well as funds to purchase service-learning materials and to attend service-learning conferences. Fellows learn general principles of service-learning and social justice from both a Jesuit perspective and a civil rights perspective and how to integrate them into their courses. They leave the Program with a revised syllabus, experience linking academic content and a social justice perspective of service-learning, data regarding how service-learning impacts students and the community, lists of community partners, and membership in a growing university-wide service-learning network. They also design a service-learning action research project that focuses on social justice.

The process of conducting action research follows a systematic process whereby Fellows develop research questions, a data collection plan, data analysis procedures, and then they analyze their results. The Fellows' final reports contain revisions to make with the targeted course, and they present these and their experiences to new Fellows as well as to community organizations. This faculty interaction and the networks it establishes are further ingredients of the institutionalization process.

Five Fellow Action Research Projects in the College of Education

Five Fellows' action research projects (from 2004–2005) were analyzed as a subset of the case study. The Fellows came from interdisciplinary programs in the College of Education (School Psychology, Adult Education, Curriculum and Instruction, and Teacher Education). Their projects focused on various social justice issues over one or two ten-week course periods.

The first Fellow ran a course entitled Multicultural Perspectives. The course focused on helping students to develop relationships with anti-racist organizations and to become anti-racist activists. The Fellow's action research project focused on student reactions to this topic and their attitudes and experiences as they read about white privilege, kept journals, engaged in service-learning in local anti-racist organizations, exchanged ideas, and developed projects and portfolios. The Fellow assessed students' demographic traits and their previous involvement with anti-racist issues and correlated this to their current experiences. The Fellow discovered that, although some of the students complained and a few refused to do their projects, most students learned how to advocate, raise consciousness, and develop relationships with anti-racist organizations, thus helping them to meet the Fellow's objectives. The Fellow became a bridge between the organizations and the Center, helping to establish formal relationships where none previously existed.

A second Fellow ran a School Psychology final-year seminar that engaged students in 15 hours of service-learning in local family-oriented agencies. Students reflected on instructor-designed social justice questions that focused on structural factors and systemic barriers faced by clients. Students wrote essays about their experiences and presented them as a panel. The Fellow assessed the students' competencies and created themes about their responses. These themes fit core standards of school psychologists. She discovered that their experiences were considered to be highly valuable to them, especially in understanding what a just and compassionate society would offer families in support and help. Community agencies were not assessed.

Another Fellow taught a course called Issues in Adult Basic Skills with the aim of getting students to develop knowledge about feminism, political advocacy skills, and relationships with local agencies that serve migrant women. Students engaged in 30 hours of service-learning, read texts, and heard speakers on women and literacy issues, exchanged ideas on a public listserv devoted to women and literacy, kept journals, and developed action research projects that focused on research and advocacy for agencies and their clients. The university students presented their findings to their classmates, to the agency staff, and to the public. In addition, the agencies evaluated the university students' work. The Fellow developed themes of her students' work. She found that while the university students complained about the workload and the operational issues of the organizations, they gained a sense of complexity about the problems, as well as some advocacy skills that they previously lacked. The agencies used the students' research to seek grants, to develop courses, and to make cases for clients so they could get access to services that were unavailable to them.

Another Fellow offered a course over two ten-week periods called Social Justice in Professional Practice. Her action research project focused on learning about whether students had developed competencies, awareness, and knowledge about social justice issues in education. The students also were expected to develop relationships with the agencies where they did their service-learning. The Fellow conducted observations of students, collected their log entries and action research projects, and organized the data into themes. She found that students chose agencies that linked to their own personal histories and were relevant to their careers. But they also experienced a great deal of frustration when they faced barriers at the agencies (paperwork and clearances). The Fellow surmised that students had developed more of a sense of a duty to serve and to use their professional skills for social justice causes as well as to advocate in the workplace.

The fifth Fellow's course was entitled, Service Leadership for Social Justice. In the course pre-service teachers (preK–12) read about social justice issues, researched them through a peer process, and wrote a reflective report on social justice issues in teaching. They also engaged in 35 hours of service-learning in school classrooms and community agencies that had had long-term relationships with the Teacher Education program and developed an action research project that they presented in a conference for other university students, school teachers, and community agencies. The outcomes of their projects included increasing city funding for human service agencies, obtaining housing for migrant workers, and advocating for stores to move into poor neighborhoods. Through follow-up evaluations the Fellow learned that many students continued conducting service-learning with a social justice perspective in their school classrooms.

