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ABSTRACT

Service-learning and Jesuit pedagogy have each been the subject of numerous studies and journal articles, particularly throughout the last 40 years. The purpose of this study was to connect these two bodies of research and identify fundamental characteristics that must be present in order for service-learning to conform to Jesuit pedagogy. This study includes an analysis of the core documents of Jesuit education, an examination of research pertaining to service-learning, and a review of literature related to identity development, reflection, social justice, and cultural immersion. The result is a framework of five characteristics (social justice, solidarity, service, reflection, and academic rigor) essential for service-learning to meet the demands of Jesuit pedagogy.
INTRODUCTION

For the last nine years, I have worked as a mathematics instructor at a Jesuit high school in a northern suburb of Chicago. As a member of the faculty, I was expected to participate in the development of my students both through my role in the classroom as well as through involvement in furthering the mission of the school by participating in co-curricular activities. In order to achieve this second objective, I have been involved in a range of service-learning opportunities with students over the years. I have traveled to Appalachia to build homes, lived on a Lakota Sioux reservation and assisted in home repair, served meals in Chicago area soup kitchens, collected books to donate to schools overseas, and most recently co-created and led a two week immersion experience in East Africa.

Although each of these experiences has appeared to be worthwhile and positive for both student and teacher, I am not certain that pedagogically the experiences will be long lasting (i.e. enable students to seek out similar experiences on their own) or integrated (i.e. synthesized and analyzed within the explicit curriculum of a Jesuit college preparatory high school). As a Jesuit educator charged with the responsibility of ensuring students have “achieved considerable knowledge of the many needs of local and wider communities and [are prepared] for the day when he or she will take a place in these communities as a competent, concerned, and responsible member,” my prior experiences have raised questions about the structure of service and the benefit of service.
requirements, particularly in the context of Jesuit secondary education (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 5). That is, how do experiences of service-learning reflect the goals and values presented in the core documents of Jesuit pedagogy?

In order to undertake such an exploration, it will first be necessary to develop a working knowledge of Jesuit spirituality and Ignatian Pedagogy in order to understand how service-learning fits within the broader structure of Jesuit education. Jesuit secondary schools are guided by three primary documents, the Profile of the Graduate of a Jesuit High School at Graduation, originally written in 1981 and commonly referred to as the “Grad at Grad” outcomes, The Characteristics of Jesuit Education, and the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm (IPP), a guide for structuring effective curriculum contained within the document Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach. By conducting an analysis of these core documents and other supporting documents, a foundation will be created from which examining service-learning as a learning tool within Jesuit secondary schools can be conducted.

Additionally, it will be necessary to identify working definitions for “service,” “service-learning” and “cultural immersion” as such terms are sometimes used interchangeably but have distinct differences. Definitions for each of these terms are not universally recognized; therefore to adequately define each will be an emphasis of the following research. This will be achieved by examining various existing definitions of each term in order to create working definitions of service, service-learning and cultural immersion for the purpose of this research. An overview of existing frameworks for service-learning will also be included to inform the creation of a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context, the ultimate goal of this study.
As service, service-learning, and cultural immersion have been studied extensively, the research presented here includes a review of existing literature on the topic. In that a comprehensive summary of existing studies is a tremendous undertaking and beyond the scope of this analysis, specific research pertaining to this study has been selected for inclusion. That is, studies pertaining to identity development, reflection, social justice, and cultural immersion programs have been selected as they are most closely related to the objectives of this study.

Following this review of literature, the focus shifts to looking at service-learning programs in practice. This is done by profiling several service-learning programs; programs taking place in public and private, Catholic and Jesuit, secondary and university settings across the country. The goal of profiling specific programs is to help understand how theory is applied in practice and to identify possible pitfalls or shortcomings of service-learning programs before a framework for service-learning in Jesuit secondary schools is put forth.

**Purpose of this Study**

Within the context of the foundation documents for Jesuit pedagogy, the goal of this study is to develop a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context. A secondary goal is to determine if the characteristics of such a framework distinguishes service-learning and cultural immersion programs taking place in Jesuit secondary schools from programs at other institutions. In other words, is service-learning in a Jesuit context distinctive? The creation of this framework derives from fundamental tenets that identify Jesuit pedagogy as well as an analysis of existing service-learning programs. Ultimately, the end result will be a framework of criteria, based on Jesuit ideology and
the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm as well as research done at the secondary and post-secondary levels (Jesuit, non-Jesuit and secular) on structuring service-learning programs. Such a framework will discern and articulate what criteria must be satisfied in order for service-learning programs to be characterized as demonstrating the elements of Jesuit pedagogy. The goal is that this framework can be used by Jesuit secondary schools to develop new programs or to evaluate existing programs, however, such analysis is beyond the scope of this project.
CHAPTER I

IGNATIAN PEDAGOGY, JESUIT SPIRITUALITY & THE APOSTOLATE OF JESUIT EDUCATION

At present, the Society of Jesus operates forty-six secondary schools in the United States and Puerto Rico, educating roughly 50,000 adolescents annually. Additionally, the Jesuits have been a presence in American higher education since Georgetown University was established in 1789 and are responsible for twenty-eight colleges and universities across the country today. These current statistics reflect over 500 years of educational tradition, dating back to the first Jesuit school in Messina, Italy, founded in 1548.

With such a long history of involvement in education, it is not surprising that Jesuits have developed a distinct educational philosophy, following certain guiding principles that characterize Jesuit institutions. As well, Jesuits and Jesuit educators maintain that they have created distinctive pedagogy influenced by the life and teachings of St. Ignatius, founder of the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits).

During his lifetime, Ignatius approved the foundation of forty Jesuit schools in Europe (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 185). At the same time, he was in the process of writing the Constitutions of his new religious order. Part IV of the Constitutions serves as

the best source for the explicit and direct thought of Ignatius on the apostolate of education, even though it was largely completed before he realized the extensive
role education was to play in the apostolic work of Jesuits. The priorities in the formation of Jesuits became priorities of Jesuit education: a stress on the humanities, to be followed by philosophy and theology, a careful orderly advance to be observed in pursuing these successive branches of knowledge, repetition of the material and active involvement of the students in their own education”


Ignatius planned to further develop principles for governing all Jesuit schools derived from the concrete experiences of those engaged in education, but he died before such a compilation could be created (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 188). Following his death, the number of Jesuit schools continued to increase and the need for a unifying set of principles was even more necessary. To meet this need, a group of Jesuits convened and began drafting what would become the *Ratio Studiorum*, or “Plan of Studies.” This document, in its final form, is a handbook to assist teachers and administrators in the daily operation of the school; it is a series of “rules” or practical directives regarding such matters as the government of the school, the formation and distribution of teachers, the curriculum and method of teaching. Like Part IV of the *Constitutions* it is not so much an original work as a collection of the most effective educational methods of the time, tested and adapted for the purposes of the Jesuit schools.


While effective during its time, Jesuit education today “does not and cannot form the unified system of the 17th century” for which the *Ratio Studiorum* was written, due to the sheer number of Jesuit schools spread across continents in numerous countries.
(International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 197). Instead, to meet the demands of such diverse educational settings, “A structure imposed on all schools throughout the world has been replaced by the distinct needs of different cultures and religious faiths and the refinement of pedagogical methods that vary from culture to culture” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 197). Although the contexts and cultures served vary greatly and Jesuit education seeks to respond to such variations, a common “way of proceeding” is expected; that is, “the inspiration, values, attitudes and style which have traditionally characterized Jesuit education, which must be characteristic of any truly Jesuit school today wherever it is to be found” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 9).

In an attempt to define and maintain this “way of proceeding,” Jesuit secondary schools in North America are guided by the Jesuit Secondary Education Association (JSEA). The JSEA defines its mission as providing resources for sustaining the Ignatian vision of Jesuit schools. Following the social, political and religious turmoil of the 1960’s, the JSEA (founded in 1970) began “searching for distinctive and identifiable qualities in [member] schools which would legitimize the adjective Jesuit” (Bailey, 1991, p. 1). This search resulted in the writing of numerous monographs aimed at articulating an Ignatian vision of education. These authoritative texts on Jesuit education were compiled and published in 1994 as Foundations. The documents contained within Foundations “intend to establish the bases, delineate the principles and provide the hidden supports for the dynamic renewal process, which [had] been taking place within Jesuit secondary education” from 1970 to 1993 (Meirose SJ, 1994, p. 1). Meirose, SJ believed that:
These documents, though published between 1970 and 1993, have much to say in 1994 and beyond to all who collaborate in the ministry of education – a ministry that touches the lives of thousands of students enrolled in Jesuit schools here and abroad. At the practical level the book brings together major documents in the history of the JSEA in a unified format for easy reference and use. (Meirose SJ, 1994, p. 2)

Contained within *Foundations* is the original *Profile of the Graduate of a Jesuit High School at Graduation* (1981) and *Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach* (1993). These two documents have since been published separate from *Foundations* and serve as guiding texts for Jesuit schools today.

While the JSEA focused on Jesuit education in North America, in order to ensure that education taking place in Jesuit schools around the world is characteristically ‘Jesuit,’ Fr. Pedro Arrupe, in his role as Superior General of the Society of Jesus, encouraged the articulation of such defining characteristics in the early 1980’s. He explained that a Jesuit school,

should be easily identifiable as such. There are many ways in which it will resemble other schools...But if it is an authentic Jesuit school – that is to say if our operation of the school flows out of the strengths drawn from our own specific charism, if we emphasize our essential characteristics and our basic options – then the education which our students receive should give them a certain ‘Ignacianidad,’ if I can use such a term. I am not talking about arrogance or snobbery, still less about a superiority complex. I simply refer to the logical consequence of the fact that we live and operate out of our own charism. Our
responsibility is to provide, through our schools, what we believe God and the church ask of us. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 1)

Arrupe’s vision led to the creation of a separate group of Jesuit and lay educators referred to as the International Commission of the Apostolate of Jesuit Education (ICAJE). Formed in 1982, ICAJE sought to address questions about the effectiveness of Jesuit schools worldwide (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 1). In an attempt to develop a clearer and more explicit understanding of the distinctive nature of Jesuit Education, ICAJE composed *The Characteristics of Jesuit Education*. This document was intended to describe “the inspiration, values, attitudes and style which have traditionally characterized Jesuit education, which must be characteristic of any truly Jesuit school today wherever it is found, and which will remain essential as [Jesuit schools] move into the future” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 3). While written in part for Jesuit educators, ICAJE recognized that the document was dense and inaccessible for many working in Jesuit schools. Therefore, *Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach* was written in response to the original publication of *The Characteristics of Jesuit Education* (1986) as a way of making *Characteristics* more approachable for teachers. Both documents have since been revised and republished.

This chapter seeks to present the apostolate of education from a Jesuit perspective with particular emphasis on Jesuit education at the secondary level. That is, why is the Society of Jesus involved in education? What is the mission of Jesuit education at the secondary level? What characterizes Jesuit schools and their graduates? Finally, what
constitutes Ignatian pedagogy? To do so, we will examine the Jesuit Secondary Education Association’s *Foundations* as a means of understanding the mission of Jesuit education. As well, an analysis of the core documents of Jesuit pedagogy (*The Profile of the Graduate of a Jesuit High School at Graduation, The Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, and *Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach*) will be conducted as a means of establishing the fundamental tenets identifying Jesuit pedagogy.

**Jesuit Worldview**

According to the Society of Jesus, the Jesuit worldview is rooted in the life and experiences of St. Ignatius, founder of the Society of Jesus. For Ignatius, all that is good comes from God and all other reality comes from God and has value only insofar as it leads us to a deeper relationship with God (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 41). In this way, the Jesuit worldview is world-affirming. That is, one is encouraged to find God in all things and to see each life experience as an opportunity to lead one to a deeper relationship with God. In contrast to other religious orders that used isolation and separation from society for spiritual development, Ignatius believed experiencing God meant being out in the world. Today, this active, world-focused element of faith development is still evident in Jesuit schools which seek to prepare students for participation in their local communities by promoting service to others (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 43).

In order to approach one’s life as an opportunity to find God in all things, Ignatius strongly believed that the life of Jesus provides the model for human life centered on God’s love and in service of others. Using Christ as an example, Ignatius asks for “the total and active commitment of men and women who, to imitate and be more like Christ,
will put their ideals into practice (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 43). This belief has been translated into Jesuit educational mission as the pursuit of forming “men and women for others” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 7) and a foundational commitment to a faith that does justice with a particular concern for the poor and marginalized (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 43).

In addition, Ignatius emphasized an ongoing process of discernment and reflection to evaluate how effectively one was following Christ’s model and using the world to grow closer with God. This constant examination was meant to bring about what Ignatius referred to as the “magis” – the more. “His constant concern was for greater service of God through a closer following of Christ…The concrete response to God must be ‘of greater value’” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 43). The idea of “magis” is interpreted by Jesuit institutions to mean pursuing excellence through continual evaluation and reevaluation of what can be done to better serve students and communities.

Such a worldview, emphasizing involvement in the world, reflection, and service of others as a means of promoting a faith that does justice, guides Jesuit educational institutions and Ignatian pedagogy which will be examined in more depth later in this chapter.

**Philosophy of Jesuit Education**

The aim of Jesuit education has never been simply the acquisition of a store of information and skills or preparation for a career, though these are important in themselves and useful to emerging Christian leaders. The
aim of Jesuit secondary education is, rather, that full growth of the person which leads to action – action that is suffused with the spirit and presence of Jesus Christ, the Man for Others. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 167)

Jesuits maintain that through a deliberate process of formation, rooted in *The Spiritual Exercises* of Saint Ignatius, Jesuit schools work to “transform how youth look at themselves and other human beings, at social systems and societal structures, at the global community of humankind and the whole of natural creation” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 19). The goal is that students of competence, conscience, and compassion will emerge with knowledge “ready to embrace and promote all that is fully human” resulting in a commitment to work in defense of “the freedom and dignity of all peoples…in cooperation with others equally dedicated to the reform of society and its structures” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 17).

Charged with the apostolic mission of Saint Ignatius, Jesuit secondary education often exists within a context that is, in part, opposed to the realization of that objective. That is to say, the prevailing North American cultural and economic ideology:

reduces the human world to a global jungle whose primordial law is survival of the fittest. Students who subscribe to this view want to be equipped with well-honed professional and technical skills in order to compete in the market and secure one of the relatively scarce fulfilling and lucrative jobs available. This is a success, which many students (and parents) expect. (Kolvenbach, 2001, p. 11)

As Peter-Hans Kolvenbach suggests above, writing in his role as Superior General of the Society of Jesus, American education is so focused on financial gain as a measure of success that the humanistic openness with which Jesuit institutions intend to form their
charges is commonly entangled with a culture that does not promote service of others, particularly the poor and marginalized. Jesuit institutions, with their imperative to “find God in all things,” must be careful to avoid reducing education to a conduit for the professional and economic advancement of particular members of society, ultimately serving the interest of individual power and prestige rather than advocating for justice as intended. Likewise, Jesuit education seeks to overcome the “naïve notion that all education, regardless of its quality or thrust or purpose, will lead to virtue” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 14). Rooting youth with a strong sense of self, intertwined with a radical responsibility to others, becomes a difficult task in the context named by Kolvenbach. Therefore, Jesuits describe the mission of their pedagogy in this way:

Education in Jesuit schools seeks to transform how youth look at themselves and other human beings, at social systems and societal structures, at the global community of humankind and the whole of natural creation. If truly successful, Jesuit education results ultimately in a radical transformation not only of the way in which people habitually think and act, but of the very way in which they live in the world, men and women of competence, conscience and compassion, seeking the greater good in terms of what can be done out of a faith commitment with justice to enhance the quality of peoples' lives, particularly among God's poor, oppressed and neglected. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 19)
That is, Jesuit education seeks to balance preparing students with the knowledge and skills necessary for entry into an ever-changing workplace while also forming reflective, responsive global citizens committed to serving others and promoting social justice.

To achieve such a goal, the Society of Jesus approaches education as a “carefully reasoned investigation through which the student forms or reforms his or her habitual attitudes towards other people and the world” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 15). Such a focus seeks to undermine primarily utilitarian and selfish motivations for education and shift towards a pedagogy for faith and justice. The Society of Jesus expresses this shift by describing its mission as:

the service of faith of which the promotion of justice is an essential element [where] a new world community of justice, love and peace needs educated persons of competence, conscience and compassion, men and women who are ready to embrace and promote all that is fully human, who are committed to working for the freedom and dignity of all peoples, and who are willing to do so in cooperation with others equally dedicated to the reform of society and its structures. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 17)

To educate in such a manner requires assisting students in entering into “the sacrifice and joy of sharing their lives with others [and] helping them to discover that what they most have to offer is who they are rather than what they have” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 18). In this way, Jesuit education encourages students to not only learn about the world, but to be in the world. At the same time, it seeks to “transform how youth look at themselves and other human beings, at social
systems and societal structures, at the global community of humankind and the whole of natural creation” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 19). Therefore, Jesuit education must be structured in such a way as to allow students to experience themselves in relation to others, while also providing the knowledge and skills to address complex issues – particularly those faced by the poor and marginalized. The aim is to create persons “educated in faith and justice, who have a powerful and ever growing sense of how they can be effective advocates, agents and models of God’s justice, love and peace within as well as beyond the ordinary opportunities of daily life and work” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 17).

**The Spiritual Exercises: A Guide for Jesuit Education**

Jesuits understand their pedagogy to be rooted in the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius. With the intent of re-examining and restating traditional Jesuit strategies in education, Robert Newton, SJ, composed *Reflections on the Educational Principles of the Spiritual Exercises* (1977), a monograph later included in *Foundations*. In his essay, Newton uses the Spiritual Exercises to both justify and explain Ignatian pedagogy. According to Newton,

The Spiritual Exercises are a carefully arranged series of activities or exercises by which a retreatant is brought face to face with basic religious realities and is challenged to respond to those realities. The Exercises were based on Ignatius’ own spiritual experience and were modified and refined by him through a lifetime of directing others (both lay and religious) in making the Spiritual Exercises. The Exercises were also the process which Ignatius used to lead individual Jesuits to the same experience of God which had moved him to found the Society of
Jesus…In a sense, the Spiritual Exercises can be seen as a practicum in how to pray and Jesuit education as a practicum on how to learn; and the product of both is a person who can pray and learn in the face of new opportunities and challenges to one’s growth. (Newton, 1991, p. 2, p. 4)

As does Newton, the authoritative texts of Jesuit education (The Characteristics of Jesuit Education, Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach, and The Characteristics of a Graduate of a Jesuit High School at Graduation) point to Ignatius’ Spiritual Exercises, a guide or handbook for spiritual directors, as the underlying methodology for Jesuit education in that it focuses on continuous self-development.

Emerging from the Jesuit worldview described earlier in this chapter, the Exercises incorporate a series of norms that give direction as to both the substance and process of education necessary to maintain a distinctive Jesuit character.

Jesuit educational institutions were founded on the identical assumption which gave purpose to the Spiritual Exercises. Schools and colleges were not intended to be ends in themselves but instruments to aid Jesuits and their colleagues to attain the purpose for which they were created, the knowledge, the love and the service of God…the level of academic success is not the final measure of effectiveness; it is the degree to which the apostolic goal – the greater glory and service of God – is achieved. (Newton, 1991, p. 2-3)

If education is to serve as a means rather than an end in itself, rooting education in real-world experience and structuring the learning process in a manner similar to a spiritual retreat places emphasis on forming critical, reflective thinkers. Thus, “primary emphasis
on how to learn rather than on what is learned” emerges as a pedagogical practice (Newton, 1991, p. 4).