Overall, findings of the Fellows' action research projects indicated that their students had rewarding experiences. Students were able to complete their projects within the established time frame, understood more deeply a wide range of social justice concepts, and expanded their perceptions of their roles and responsibilities in acting upon social justice issues in both their personal and professional lives.

But there were problematic issues too. Faculty Fellows realized that conducting service-learning from a social justice perspective is a complex endeavor that takes time, prior knowledge, and commitment on the part of themselves and the students. They also noted that while sending students into the community over the course of a ten-week academic quarter is helpful in assisting community organizations to address their day-to-day operating needs, in order to address underlying causes of the problems the agencies were tackling it is necessary to develop and sustain longer term in-depth partnerships.

This finding confirmed survey results and interviews with the 18 fellows in 2004, 83% of them continued to use service-learning in at least one course mainly to enhance students' commitment to social justice and ethical leadership. While they also felt that service-learning fit with the university mission, they said that it was not easy to do, and they needed much support.

FOUR THEMES FROM THE CASE STUDY

We developed four themes about institutionalizing service-learning with a social justice perspective from both our literature review, the Jesuit mission that permeated the curricula, the Center for Service and Community Engagement, and the ASLFFP action research projects. We highlight five of the Faculty Fellow action research projects' findings that were part of our case study. These themes are: (1) social justice worldview, (2) attention to developmental processes, (3) blended outcomes, and (4) recognition of fragile boundaries.

A Social Justice Worldview

Stemming from its Jesuit mission, a social justice perspective permeates all aspects of university programs—from the Center for Service and Community Engagement to its Faculty Fellowship program to the program for Jesuit Identity to building plaques displaying the mission. These mechanisms, somewhat addressed in the institutionalization literature as normed practices and in the social justice literature as community participation, support a worldview and the groundwork for service-learning with a social justice perspective to flourish. This worldview is presented explicitly to new faculty during Faculty Institutes, and it is enhanced for university students when they receive explicit instruction about social justice. Similarly, community-based agencies that regularly work with the university have an understanding of this commitment and have built-in expectations about a continuing relationship. A number of the action research projects, for example, demonstrated that this shared worldview indeed developed among faculty, the students, and community-based organization members. One community director stated that the students' project "would benefit the clients that we serve.... This knowledge will empower [the clients] to speak up and speak out on political issues that may concern them."

Attention to Developmental Processes

By our examination of several Faculty Fellow projects in-depth, we determined that applying a developmental lens to the processes of service-learning yielded important information. With this analytical approach, we discerned that faculty were able to establish student growth points and community-based agencies whose qualitative evaluations of students' behaviors and attitudes were in alignment. These critical issues were side-stepped in the previous body of literature, which focused on general rather than specific processes and on students more than faculty or community agency members. One Fellow had students self-assess on a cultural competence instrument; students used this information to determine the types of competencies they needed to develop in their service-learning projects. Students also got feedback from community agencies, participated in on-line discussions to obtain feedback from peers, and submitted electronic portfolios to the instructor to demonstrate their processes and progress. This was reinforced in the Fellowship program where Fellows were given opportunities to reflect on their own development—one of the more salient features of the program that they appreciated.

Blended Outcomes

Again, primarily by examining the ASLFFPs, we discovered that sponsoring a social justice perspective might lead one to conclude that political knowledge is the most important outcome in service-learning projects or that all faculty and students think alike because of a similar worldview. Yet, all of the service-learning participants, including community agencies, expressed many political views. In addition, the Fellows' action research projects revealed that the outcomes for students included increasing levels of critical thinking and cultural competence and developing a stronger service ethic. These outcomes were often mixed together. The institutionalization literature does not acknowledge this conflation. Yet, the seamless integration of personal with professional formation did link the students' service-learning to something larger than the university context; one Fellow reported that preservice teachers continued to use service-learning from a social justice perspective in their school classrooms after their university course was over.

Recognition of Fragile Boundaries

Fellows reported that many students appeared to come away from their experiences with a deeper sense about the complex nature of community-based organizations; students often recorded in their journals that the agencies' cultures were "chaotic" or were like a "catch-22" as they juggled multiple issues, for example, lack of funding, heavy workloads, organizational problems, and handling clients' needs and interests as they changed or turned out to be different from agency goals. Likewise, some agency directors observed that some of the university students were sensitized to their everyday problems. One director, who was facing severe cutbacks, stated that the university students enabled her to get help for projects that she was unable to fit into the agency's day-to-day work schedule. The fragility of the relationships were not often obvious to students until they experienced a problem in their service-learning site and would express it to their university classmates or write about it in journals. Some students noted that the difficulties faced by the agencies (which were not mentioned in brochures or reports) translated into poor supervision of their projects. One Fellow provided an "open space" in her university classroom so students could express these kinds of concerns, exchange strategies with each other, and learn to negotiate the "hidden curriculum" of the agency. Another Fellow chose loosely-knit activist organizations to collaborate with so that the students could learn what it was like to be an activist fostering changes that might not occur in formal organizations due to funding and bureaucratic pressures. Examining these fragile boundaries, as experienced by agency workers, faculty, and students, offered a rare and close-up view on the processes of service-learning institutionalization (Billig, 2002; Pickeral, 2002).