Newton maintains that to structure learning in such a way, the relationship between teacher and student is fundamental. Traditional roles of teacher as the dispenser of knowledge and student as passive recipient would not suffice. Instead, Newton suggests that Ignatius envisioned the relationship between teacher and student should mimic that of the relationship between spiritual director and retreatant. Just as a spiritual director works to guide an individual retreatant through a process of self-discovery, ideally, Jesuit educators assume a role which “helps students become independent learners – someone who can set their own educational objectives, organize programs or activity to achieve them, and accomplish their goals at a pace suited to their ability” (Newton, 1991, p. 9). In this way, the pedagogical role of the teacher is not simply to inform, but rather to help the student progress in the “truth” as illustrated in Figure 1. The teacher-as-guide is responsible for facilitating the relationship between the student (or learner) and the truth where the focus is not on the quantity of course material covered, but rather on the depth of understanding. Such an approach maintains that teachers should “emphasize restraint in doing the thinking for students” as a way of moving students toward higher level thinking skills of application, evaluation, comparison and synthesis (Newton, 1991, p. 8).

Figure 1. Teacher-Learner Relationship (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 27)
In that all students are different and approach learning differently, the teacher-as-guide approach requires a certain amount of individualization. That is, teachers must demonstrate care and concern for each student, referred to as *cura personalis*, or care of the individual person, a hallmark of Jesuit education. *Cura personalis* charges Jesuit teachers with “taking a personal interest in the intellectual, affective, moral and spiritual development of every student, helping each one to develop a sense of self-worth and to become a responsible individual within the community” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 43). *Cura personalis* recognizes that while the primary purpose of education is cognitive and “information, analysis and reflection [can] enlighten the mind, unless the educational process involved the whole person, mind, senses and heart … it would not be a truly human experience which could transform the individual” (Newton, 1991, p. 10). Therefore, according to Newton, Jesuits approach education as a means rather than an end and Jesuit schools seek to form the whole person (intellectually, spiritually, emotionally and physically) to encourage and enable further growth.

**Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm**

The Spiritual Exercises [are] a perfect description of the pedagogical role of teacher as one whose job is not merely to inform but to help the student progress in the truth…The teacher creates the conditions, lays the foundations and provides the opportunities for the continual interplay of the student’s EXPERIENCE, REFLECTION, ACTION. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 26-27)
As the previous quote illustrates, Jesuits view education as growing directly out of the Spiritual Exercises, and the model of Experience, Reflection, Action lays the foundation for a teaching methodology referred to as the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm, or IPP. In contrast to an instructional model where the teacher conveys knowledge to the student, and thereby has a more active role in the learning process than the student, Jesuits believe the introduction of reflection and insistence on a teacher-as-guide role engages the student more actively in the learning process and distinguishes the IPP from historically preceding modes of instruction. The IPP employs five distinct elements: Context, Experience, Reflection, Action, and Evaluation, each of which is important individually, but all of which are intended to work in concert with one another as a pedagogical method. The IPP and its elements will be explained here as the Jesuits understand and use each.

The first element, Context, acknowledges the importance of the role of the educator to understand the reality of the student’s life – the social, emotional, economic, political, and familial realities within which education takes place. This initial step is important so that the educator can assist the student in understanding his or her own life experience with the understanding that if “a student understands the context of his or her own life, he or she will be better able to grasp and appropriate the material presented” (Gallagher and Musso, 2006, p. 2). Just as the Spiritual Exercises begin with an examination of self, the IPP acknowledges that effective pedagogy must be rooted in the lived experience of a student in order to meaningfully place the material to be studied.

Identifying context goes beyond individual examination, however. The IPP maintains that teachers must also conduct an examination of the institutional environment
wherein learning takes place as part of understanding the context of student learning. That is, “the climate of the school may well be the pre-condition necessary before value education can even begin, and … more attention needs to be given to the school environment in which the moral development and religious formation of adolescents takes place” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 40). Jesuit pedagogy emphasizes that to be effective, the personal relationship between teachers and students, the idea of *cura personalis*, is foundational and therefore necessitates the instructor addressing and including student context as a precursor to learning.

Additionally, a Jesuit worldview emphasizes “a ‘preferential option for the poor’ [which] includes those without economic means, the handicapped, the marginalized and all those who are, in any sense, unable to live a life of full human dignity” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 85). Consequently, “the poor form the context of Jesuit education [to the extent that] educational planning needs to be made in function of the poor, from the perspective of the poor” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 88). Jesuit education, therefore, must address both the context of individual students while also centering on the poor. Such an emphasis on the poor and marginalized distinguishes Jesuit education from secular approaches that promote accessing students’ prior knowledge, but do not emphasize the role of the poor.

Moving beyond context, Jesuit educators are challenged to provide a “realistic knowledge of creation…[including] an awareness of the social effects of sin…the injustice, and the need for redemption in all people, in all cultures, in all human
structures…[in essence] the need to be in contact with the world” while also being “involved in the lives of the students, taking a personal interest in the intellectual, affective, moral and spiritual development of every student, helping each one develop a sense of self-worth and to become a responsible individual in the community” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 57, p. 43). To do so requires that educators not only consider context, but that they also are able to provide and facilitate *Experiences* that push students to go beyond cognition of academic material and be in contact with the world as a way to foster engaged citizenship. That is, students must know and understand their context, their unique perspective garnered from a particular life experience, as the starting point for new experiences. The IPP contends that engaging in meaningful experiences “will evoke an affective response to the material which can spur personal as well as intellectual growth” (Gallagher and Musso, 2006, p. 3). Therefore, Jesuit schools are compelled to “provide students with opportunities for contact with the poor and for service to them…in order to come to a better understanding of the causes of poverty” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 89) which requires moving learning “beyond rote knowledge to the development of the more complex learning skills of understanding, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. [In this way, learners] grow as persons of competence, conscience, and compassion” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 31).

Simply providing experiences, however, is not enough. Jesuit pedagogy requires that for experience to be educational, *Reflection* is essential. Reflection refers to
a thoughtful reconsideration of some subject matter, experience, idea, purpose or spontaneous reaction, in order to grasp its significance more fully. Thus, reflection is the process by which meaning surfaces in human experience: by understanding the truth being studied more clearly, by understanding the sources of the sensations or reactions I experience, by deepening my understanding of the implications of what I have grasped for myself and others, by achieving personal insights into events, ideas, truth, or the distortion of truth [and] by coming to some understanding of who I am and who I might be in relation to others. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 49, p. 54)

For reflection to be done effectively, the teacher’s role (as guide) is once again essential. The teacher must challenge students to broaden their perspectives while also inviting them to consider other viewpoints, particularly those of the poor and marginalized. Teachers are charged with facilitating student growth by being ready to challenge students and to help them

reflect on personal experiences so that they can understand their own experience of God. … The educational program, in bringing students into realistic contact with themselves, tries to help them recognize various influences and to develop a critical faculty that goes beyond the simple recognition of true and false, good and evil. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 56)

Utilizing reflection involves learning to “interpret, evaluate, and assign meaning to significant experiences…[which] enable one to consciously act rather than unknowingly
react to and within the circumstances of one’s life” (Gallagher and Musso, 2006, p. 3). In this way, reflection calls for active participation on the part of the student in the process of extracting meaning from experiences. Jesuits see the inclusion of reflection as an essential pedagogical element similar to its role in the Spiritual Exercises. The Exercises focus on the process of self-evaluation as a means of developing greater understanding. Similarly, the element of reflection in an educational setting seeks to integrate context and experience while also leading to a response on the part of the student. In this way, reflection requires looking back (placing experience in the student’s personal context) while also looking forward (what can be done in light of this new understanding?).

Although context, experience, and reflection are essential, to end there would fall short of the Jesuit aims of education in that education and understanding should not be solely for one’s own benefit. Rather, the goal of Jesuit education is to compel Action. Since the Spiritual Exercises emphasize that “love is shown in deeds,” Jesuit education aims to assist “in the formation of men and women who will put their beliefs and attitudes into practice throughout their lives” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 73).

The term action refers to “internal human growth based upon experience that has been reflected upon as well as its manifestation externally...[and] involves two steps: interiorized choices [and] choices externally manifested” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 62). Interiorized choices refer to incorporating new meaning (based on experience and reflection) that becomes part of a student’s value system or point of reference in future situations. In such a way, change is manifested internally. Additionally, this change in values or perspective may cause one
to do something based on this new understanding. In this way, choices may be manifested externally. Action may take different forms, but generally,

The student may choose to accept or reject the truth that has been discovered, or choose to adopt an attitude, predisposition or value by which everything else will be measured. [Likewise,] the student may choose to study a topic more in depth, develop more effective study habits, reconsider a career choice, create a cooperative project or pursue opportunities for service. (Gallagher and Musso, 2006, p. 4)

In that Jesuit education aims to promote “faith that does justice,” the action component of the IPP challenges students to “imitate and be more actually like Christ…[putting] ideals into practice in the real world of family, business, social movements, political and legal structures, and religious activities” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 71). Jesuit education places the focus on “education for justice [where] adequate knowledge [is] joined to rigorous and critical thinking” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 77). In this way, action synthesizes the elements of context, experience, and reflection by forcing students to put into practice new understanding (a refined context), often in the form of new experiences that lead once again to reflection. The goal is the formation of “a new type of person in a new kind of society…[where] each individual has the opportunity to be fully human and accepts the responsibility of promoting the human development of others” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 76).
The ultimate goal of forming “Men [and Women] for Others,” a phrase first used by former Jesuit Superior General Fr. Pedro Arrupe, expresses that Ignatian pedagogy is not satisfied with academic mastery alone (Arrupe SJ, 1991, p. 8). Therefore, Jesuits believe the IPP is not complete without the final step, *Evaluation*. Evaluation seeks to determine whether the process of linking context, experience, reflection and action has taken place. Evaluation can occur both in the form of a teacher evaluating a student or as student self-evaluation. In either case, the goal is that the “student’s attitudes, priorities, [and] decisions may be reinvestigated in light of further experience, changes in his or her context, challenges from social and cultural developments and the like” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 67). In this way, evaluation acts as a checkpoint for determining the effectiveness of the IPP. “Without an effective evaluation process neither an awareness of the real needs nor a responsible response to those needs will be possible. Stagnation or misdirection, instead of conscious commitment to move toward a particular vision, will result” (Gallagher and Musso, 2006, p. 5). Evaluation ties experience and action back to a student’s context and cognitive understanding. As such, it provides the basis for an ongoing pattern of learning, highlighting the cyclical process of the IPP as illustrated in Figure 2 (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 68).

Combining the elements of Context, Experience, Reflection, Action and Evaluation, Jesuits believe the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm accentuates the
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relationship between teacher, learner and subject manner while providing a model for the teaching-learning process that can be used across the curriculum. It is both systematic and methodical as well as personal in that it incorporates structured opportunities for personal reflection into the learning process. Likewise, Jesuits contend that it reflects an Ignatian worldview by focusing on the formation of men and women for others who “gradually learn to discriminate and be selective in choosing experiences; who [are] able to draw fullness and richness from the reflection on those experiences; and who [become] self-motivated…to make conscious, responsible choices;” all of which are characteristics necessary for engaged, responsible citizens (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 69). In this way, Jesuit education is constructed not merely as an avenue for personal advancement, but rather as a means of assisting in “the formation of men and women who will put their beliefs and attitudes into practice throughout their lives” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 73).

**Profile of the Graduate of a Jesuit High School at Graduation**

By using the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm as a tool, the curriculum of Jesuit institutions aims to form “leaders in service, in imitation of Christ Jesus, men and women of competence, conscience and compassionate commitment” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 13). Consequently, the curriculum at Jesuit secondary schools focuses on integrating the academic, spiritual, intellectual and emotional development of each student to achieve this goal. This educational philosophy is summarized by the JSEA in a document called *The Profile of the Graduate at Graduation* (or *Grad at Grad* outcomes). Originally published in 1980 and revised in
2010, the educational outcomes of *Open to Growth, Intellectually Competent, Religious, Loving, and Committed to Doing Justice* reflect an Ignatian desire to form “life-long learners imbued with an Ignatian approach to living shaped by the knowledge, understanding, and use of the interplay of experience, reflection, and action (the dynamic at the heart of the Spiritual Exercises)” (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 1). In this way, the *Grad at Grad* provides an overview of the qualities of graduates deemed most desirable by Jesuit educators; qualities that reflect the essence of a mature, adult faith and those of an engaged, responsible citizen. Additionally, the *Grad at Grad* points to the belief that the Society of Jesus does not solely seek to develop intellectuals, but rather, desires to simultaneously inculcate students in a worldview that emphasizes compassion, mercy and justice. Achieving such an objective relies on the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm as guide.

We will now consider each of the five outcomes individually to demonstrate the importance of each from an Ignatian perspective. That is, why were these five outcomes deemed essential for graduates of Jesuit secondary institutions to possess? Additionally, the five broad outcomes will be examined in an effort to identify specific traits Jesuits point to in graduates that characterize each.

**Open to Growth**

Education, from a Jesuit perspective, is considered a life-long process, the goal of which is “to discover God, present and active in creation and in history” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 39). From this perspective, openness to growth implies that “perhaps even more important than the formation [given] is the capacity and concern to continue [one’s] own formation… [understanding that] it is
important to learn; but it is much more important to learn how to learn, to desire to go on learning all through life” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 46). Discovering God in creation and history challenges Jesuit education to promote dialogue between faith and culture, encouraging students to have contact with and appreciate both their own and other cultures while simultaneously being critical of the contributions and deficiencies of each (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 38). The imperative of “openness” responds to the demands of a society characterized by rapid technological advances and ever-changing social realities. Openness, in this sense, encompasses flexibility and an understanding that one’s education will never be complete.

Additionally, Jesuit education gives attention to developing the creative, imaginative and affective dimensions of each student with the intent of preventing education from becoming solely intellectual. As such, “Jesuit education includes opportunities – through course work and through extracurricular activities – for all students to come to an appreciation of literature, aesthetics, music and the fine arts” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 28). Therefore, openness to growth involves trying new experiences followed by reflection and evaluation, an example of how the IPP is infused into the Grad at Grad outcomes.

Openness to growth can be observed in the student body in a variety of ways. From taking personal responsibility for growth to considering other points of view, from taking on leadership roles to exploring career and life choices, from seeking new experiences to developing habits of reflection; in these and other ways, Jesuit education
aims to develop an openness to growth (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 3).

**Intellectually Competent**

A thorough and sound intellectual formation includes a mastery of basic humanistic and scientific disciplines through careful and sustained study that is based on competent and well-motivated teaching. This intellectual formation includes a growing ability to reason reflectively, logically and critically. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 26)

For Jesuit schools, pursuing the *magis* cannot occur without a focus on academic rigor. Therefore, the goal of developing intellectually competent graduates is a natural consequence. To do so, the pedagogy of Jesuit schools is “structured carefully...in the way that courses build on material covered in previous courses and in the way courses are related to one another. The curriculum should be so integrated that each individual course contributes toward the overall goal of the school” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 161). Additionally, the curriculum is designed to include “analysis, repetition, active reflection, and synthesis; it should combine theoretical ideas with their applications” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 162).

Once again, however, the end goal of Jesuit education is not to simply prepare students for economic success. Rather, intellectual competence implies a desire to “develop the qualities of mind and heart that will enable [students] – in whatever station they assume in life – to work with others for the good of all in the service of the Kingdom of God” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 110).
That is, “the student will have developed many intellectual skills and understandings that cut across and go beyond academic requirements for college entrance” (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 4). In this way, preparing intellectually competent graduates coincides with Arrupe’s goal of forming “men and women for others” in that it means “beginning to develop that critical consciousness which enables one better to analyze the contemporary issues facing men and women and to seek and evaluate the various points of view on these issues from the standpoint of a man and woman for and with others” (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 5).

Intellectual competence may be exhibited in Jesuit schools a number of different ways. To help illustrate, the JSEA provides various examples. For instance, intellectual competence may mean developing problem-solving skills or applying previously acquired skills in a new situation. It may mean connecting current issues to historical antecedents or understanding the complexity of social issues and acting as a responsible, engaged citizen. It also implies academic honesty and integrity, taking pride in one’s own work and accomplishments (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 4-5).

**Religious**

Jesuit schools consider their role to be part of the apostolic mission of the church in building the Kingdom of God and acknowledge that “every aspect of the educational process can lead, ultimately, to worship of God … [and] to help students discover God active in history and in creation (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 93, 36). Therefore, including religious formation as a goal for graduates is logical. Jesuit education seeks to provide “instruction in the basic truths of
[Catholic] faith, … a knowledge of and love for the church and the sacraments, … and concrete experiences of church life” (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 101, 103). It is important to note that Jesuit schools do not intend to graduate only those students who profess and practice the Roman Catholic faith. Rather, the goal encompasses forming students who have a basic knowledge and understanding of the Catholic faith, have had an introduction to Ignatian Spirituality, and who have had the opportunity to examine their own beliefs with an orientation toward God (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 6). As such,

Jesuit education tries to foster the creative Spirit at work in each person, offering the opportunity for a faith response to God while at the same time recognizing that faith cannot be imposed. In all classes, in the climate of the school, and most especially in formal classes in religion, every attempt is made to present the possibility of a faith response to God as something truly human and not opposed to reason, as well as to develop those values which are able to resist the secularism of modern life. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 35)

In this way, religious formation is less about indoctrination into a particular set of beliefs, but rather an orientation toward “a faith that is centered on the historical person of Christ, which therefore leads to a commitment to imitate him as the ‘Man for others’” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 70).

Jesuits believe religious formation does not simply take place in theology courses, however. Instead,
An attitude of pastoral care or *cura personalis* should permeate the school; enabling the seeds of religious faith and religious commitment to grow in each individual by enabling each one to recognize and respond to the message of divine love: seeing God at work in his or her life, in the lives of others, and in all of creation; then responding to this discovery through a commitment to service within the community. A Jesuit school makes adequate pastoral care available to all members of the educational community in order to awaken and strengthen this personal faith commitment. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 63)

Jesuits consider that since every program in the school can be a means of discovering God, religious formation is constant, consistent, ongoing and integrated throughout the school in coursework, athletic endeavors and co-curricular involvement.

Within an individual student, this outcome may manifest itself as taking personal responsibility for exploring one’s own faith, understanding the connection between faith and being a “man or woman for and with others,” or knowing Catholic teaching on moral issues and social justice (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 6).

Likewise, Jesuit education aims to provide each student with an opportunity for a personal experience of God (through prayer, retreat, liturgy, etc.) and to expose them to the Spiritual Exercises at some point prior to graduation (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 6). The goal of forming “religious” graduates is undertaken with the hope that such exposure will lead to the development of a life-long relationship with God.
Loving

In an effort to begin moving students beyond the self-involved nature of adolescence into mature adult faith and relationships, the JSEA established the characteristic “loving” as essential for graduates. ‘Loving’ graduates have a realistic knowledge, love and acceptance of self. That is, Jesuit education seeks to “encourage each student to confront [obstacles] to freedom honestly, in a growing self-awareness and a growing realization that forgiveness and conversion are possible through the redemptive love and the help of God” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 54). The term also implies moving students beyond self-interest and self-centeredness that characterize adolescent development to deeper personal relationships involving vulnerability (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 7). Such a goal arises from the belief that:

Since the truly human is found only in relationships with others that include attitudes of respect, love, and service, Jesuit education stresses – and assists in developing - the role of each individual as a member of the human community. Students, teachers, and all members of the educational community are encouraged to build a solidarity with others that transcends race, culture or religion. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 33)

Within Jesuit schools, working toward the creation of such graduates is evident in activities that promote genuine care for others and healthy communication, especially among persons of other races, genders, religious affiliations, socio-economic backgrounds and sexual orientation with the goal of breaking down personal prejudices and stereotypes (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 7). Additionally,
this outcome implores Jesuit schools to develop graduates who have made specific contributions to the school community as well as those that have experienced support from members of the school community (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 7). In this way, ‘Loving’ graduates can demonstrate a realistic understanding and appreciation of both self and others while acting as committed members of diverse school, local and global communities.