LESSONS FROM OUR EXPERIENCES

Although Seattle University had sufficient infrastructural support, such as the Center for Service, ASLFFP, and a model COE—as well as a strong determination to institutionalize service-learning from a Jesuit social justice perspective, external and internal barriers (discussed above) still came into play. From our thematic analysis, we learned that a social justice worldview is a starting point; university-community relationships do not exist naturally, but rather, take time, commitment, expertise, and a lot of work to grow—much more than a ten-week academic quarter provides.

The relationships, subsequently, need to be negotiated and nurtured on a constant basis through many different sources so that they may grow. We learned that the developmental processes of student and faculty (e.g., moving from complaining to critique) were heavily determined both by academic culture (time to reflect) and societal forces (economic pressures on institutions). Furthermore, Swaminathan (2007) discusses how competencies are socially constructed and problematically applied in practice.

We learned that community agency outcomes could conflict with university goals, causing student disappointment and frustration. These reactions may have served as barriers to their serving as critical links in the process of creating partnerships for service-learning institutionalization.

Lastly, we learned that the relationships between agencies and universities often break and then heal only to break again as they deal with new demands and actors; external barriers were especially strong. We found that internal and external barriers to institutionalizing service-learning from a social justice perspective can be reduced, but they do not disappear.

So, where is the justice in service-learning? Our case study and themes highlight how a justice orientation, rooted in the very policies and practices of an institution (e.g., ASLFFP, the Jesuit mission, the Center for Service), as well as the willingness of community agencies to participate, creates a climate and commitment for service-learning from this perspective to emerge. Other pre-conditions are important too. All service-learning participants—faculty, community agency members, and students—need to increase their attunement to their own practices as well as to other practices that are less familiar as the basis for creating bonds and allegiances across sites of privilege and power. Furthermore, as some of the projects showed, students can bridge areas of need in small but important ways as they become sensitized to community-based agencies, focusing on the struggles and steps in making social change, all the while recognizing the fragility of their actions. One student stated, "Small wins matter." This expression reflects the Jesuit tradition of education in the persistent pursuit of justice; as Pedro Arrupe (1973) declared, "The struggle for justice will never end" ("The struggle never ends, " ¶1). But desire and spirit are not enough for the Jesuits for, as Arrupe added, technologies are necessary. For this long-term endeavor, faculty, like students, would need to develop finely tuned practices for sustaining service-learning from a social justice perspective. They may need anti-oppression training and opportunities to immerse themselves into communities to understand how to perpetually nurture collaborations while respecting boundaries and changing needs of community-based organizations. Community-based agency staff can co-teach and dialogically engage with one another, with students, and with faculty on issues that matter and telling their stories (Bell, Horn, & Roxas, 2007; Swaminathan, 2007). While activism (for students, faculty, and community-based agencies) may be prioritized as part of a social justice perspective of service-learning, the skills to enact it and an awareness about its processes and goals need to be addressed first and foremost as part of the larger goals of institutionalization.

NOTES

The authors thank the other Faculty Fellows who submitted their action research projects and summaries to us for our analysis: Pamela Taylor, Kay Beisse, and Laurel Stevahn.

1. Social justice is a major theme of Jesuit education (Arrupe, 1973; Fleming, 1999) that has a distinctive tradition from other social movements. The Jesuit social justice mandate is highlighted in Seattle University's mission statement. The mission emphasizes "the service of faith and the promotion of justice to address issues of poverty, injustice, discrimination, violence, and the environment in knowledgeable, committed, and effective ways." (Seattle University Mission, How we educate, n.d., ¶3).

2. The College of Education at Seattle University, for example, has adopted the social justice definition by Adams, Bell, and Griffith (1997) for teaching as well as service-learning, using it in conjunction with Jesuit traditions of social justice. Modern-day Jesuits typically acknowledge their involvement with the civil rights movement and/or its influence on Jesuit institutions.

REFERENCES

Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*(1), 5–17.