**Committed to Doing Justice**

Since “the Society of Jesus is committed to ‘the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement,’” it follows that the final characteristic Jesuit schools seek to instill in their graduates is a commitment to doing justice (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 7). This goal reflects the world-affirming Ignatian perspective described earlier, one in which God’s presence is found in the world and therefore encourages students to have both a realistic understanding of the world as well as engage it actively in the pursuit of justice. To do so, Jesuit education aims to assist students in acquiring the “knowledge of the many needs of local, national, and global communities” and is preparing each graduate to “take a place in these communities as a competent, concerned and responsible member” (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 8).

Achieving such a goal requires education for justice becomes a main focus of Jesuit schools. By incorporating justice issues into the curriculum, including “an awareness of the social effects of sin: the essential incompleteness, the injustice, and the need for redemption in all people, in all cultures, in all human structures; [and] the need to be in contact with the world as it is” Jesuit schools seek to form students that “know
reality and are able to evaluate it critically” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 57-58). This critical dimension should also be reflected in how Jesuit schools are structured and function. That is, Jesuit schools aim to have “school policy and school life encourage mutual respect; they promote the human dignity and human rights of each person, adult and young, in the educational community” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 79).

Work for justice cannot, however, be merely an intellectual exercise. Although a critical knowledge and understanding of issues present in society is essential, “there is no genuine conversion to justice unless there are works of justice” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 80). As such, Jesuit education encourages students and faculty to be actively engaged in issues present in the community, both local and global. To support such a goal, “there are opportunities in Jesuit education for actual contact with the world of injustice. The analysis of society within the curriculum thus becomes reflection based on actual contact with the structural dimensions of injustice” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 80). This contact with others places education within a larger community and society, enabling Jesuit education to stress values such as “equality of opportunity for all, the principles of distributive and social justice, and the attitude of mind that sees service of others as more self-fulfilling than success or prosperity” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 83).

A commitment to doing justice is consistent with the “preferential option for the poor” made by the Society of Jesus (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 85). As such, Jesuit schools are compelled to provide students
with “opportunities for contact with the poor and for service to them, both in the school and in outside service projects, to enable these students to learn to love all as brothers and sisters in the human community and also in order to come to a better understanding of the root causes of poverty” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 89). Through reflection, contact with the poor provides a means of connecting intellectual understanding with direct, personal experience.

Finally, to be educational, “the promotion of justice in the curriculum…has as one concrete objective an analysis of the causes of poverty” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 90). In this way, service alone is not the end goal, nor does it achieve a commitment to doing justice. Rather, Jesuits believe inviting students to work with the poor and marginalized is a means of exposing students to injustice while simultaneously exposing them to a rigorous, academic social analysis; the combination of which provide the basis for a commitment to doing justice.

Within Jesuit schools, students demonstrate a commitment to doing justice by any number of the following:

- A growing awareness of the global nature of many social problems
- Engaging in public dialogue on environmental issues, practices, and solutions
- Increased understanding of and solidarity with marginalized members of society through direct experience and reflection
- A sense of compassion and a growing understanding of those social changes which will assist all in attaining basic human rights for all
- Ability to reflect on social justice implications of future careers
Beginning to understand the complexity of many social issues and the need for critical reading of diverse sources of information about them

Confronting moral ambiguities embedded in values promoted by Western culture

(Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 8)

In the end, the goal is to develop graduates who have the “skills necessary to live in a global society as a person for and with others” (Commission on Research and Development, 2010, p. 8).

Education and Justice

The final Grad at Grad outcome, “Committed to Doing Justice,” reveals a firm obligation on the part of the Society of Jesus to work towards justice. This obligation was solidified during the 32\textsuperscript{nd} General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, which convened from December of 1974 to March of 1975, to discuss and determine the direction of the Society in the coming years. What emerged from the gathering was an articulation of the mission of the Society of Jesus as “the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement” (32nd General Congregation, 1975, p. 48). This imperative and its rationale are contained within Decree 4 of the document produced by the 32\textsuperscript{nd} General Congregation. For the past 35 years, Jesuit education and subsequent General Congregations have continually sought to further clarify and fulfill this mission.

The emphasis on justice recognizes that the Society of Jesus must respond to “a world increasingly interdependent but, for all that, divided by injustice: injustice not only personal but institutionalized: built into economic, social, and political structures that
dominate the life of nations and the international community” (32nd General Congregation, 1975, p. 52). Jesuit schools, as an extension of the Society, have a responsibility to work to promote justice through education. The 32nd General Congregation maintains “we should pursue and intensify the work of formation in every sphere of education, while subjecting it at the same time to continual scrutiny. We must prepare young people and adults to live and labor for others and with others to build a more just world” (32nd General Congregation, 1975, p. 109).

Building a more just world requires realistic knowledge and experience of the injustices present in our world today. Therefore, the 32nd General Congregation argued for solidarity with the poor, stating, “If we have the patience and the humility and the courage to walk with the poor, we will learn from what they have to teach us what we can do to help them. Without this arduous journey, our efforts for the poor will have an effect just the opposite from what we intend” (32nd General Congregation, 1975, p. 99). That is, without personal experience with the poor and marginalized to understand issues and solutions from their perspective, work for justice will be incomplete and may even unintentionally support systemic injustice. Additionally, the 32nd General Congregation concluded that “It is from faith and experience combined that we will learn how to respond most appropriately to new needs arising from new situations” (32nd General Congregation, 1975, p. 55). In this way, Jesuits contend work for justice cannot be separated from faith.
Summary

While Jesuit education began as an application of existing pedagogical methods and continues to incorporate contemporary teaching practices, Jesuits also pride themselves on the distinctive character of Jesuit schools. Based on the examination of the authoritative texts for Jesuit schools presented here, in order for a school to be considered “Jesuit” or a teaching method to be considered “Ignatian” a number of characteristics must be present.

Jesuits point to the relationship between teacher and student to mimic the relationship between spiritual director and retreatant, ensuring the student’s active role in learning. As well, Jesuit educators are expected to incorporate the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm with its elements of Context, Experience, Reflection, Action, and Evaluation as the primary teaching method. Therefore, for teaching to be “Ignatian,” evidence of these distinct elements must be present. Likewise, one could look to the students themselves to determine the “Jesuit” character of the institution. In this way, the Grad at Grad outcomes (Intellectually Competent, Loving, Religious, Open to Growth, Committed to Doing Justice) act as a means of identifying whether Jesuit schools are graduating students who possess the characteristics deemed most desirable by Jesuits. Finally, the commitment to the poor and marginalized is a characteristic that can serve to distinguish Jesuit schools from other academic institutions. By looking at programs and policies of Jesuit institutions, one could determine the extent to which this commitment is being honored. The emphasis the 32nd General Congregation placed on understanding perspectives of the poor and marginalized, comprehending societal structures which create and maintain injustice and the use of experience as an educational tool are evident
in the Characteristics of Jesuit Education and the Profile of the Graduate at Graduation
discussed previously and can serve as conditions for identifying the Jesuit character of an
institution. In their attempt to form “women and men for and with others,” Jesuit schools
must continually work towards bridging faith and culture in the curriculum and life of the
school and providing opportunities for students to have direct experience with victims of
injustice, the poor and marginalized.

In the next chapter, we will examine service-learning as an educational practice
with the potential of assisting Jesuit schools in providing students with opportunities to
combine an experience of service in the community and awareness of the social,
economic and historical factors as a means of working for justice.
CHAPTER II
DEFINING TERMS: SERVICE, SERVICE-LEARNING & CULTURAL IMMERSION

While Jesuit education and Ignatian pedagogy have been developing over the last 500 years, key tenets such as context, experience, reflection, and action are simultaneously present outside the realm of Jesuit schools in evolving educational practices. One such instance is the concept of service-learning. Although the term “service-learning” emerged during the last fifty years in educational spheres, the value of service and the idea of linking service and learning have existed far longer.

In recent years, community service and service-learning have become increasingly common at the secondary level as demonstrated by a growing number of service opportunities and service-learning programs offered each year. The National Center for Education Statistics reports an increase in the number of students engaged in community service from 49% in 1996 to 52% in 1999 (Kleiner et al., 2000, p. 12). Similarly, the number of students participating in service-learning has risen from 81,000 students in 1984 to nearly 3 million in 1997, even though during that time the total number of high school students has remained relatively consistent (Greenberg, 2000, p. 18-21). By 2005, the number of youth between the ages of 12 and 18 participating in community service as part of a school requirement had risen to 10.6 million (Spring et al., 2006, p. 1).
This rapid growth over a short period of time has been accompanied by vastly different definitions of service-learning and diverse interpretations of what criteria constitute service-learning as well as what distinguishes community service opportunities offered by schools from true service-learning programs. As this is the case, one goal of this study is to examine characteristics of service-learning programs and existing frameworks for service-learning to determine common elements. That is, for a program to be considered service-learning, what elements must be present? In addition, since service activities and service-learning are taking place in both public and private schools, it will be necessary to investigate whether service-learning frameworks differ between public and private institutions. More specifically, are there characteristics that distinguish service-learning depending on the governing structure of the institution? Such an examination will serve as a foundation for developing a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit context, the goal of this study.

Annually, Jesuit secondary schools in the United States educate approximately 50,000 students (Jesuit Secondary Education Association, 2010). A 2005 survey found that students in private schools are 50% more likely to engage in school bases service than students in public schools (Spring et al., 2006, p. 2). This phenomenon is certainly true in the case of Jesuit secondary schools. As one of the goals of Jesuit education is to foster a commitment to doing justice and develop what former Superior General, Father Pedro Arrupe, referred to as “men and women for others,” service, service-learning, and cultural immersion experiences are incorporated into the curricular offerings of many Jesuit schools as a means of providing opportunities to be engaged in the community (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 7). Although
the Jesuit Secondary Education Association (JSEA) does not compile comprehensive statistics about the number of students at Jesuit secondary schools engaged in service or service-learning, each and every school offers opportunities for service, whether voluntary or mandatory. However, developing students committed to justice, an outcome of Jesuit education, goes beyond engagement in service activities alone. Jesuit education seeks to link an academic understanding of the structures, policies and practices that necessitate a need for service while also engaging students in the act of serving. The Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm (IPP) of Experience, Reflection and Action compels educators to move students beyond solely experiences of service. In this way, service-learning, a combination of experience and education, emerges as a possible model for doing so.

What follows is an examination of secondary school service-learning programs. We seek to understand why schools across the county, both public and private, have begun incorporating service-learning opportunities into their curriculum. To do so, we first look at the secular and sectarian imperatives to serve and the concept of linking service to education. Next, definitions for service, service-learning, and cultural immersion are examined and developed. Once working definitions are established, it is possible to examine existing frameworks of service-learning programs to determine common characteristics. Finally, since fostering students’ commitment to justice is a goal of Jesuit education, service-learning is connected to the concept of social justice from a Catholic perspective.
Service and Learning

Service-learning, as the term indicates, is the combination of some form of service provided with academic learning. To begin our investigation of this concept, we will first examine this dual purpose: service-learning both as an educational tool as well as a means of addressing social issues such as poverty, disease, care for the environment, etc. In this way, service-learning will be approached both as an element of effective pedagogy as well as means of working for social justice.

Service to one’s community has roots in many of the world’s religions, notably Judeo-Christian traditions which link serving others to serving God. As this study seeks to connect service and service-learning with the Christian tradition of Catholicism, namely Jesuit educational pedagogy, a brief articulation of some Biblical imperatives toward serving others is presented. Much of the New Testament is devoted to Christ’s message of “You shall love your neighbor as yourself” (Galations 5:13-14). The gospel of Matthew contains one of the most notable Christian obligations, “Amen, I say to you, whatever you did for one of these least brothers of mine, you did for me” (Matthew 25:40-41) making explicit the connection between serving others and serving God. Mark’s gospel emphasizes service with the notion that the first shall be last, stating “Whoever wishes to be great among you will be your servant; whoever wishes to be first among you will be the slave of all. For the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many” (Mark 10:43-45). In each of these instances as well as much of the New Testament, Christ’s example and message continually compel Christians to serve others as a means of serving God.
Service-learning in the United States has secular roots as well. From such a perspective, service to one’s community is viewed as civic engagement, a vital element of an effective democracy. Over the course of the twentieth century, national legislation and federal programs in the US demonstrate a movement toward and recognition of service to one’s community. From programs such as AmeriCorps or the Peace Corps to the creation of the Office of National Service and the National and Community Service Act of 1990, the national focus on service paralleled the increased emphasis on service taking place in schools and universities across the country. With a common focus on service to the community, service-learning emerged in the twentieth century as a way to bring school and community back together (Kraft, 1996, p. 134).

The idea of connecting service to education, however, can be traced much earlier and is often attributed to John Dewey. Dewey’s notion of schooling sought to connect education to real world experience, as he perceived schooling to be an inherently social process. Dewey advocates for a shift from education as the transfer of knowledge to the idea that there is “an intimate and necessary relation between the processes of actual experience and education” (Dewey, 1986, p. 244). In this way, education becomes a means of engaging students with prior knowledge through experience. He argues that doing so recognizes “the organic connection between education and personal experience” so that students approach education not as a static acquisition of knowledge, but rather as preparation for approaching the problems and challenges of a changing world (Dewey, 1986, p. 247). Dewey acknowledges, however,

The belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative. Experience and
education cannot be directly equated to each other. For some experiences are mis-educative. Any experience is mis-educative that has the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience. An experience may be such as to engender callousness; it may produce lack of sensitivity and of responsiveness. Then, the possibilities of having richer experience in the future are restricted. (Dewey, 1986, p. 247)

In this way, Dewey recognizes that simply engaging students in service does not imply service-learning. Rather, to ensure the educative nature of experiences, Dewey demands that educators “arrange for the kind of experiences which, while they do not repel the student, but rather engage his activities are, nevertheless, more than immediately enjoyable since they promote having desirable future experiences” (Dewey, 1986, p. 248). In such a model, the teacher becomes a guide or facilitator assisting the student in discovering meaning through experience.

According to Kraft, Dewey provided the foundation for, working together rather than in isolation on learning tasks; using ‘educative’ and minimizing ‘miseducative’ experiences; the organic relation between what is learned and personal experience; the importance of social and not just intellectual development; and the value of actions directed toward the welfare of others. (Kraft, 1996, p. 133)

In short, service-learning emerged in the twentieth century as one term to describe a method of bridging education and experience in a manner suggested by Dewey.
Defining Terms

Before we begin developing a framework, it will first be necessary to identify working definitions for “service,” “service-learning” and “cultural immersion” as each of these terms are used in various secondary school settings to describe student involvement in the local and global community. Settled definitions for each of these terms are not universally recognized; therefore to adequately define each we must begin by looking at what connotations are connected to each term and identify the distinguishing characteristics among them. For example, service-learning is defined as “an educational practice that involves the active participation of students in activities that address community needs, is integrated into the academic curriculum, has structured time for reflection, and provides opportunities for the direct application of the knowledge and skills acquired” (Spring et al., 2006, p. 9) by the Corporation for National and Community Service but is also defined as combining “service to the community with student learning in a way that improves both the student and the community” by the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (Brown, 2001, p. 10). While both definitions emphasize the link between student learning and community involvement, the first definition is explicit about the need for reflection and second identifies improvement of both student and community as key. Other definitions can (and will) be presented to demonstrate that settled definitions for these terms do not exist and developing working definitions for the purpose of this study is necessary. Developing such definitions will come as a result of a conceptual analysis of how the terms are defined and used in prior studies. That is, how has each term been defined and used previously and can such an
examination point to common elements utilized to develop definitions for use in this study?

**Defining Terms: Service**

To begin, *service* brings forth connotations of “helping” and is often associated with terms like “community service” or “volunteering.” The emphasis of service is on the act of doing something – collecting canned goods, serving meals, or donating clothing, for example. In this way, service activities may be undertaken by individuals acting out of their own goodwill or they may be facilitated through an organization such as a school or social group. For the purpose of this study, service will be examined and defined specifically in the context of education. Experiences of service provide students with direct contact with individuals at a particular organization, however, since an estimated 19% of public schools require students to perform community service, the emphasis is often on completing required hours rather than building relationships (Kleiner et al., 2000). The implicit expectation is that a school is primarily concerned that a student will continue to perform a service until a specified number of hours have been completed or a particular requirement fulfilled. That is, although required service may result in continued involvement by the student, this is not typically the explicit educational goal. Recent studies have shown the impact of requiring service on future student participation in similar activities. Metz and Youniss (2003) show that after completing 40 hours of service, more than 80% of students went on to do service for which no school credit was given. Additionally, Metz and Youniss (2005) and Zaff and Lerner (2010) illustrate that requiring service is more influential with regard to encouraging future civic involvement among students who would not have participated in
service opportunities on their own. With this in mind, school service programs may wish to emphasize the role of service programs as a means of developing civic engagement rather than touting hours of service completed by students.

Arenas et al. define community service as “service that students provide to the school or [local] community in which there is no prescribed learning agenda related to the academic curriculum” (Arenas, Bosworth, and Kwandayi, 2006, p. 24). This definition demonstrates that the emphasis of service is not connected to any academic pursuit, rather, its goal is to fulfill a perceived need in the school or community. This same study includes another definition of service as “an organized period of substantial engagement and contribution to the local, national or world community recognized and valued by society” (Arenas, Bosworth, and Kwandayi, 2006, p. 24). Again, this definition addresses the element of service as meeting perceived need but also includes a qualifier about the value associated with an activity and the need for involvement to be significant in some way. Cuban and Anderson identify that one of the shortcomings of service is that it “pays surface attention to social problems and is experienced by volunteer and recipient as charity” (Cuban and Anderson, 2007, p. 145). Therefore, any definition of service must also acknowledge the inherent divide between service providers and service recipients present in service relationships.

What emerges in each of these descriptions both defines service and distinguishes it from service-learning. Taking each of these ideas into account, for the purpose of this study, we will use the following definition for service: activities which seek to address needs perceived by service providers in the local, national or world community through organized involvement of individuals or groups. As the focus of service is action,
defining service as an activity seeks to make that distinction clear. As an examination of
service programs is beyond the scope of this study, the definition of service provided here
will be used primarily as a means of distinguishing service from service-learning.

**Defining Terms: Service-Learning**

As the number of students participating in community service increases among
both public and church-related schools, integrating service into the academic curriculum
has become more common. From 1996 to 1999, service participation among students in
private, religious schools rose from 69% to 71% while service in public schools rose
from 47% to 50% and connecting service to classroom experience through activities such
as discussion and journaling grew from 45% to 46% in all schools (Kleiner et al., 2000, p.
5, p. 13). At the post-secondary level, membership in Campus Compact, an organization
devoted to educating college students to become active citizens who are “well-equipped
to develop creative solutions to society’s most pressing issues,” has grown from four
universities in 1985 to roughly 1100 in 2010 (Cruley 2010). Of these 1100 participating
schools, 44% are private, 4-year colleges and universities as compared to 34% public, 4-
year colleges and universities (Campus Compact, 2009, p. 2). This increased emphasis on
connecting service to reflection and classroom experience at the high school level while
also equipping students to address societal issues through service and learning at the post-
secondary level seems to indicate that both types of institutions recognize service alone
does not necessarily address the economic, political, and historical contexts that create
and maintain a need for service; nor does service alone equip students to create potential
solutions to issues such as poverty, access to education or social stratification.
Consequently, colleges, universities and high schools have begun developing service-learning programs and curriculums to meet this need.