Adams, M., Bell, L. E., & Griffith, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook.* New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. (1999). Freire, neo-liberalism and education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 2,* 5–20.

Arrupe, P. (1973, July). Men for others. Tenth International Congress of Jesuit Alumni of Europe. Valencia, Spain. Retrieved January 24, 2007, from http://www.creighton.edu/CollaborativeMinistry/men-for-others.html

Battistoni, R. M. (2003). What is good citizenship? In S. Jones (Ed.), *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (2nd ed., pp. 179–186). Providence, RI: Brown University, Campus Compact.

Bell, C. A., Horn, B. R., & Roxas, K. C. (2007). We know it's service, but what are they learning? Preservice teachers' understandings of diversity. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40*(2), 123–133.

Berg, B. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bickford, D., & Reynolds, N. (2002). Activism and service-learning: Reframing volunteerism as acts of dissent. *Pedagogy, 2*(2), 229–252.

Billig, S. (2002). Adoption, implementation, and sustainability of K-12 service-learning. In A. Furco & S. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning the essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 245–270). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Boyle-Blaise, M., Brown, R., Hsu, M-C., Jones, D., Prakash, A., Rausch, M., Vitols, S., & Wahlquist, Z. (2006). Learning service or service learning: Enabling the civic. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 18*(1), 17–26. [Electronic version]. http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/articleView.cfm?id=70

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2,* 112–122.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 71*(3), 273–290.

Brown, D. (2001). *Pulling it all together: A method for developing service-learning and community partnerships based in critical pedagogy.* Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service. National Service Fellowship Program.

Butin, D. W. (2004, October). Service-learning and the post-modern condition. Paper for the 4th Annual International Conference on Advances in Service-Learning Research. Greenville, SC.

Butin, D. W. (2006a). The limits of service-learning in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 29*(4), 473–498.

Butin, D. W. (2006b, January). *Where is community studies in higher education? Institutionalizing a scholarship of engagement.* Panel presentation. American Association of Colleges & Universities. Washington, DC.

Donahue, D. (2000). Charity basket or revolution: Beliefs, experiences, and context in pre-service teachers' service learning. *Curriculum & Inquiry, 30*(4), 429–449.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1999). *Where's the learning in service learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, J. S., Giles, D. E., Stenson, C. M., & Gray, C. J. (2001). *At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions, and communities, 1993–2000.* Retrieved January 24, 2007, from http://www.compact.org/resources/downloads/aag.pdf

Fleming, J. J. (1999). *The emerging role of service learning at Jesuit universities. Explore: A quarterly examination of Catholic identity and Ignatian character in Jesuit higher education.* Santa Clara, CA: Bannan Institute for Jesuit Education and Christian Values.

Furco, A. (2002a). Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. *The Journal of Public Affairs, 6*(1), 39–68.

Furco, A. (2002b). *Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service learning in higher education. A project of Campus Compact.* Providence, RI: Brown University.

Furco, A. (2003). *In* Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. *In S. Jones (Ed.), Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (2nd ed., pp. 11–14). Providence, RI: Brown University, Campus Compact.

Gelmon, S., Sherman, A., Gaudet, M., Mitchell, C., & Trotter, K. (2004). Institutionalizing service-learning across the university: International comparisons. In M. Welch & S. Billig (Eds.), *New perspectives in service learning: Research to advance the field* (pp. 196–217). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Hessler, H. B. (2000). *Composing an institutional identity: The terms of community service in higher education.* Retrieved September 27, 2006, from http://wac.colostate.edu/llad/v4n3/hessler.pdf

Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 4,* 30–41.

Holland, B. (2000). Institutional impacts and organizational issues related to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Special Issue*(Fall), 52–60.

Holland, B. (2003). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. In S. Jones (Ed.), *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (2nd ed., pp. 253–256). Providence, RI: Brown University,

Holland, B. (2004a, November). *Building a sustainable strategy and sustaining service-learning/civic engagement.* Presentation to Washington Campus Compact. Seattle, WA.

Holland, B. (2004b). Levels of commitment to engagement, characterized by key organizational factors evidencing relevance to institutional mission [matrix]. Retrieved on January 24, 2007, from http://www.henceonline.org/resources/institutional

Holland, B., & Gelmon, S. (2003). The state of the engaged campus: What have we learned about building and sustaining university-community partnerships? In S. Jones (Ed.), *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (2nd ed., pp. 195–198). Providence: Brown University, Campus Compact.