While preparing for and providing service in a community, students are also expected to study, reflect and dialogue with those they serve as well as learn about the political, social, and economic conditions and structures that create and support poverty and oppression. Students are asked to understand and reflect on the realities of such injustices in light of their own life experience. In doing so, the hope is that students move beyond emotions of pity and guilt that often surface in the face of an experience of poverty or oppression, and begin to integrate these experiences into the fabric of their everyday lives and lifestyle decisions (Office of Youth and Young Adult Ministry and Office of Evangelization and Catechesis, 2005, p. 3). This paradigm shift, taking service beyond the experience itself to incorporate reflection and understanding, lays the foundation for the concept of service-learning.

In contrast to service where the emphasis is solely on the act of doing, service-learning focuses on the interplay between the service itself and an academic understanding of the context wherein the service takes place. Once again, no standard definition of service-learning seems to exist. Arenas et al. distinguish service from service-learning in this way: “service-learning is also service to the community but, in contrast to community service, it is intentionally connected to the regular curriculum so that students can make connections between the abstract theories of the classroom and their concrete experiences inside and outside the school” (Arenas, Bosworth, and Kwandayi, 2006, p. 24). This concept of connecting curriculum to experience is a recurring theme in various definitions of service-learning. For instance, according to the
National Center for Educational Statistics, service-learning is defined as “an educational activity, program, or curriculum that seeks to promote students’ learning through experiences associated with volunteerism or community service” (Kleiner et al., 2000, p. 1). The National Community Trust Act of 1993 expands on this notion of service-learning as an educational activity by defining it as:

a method whereby students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service that is conducted in and meets the needs of communities…[is] coordinated with an elementary school, secondary school, institution of higher education, or community service program and the community; help to foster civic responsibility; integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students, or the educational components of the community service. (Mullaly, 2001, p. 40)

Although this definition indicates the dual nature of action and education implied in the name “service-learning,” it does little to explain the interrelated elements of service and learning. Eyler and Giles seek to make this connection explicit, as they find service-learning programs typically emphasize one element (service or learning) over the other. Their definition makes this distinction clear. According to Eyler and Giles, “Service – LEARNING [presents] learning goals primary; service outcomes secondary; SERVICE-learning [makes] service outcomes primary; learning goals secondary; [while] SERVICE-LEARNING [constructs] service and learning goals of equal weight [where] each enhances the other for all participants” (Eyler and Giles, 1999, p. 5).

While Eyler and Giles’ definition makes clear the distinction and connection between service and learning, it does not address the nature of or implications of the
service activities or the role of the student. Bringle and Hatcher address this oversight with their definition and focus on the role of the student stating that service-learning is 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 and Hatcher, 1995, p. 112). This definition brings up the concept of reflection, also present in the definition used by Maryland State Department of Education that maintains, “Students improve their academic skills by applying what they learn in school to the real world; they then reflect on their experience to reinforce the link between their service and their learning” (Jones, Segar, and Gasiorski, 2008, p. 10). The National Community Service Act of 1990 also recognizes the importance of reflection stating service-learning programs need to provide “structured time for students to think, talk, or write about what they did and observed during a service activity” (Terry and Bohnenberger, 2004, p. 17). Schaffer integrates the elements of many of these definitions by explaining that:

Effective service-learning takes place when (a) the service is tied to the learning objectives of a course; (b) the community is involved in the teaching and learning process; (c) the service performed by the students meets a need that is identified by the community; (d) guided reflection; both oral and written, is required of the students; (e) the service performed is meaningful and appropriate for the course; (f) there is assessment and evaluation of student learning and the service-learning program; and (g) the institution (college or university) provides support and incentive for service-learning. (Schaffer, 2004, p. 131-132)
Although Schaffer’s definition was written for the college or university context, it is the most cohesive, combining the elements of action, education, reflection, community identified needs, and assessment. For the purpose of this study, we draw from the various definitions presented in developing the following definition of service-learning:

*educational experiences which incorporate curricular goals with needs identified by the local community wherein student reflection is essential for integrating knowledge and experience through an examination of cultural, political, religious, historical, and socio-economic context so that student experience informs knowledge and knowledge informs experience.*

**Defining Terms: Cultural Immersion**

While service-learning is a powerful tool for integrating academic understanding with an experience of service, it is also inherently limited. Since the goal of service-learning is to connect students with the community, by nature, experiences must inevitably remain local. Therefore, to distinguish service-learning experiences that take place within a student’s local community with those taking place elsewhere, we introduce a third term, cultural immersion. While service-learning has been developing over the last century, the concept of cultural immersion at the secondary level is relatively recent. The earliest instances of educational cultural immersion can be traced to collegiate foreign exchange experiences. Colleges and universities have had study abroad or cultural immersion programs dating back to the late 1800’s and the Junior Year Abroad program of the 1920’s which enabled students to earn academic credit while traveling or studying at another institution (Schwartz, 2007, p. 1). Secondary travel abroad programs became more common in the last 40 years through organizations such as the American
Institute for Foreign Study and its partner ACIS, a company that organizes foreign travel for high school students. Founded in 1978, ACIS promotes their programs as “engaging students with the sights, sounds, smells and flavors of cultures, languages and people, [while] raising awareness of cultural and historical diversity to help students develop a global perspective [while also] encouraging students to become self-directed learners, gaining self-confidence in their abilities to face new situations successfully (American Council for International Studies, 2010, p. 2). ACIS programs emphasize cultural connections while focusing on specific learning outcomes for students age sixteen to eighteen.

As the global community becomes more interrelated and travel between regions, countries and continents more accessible, it is now easier for secondary students to experience a culture vastly different from their own. Doing so provides opportunities for a new form of experience to take place which will be referred to as cultural immersion. Unlike service or service-learning, few definitions exist for immersion. In educational circles, immersion often refers to the placement of students with English as a second language in the mainstream classroom. Similarly, many colleges and universities offer language immersion programs where students live in a country where the language studied is spoken as a means of language acquisition and mastery. Although directly connected to learning a different culture through language, neither of these descriptions of immersion encompasses the meaning of cultural immersion intended here. Therefore, a preliminary task for this study is to develop a working definition of cultural immersion.

Cultural immersion, as the term implies, requires an experience of another culture. This may take place within one’s own country or may occur through travel to another. In
that travel is involved, immersion experiences are often short-term (from one week to one month) although they may last longer (e.g. a semester abroad). It is important to note that travel alone does not imply immersion; that is, one may be “immersed” in a new culture by traveling to a foreign country, but “immersion” in this context requires deliberate engagement with another culture with the intention of garnering greater understanding of social issues and cultural context through the experience. Similar to service-learning, cultural immersion seeks to connect understanding of the political, religious, socio-economic, cultural and historical facets of a location with a personal experience of the culture.

In contrast to service-learning, however, cultural immersion experiences do not require a service component, although it is possible for a service element to be present during cultural immersion. Rather, the connection to learning is rooted in the experience of another culture instead of an experience of service. In this way, prior knowledge of the context (political, historical, religious, socio-economic, etc.) wherein an immersion experience takes place provides the basis for a cultural experience to lead to deeper questions challenging perceptions and preconceived notions held by the student. The emphasis of cultural immersion is on mutual exchange – where visitors and hosts seek understanding, partnership and sharing of ideas as a means of gaining awareness of complex issues (i.e. poverty, disease, education, access to resources, racism, etc.).

With this in mind, we will use the following definition of cultural immersion: *an intensive, short-term experience of another culture where the educational focus is on understanding the political, historical, religious, and socio-economic background of an area and learning from members of the community as a way of approaching cultural*
awareness and sensitivity. For the purpose of this study, the terms “immersion” and “cultural immersion” will be used interchangeably. Additionally, while cultural immersion may involve service-learning, it is distinct in that the experiences often take place abroad and during a shorter time frame. Therefore, cultural immersion experiences may or may not qualify as service-learning depending on how an individual program is structured.
Service-Learning, Cultural Immersion, and Social Justice

Since the focus of this study is to analyze service-learning from a Catholic, Jesuit perspective, it is necessary to distinguish service-learning in a secular context from that which takes place in a decidedly Catholic, Jesuit context. The definition of service-learning developed here requires an analysis of the political, religious, socio-economic, cultural and historical context of a community wherein the experience takes place. However, church teaching states that “the best way to fulfill one's obligations of justice and love is to contribute to the common good according to one's means and the needs of others, and also to promote and help public and private organizations devoted to bettering the conditions of life” (Catholic Church. Pope (1963-1978 : Paul VI) 1965). Therefore, since the Catholic tradition maintains that as global citizens, students are challenged to gain knowledge of and to work for justice through participation in society, an examination of context in a service-learning experience provides the starting point for an examination of justice issues present.

Issues of social justice are addressed by Catholic social teaching (a body of doctrine developed by the Catholic Church on matters of poverty and wealth, economics, social organization and the role of the state) which emphasizes the dignity of the human person, community participation, care for the poor and vulnerable and solidarity with oppressed people (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1997). From a Catholic perspective, solidarity refers to action on behalf of the one human family, calling us to help overcome the divisions in our world. Solidarity binds the rich and the poor. It makes the free zealous for the cause of the oppressed. It drives the comfortable and secure to
take risks for the victims of tyranny and war. It calls those who are strong to care for those who are weak and vulnerable across the spectrum of human life. It opens homes and hearts to those in flight from terror and to migrants whose daily toil supports affluent lifestyles. (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1997)

Just as service-learning uses service experiences as a means of garnering greater understanding or application of knowledge, service-learning relies on experience as a way to access issues of social justice. In this way, service-learning (and potentially immersion experiences) promote cultural sensitivity and a love for others, while creating a desire for social, religious, and civic service and responsibility that encourages growth in such awareness and activity throughout life (Office of Youth and Young Adult Ministry and Office of Evangelization and Catechesis, 2005, p. 3). For the purpose of this study, service-learning will be deliberately tied to social justice in that the context of service experiences will be analyzed from a justice perspective. Therefore, we expand our definition of service-learning to reflect that it can be used as a means of approaching broader social justice issues.