Howard, J. (2003). Academic service learning: A counternormative pedagogy. In S. Jones (Ed.), *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (2nd ed., pp. 57–62). Providence, RI: Brown University, Campus Compact.

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (1996). In the service of what? The politics of service learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77*(9), 593–599.

Keith, N. Z. (2005). Community service learning in the face of globalization: Rethinking theory and practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 11*(2), 5–24.

King, M. L., Jr. (1963). Letter from Birmingham jail. In G. Albert (Ed.), *Service-learning reader: Reflections and perspectives on service* (pp. 331–342). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Experiential Education.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Differing concepts of citizenship: Schools and communities as sites of civic development. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness.* (pp. 69–80). New York: Teachers College Press.

Leiderman, S., Furco, A., Zapf, J., & Goss, M. (n.d.). *Building partnerships with college campuses: Community perspectives.* Private Higher Education's Engaging Communities and Campuses Grant Program. Retrieved on January 24, 2007, from http://www.cic.edu/publications/books_reports/index.asp

Lisman, C. D. (1998). *Toward a civil society: Civic literacy and service learning.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Lytle, S. (1997). On reading teacher research. *Focus on Basics, 1*(A), 19–22.

Morton, K. (1995). The irony of service, charity project, and social change in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 2*(Fall), 19–32.

O'Meara, K. (2003). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. In S. Jones (Ed.), *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (2nd ed., pp. 263–276). Providence, RI: Brown University, Campus Compact.

Pickeral, T. (2002). *Learning that lasts.* Retrieved September 26, 2006, from http://www.kwfdn.org/events/high_school/leadership/2002_06/servicelearning.pdf

Pontbriand, B. J. (2003). The sustaining factors of service-learning at a national leader school: A case study. In S. H. Billig & J. Eyler (Eds.), *Deconstructing service-learning: Research exploring context, participation, and impacts* (pp. 103–121). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Rimmerman, C. (1997). *The new citizenship: Unconventional politics, activism, and service.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

Schmitt, S., & Guest, K. (1999). *Self assessment of our commitment to justice.* Unpublished report. Seattle, WA: Seattle University, College of Education.

Scott, J. B. (2004). Rearticulating civic engagement through cultural studies and service-learning. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 13*(3), 289–306.

Seattle University Mission. (n.d.). How we educate. Retrieved January 4, 2007, from http://www.seattleu.edu/home/about_seattle_university/mission/

Seidman, I. E. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and social sciences.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Snarr, M. (2003). The university of social justice: Beyond community service, colleges educate for social change. *Sojourners Magazine, 32*(3), 28–30.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strand, K., Marullo, S., Stoeker, R., Cutforth, N., & Donahoe, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education: Principles and practices.* New York: Wiley.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Swaminathan, R. (2007). Educating for the "real world": The hidden curriculum of community service learning. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40*(2), 134–143.

U.S. Catholic Bishops. (1999). *Sharing Catholic social teaching: Challenges and directions: Reflections of the U.S. Catholic bishops.* Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Vogelsang, L. J., & Rhoades, R. A. (2004). *Advancing a broad notion of public engagement: The limitations of contemporary service learning.* Retrieved January 5, 2007, from http://www.collegevalues.org/seereview.cfm?id=1017

Wade, R. (2001). *And justice for all: Community service-learning for social justice.* Issue paper for the Education

Commission of the States. Retrieved January 24, 2007, from http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/29/13/2913.htm

Wade, R. (2007). Service-learning in the elementary classroom: Can we get there from here? *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40*(2), 156–165.

Ward, K. (1998). Faculty development for service-learning: Lessons learned. In Corporation for National Service (Ed.), *Expanding boundaries: Serving and learning* (pp. 33–35). Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.

Ward, K. (2003). Addressing academic culture: Service learning, organizations, and faculty work. In S. Jones (Ed.), *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (2nd ed., pp. 257–262). Providence, RI: Brown University, Campus Compact.

Westheimer, J. (2006). Politics and patriotism in education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(8), 608–612.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237–269.

Wilson, R. (2005, December 16). We don't need that kind of attitude. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A8.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Zlotkowski, E. (1999). *Pedagogy and engagement.* In R. Bringle, R. Games, & E. A. Malloy (Eds.), *Colleges and universities as citizens* (pp. 96–120). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sondra Cuban is a lecturer in Educational Research at Lancaster University. Her current research focuses on migrant women workers in the care sector in northern England.

Jeffrey B. Anderson is professor of Education at Seattle University where he works in the Master in Teaching Program and directs the Academic Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program. His research interests include service-learning in K-12 and teacher education, moral education, and supervision of instruction.