Existing Frameworks for Service-Learning and Cultural Immersion

Now that adequate definitions of service-learning and immersion have been established, we will examine how service-learning programs, and cultural immersion programs engaging in service-learning, are structured. Terry and Bohnenberger present a framework describing service-learning as a continuum with community service at one end and community action at the other in their 2004 study of service-learning. This
continuum (shown in Figure 3) parallels Piaget’s stages of cognitive development (shown in the right column of the figure) and Bradley’s levels of reflection (shown in the left column of the figure) (Terry and Bohnenberger 2004, 21). Terry and Bohnenberger illustrate that as community service progresses towards community action (where interaction between school and community is two-sided, as shown by the arrows), the levels of reflection and cognitive development increase. In their opinion, this progression and integration increases the effectiveness of service-learning.

Arenas, Bosworth, and Kwandayi explore a similar continuum in their 2006 study of service and service-learning in schools. The continuum presented by Arenas et al. speaks to the use of service as disciplinary action at one end and as a cultural expectation embedded into daily activities at the other (Arenas, Bosworth, and Kwandayi, 2006, p. 31-33). Once again, the emphasis on integration of service into the daily life and explicit
curriculum of a school is held up as the most beneficial. The authors cite pedagogical implementation issues such as lack of opportunity for reflection and inadequate preparation as obstacles to successful programs. Such impediments can lead to benefits for individual students while doing little to address community needs. In addition, a lack of involvement of service recipients in the process of determining what services are needed can lead to a paternalistic relationship that reinforces a power differential between service providers and service recipients. Finally, the authors argue that ongoing evaluation of the results of service-learning from the perspective of both service providers and recipients is a crucial and necessary step in creating and maintaining effective service-learning programs (Arenas, Bosworth, and K wandayi, 2006, p. 34-36).

Another model presented by Meisel (2007) divides the structure of service-learning and cultural immersion programs according to content and design. With regard to content, Meisel argues that students cannot be effective service providers without first understanding the context by exploring causes of the need for service and potential solutions. In this way, Meisel advocates for an engagement in the world so that students are “compelled to understand the impact of…service and to consider how it might improve the lives of people halfway around the world – not just in the neighborhood that borders campus” (Meisel, 2007, p. 56). In this way, service-learning is seen as a means of approaching systemic issues. As such, Meisel recognizes the vital importance of developing relationships with organizations local and abroad for both service-learning efforts in the community and short-term service trips so that those served are not simply passive recipients. Rather, Meisel views this back and forth aspect of the relationship between service providers and recipients as essential for successful implementation.
With regard to design, Meisel argues for intensity of experience and the integration of education received in and outside of the classroom through a multiyear, sequential, developmental approach. He sees such an approach as necessary to avoid “volunteer tourism, where participants see without understanding and act without feeling” (Meisel, 2007, p. 57). The end goal, from Meisel’s perspective is that any service performed outside the classroom must connect directly to education received inside the classroom so that it is possible to transform “the divide between service and academic inquiry that informs our citizenship; [so that] we are able not just to think globally but also to act globally” (Meisel, 2007, p. 57).

Frustrated by the quality and design of many service-learning programs that do little to connect service and learning, Masucci and Renner (2001) sought to develop a service-learning framework incorporating critical thinking skills with a focus on social justice. Their framework utilized four steps: pre-reflection; action; related readings, speakers and discussions; and reflection. The authors describe pre-reflection as “investigating who we are and what we stand for, as well as investigating our past service experiences, our preconceptions about the project and our predictions as to its outcome” (Masucci and Renner, 2001, p. 6). The second step, action, is crucial for introducing students to social theory to illustrate how praxis will influence the project. The idea is that,

As students come to better understand issues of social difference through exposure to theory (the words), they will be better able to identify and name these issues when they arise in the service environment (the world)...this notion can (and should) also work in reverse: reading the world (through an understanding of
one’s lived experience) and the word (providing an update to theory). (Masucci and Renner, 2001, p. 7)

Next, the authors emphasize the importance of working and dialoging with partner organizations so that the perspective of service recipients is evident in the action undertaken. Finally, reflection is necessary to “integrate and personally contextualize the experience of service-learning” by creating “a space where students can share and reflect upon experiences” (Masucci and Renner, 2001, p. 9). Masucci and Renner are careful to note that they do not view these four steps in a distinctly linear progression; rather, the framework works in a circular fashion where steps may be happening concurrently or in a different order (Masucci and Renner, 2001, p. 10).

In 2004, Schaffer conducted a study of service-learning programs in Christian colleges and universities in an attempt to identify ‘best practices’ and develop a model for replication. Schaffer identified five key elements she considered ‘best practices’ in designing a service-learning curriculum. In her estimation, these elements are: institutional support (funding and support provided by administration), mission (service-learning explicitly related to the mission of the institution), definitions and guidelines (clear articulation of the difference between service and service-learning as well as the presence of assessment tools), academic validity (connection to course learning objectives by faculty), and faith and learning tool (reflection as a means of making connections between personal faith, academic understanding, and service to the community) (Schaffer, 2004, p. 133-136). Specific references to mission and faith formation are a few of the distinguishing characteristics between the secular frameworks presented and that described by Schaffer.
Based on these five essential elements, Schaffer recommends that the following eight guidelines be utilized for designing and implementing an effective service-learning program at a Christian college or university: examine the mission (use the mission statement to justify a commitment to service-learning), enlist others (create an advisory board of faculty, staff and students), establish a definition (distinguish service-learning from other service opportunities), educate and train (instruct faculty on how to design, implement and assess service-learning), develop community partnerships (identify needed services and work with agencies to design appropriate activities), pilot test (start small to determine sincerity of purpose and commitment of those involved), reflect and evaluate (student, faculty and community partners need to connect service and learning while examining program effectiveness and make changes as necessary), and gain institutional support (fiscal and philosophical backing) (Schaffer, 2004, p. 137-142).

While Shaffer’s research was conducted for higher education institutions, the principles of her framework are general and therefore could apply to a variety of educational settings. In this way, these same principles can inform service-learning design and implementation at the secondary level, the focus of this study.

Schaffer’s framework recognizes the importance of the role of the teacher as being responsible for creating “reflection activities and assignments that engage the students in application of their faith to the course content along with personal reflections on the relationships between service, course concepts, and their belief systems” (Schaffer, 2004, p. 136). The framework presented by Masucci and Renner also advocates for a shift in the role of educators to that of teacher as intellectual where “educators are strongly encouraged to immerse themselves and their students in theory” as the entry for
discussions of social justice (Masucci and Renner, 2001, p. 8). This shift in the role of the teacher is echoed by Stewart who recognizes that in service-learning, “teachers relinquish some of the decision-making and problem-solving to their students. Teachers become facilitators of learning by providing students with access to information and engaging them so that they scaffold upon existing schema for new meaning-making” (Stewart, 2008, p. 62). Reminiscent of the role of the educator put forth by Dewey, teachers act as a guide to the experience and are charged with the responsibility of facilitating student reflection and integration.

The key element of reflection (integrating new experiences and knowledge with previously held understandings and beliefs) emerges in several of the previous studies. A 2003 study by Maher examined the effectiveness of reflection in the context of service-learning or cultural immersion trips with college students. Based on his work with cultural immersion programs linking students at Loyola University Chicago with communities in Pilsen (a Latino neighborhood in Chicago), Cuba, and the Texas/Mexico border, Maher developed the Cognitive-Experiential Tri-Circle [Figure 4], a set of three intersecting circles (self, experience, and beliefs) as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of service-learning programs (Maher, 2003, p. 94-95). According to Maher, successful service-learning programs have the circles pulled together tightly (i.e. a very
large intersection of self, experience, and beliefs) whereas if the circles intersect slightly, the individual has not integrated the experience with previously held beliefs or understanding of self. In this way, Maher advocates for a similar structure of teacher as facilitator by drawing from reflection tools combining theological reflection and field research education to create his model.

Koth (2003) builds on this notion of reflection, emphasizing the importance of spiritual reflection. According to Koth, “the lack of reference to spirituality in service-learning reflection is a missed opportunity to foster deeper contemplative practices among students” (Koth, 2003, p. 5). Koth notes several outcomes of linking service-learning and spiritual reflection: 1) exploring personal meaning and strengthening spiritual values; 2) discovering vocational ‘calling’; 3) strengthening the long-term commitment to serve (Koth, 2003, p. 5-6). Although Koth defines spirituality broadly, his premise can help inform the creation of a framework for service-learning in a decidedly Catholic/Jesuit context.

A number of common elements emerge from an examination of the existing frameworks that point to characteristics of effective programs. First, the importance of preparing students for an experience of service-learning involves an analysis of the context where the service will take place. Doing so may require an understanding of political, historical, cultural, and socio-economic factors that contribute to the needs of a community. In this way, another emphasis of existing frameworks is developing community relationships and directly involving service recipients in the process of determining what needs are present and how they will be addressed. Doing so helps to overcome the divide between school and community, service providers and service
recipients. Additionally, effective service-learning requires a clear and direct connection between service and learning. Programs must ensure that service is not an added, isolated experience. Rather, service must be integrated into the curriculum while making learning outcomes explicit to students and service sites. The role of the teacher is essential in facilitating this process. Effective service-learning describes teachers as guides or facilitators in that they carefully craft experiences to coincide with learning outcomes while also engaging students in reflection, another key element of service-learning.

Reflection challenges the student to tie together understanding of community needs and issues with academic knowledge and real-world service experience. Likewise, reflection is necessary to process the need for service while also understanding the impact of the service provided. Finally, ongoing evaluation is crucial for determining how the elements of preparation, community involvement, curricular goals, and reflection are working together to provide an effective service-learning experience.

A Framework for Service-Learning and Social Justice

In that the goal of this study is to create a framework that specifically links Ignatian pedagogy and Jesuit spirituality with service-learning and cultural immersion, we begin by examining existing frameworks tying service-learning to social justice, a focus of Jesuit charism. This section seeks to link the two as a precursor to a framework suitable for service-learning and cultural immersion in a Jesuit context.

“The poor almost seem to exist … so that university students can elevate their own consciousness by serving them for a short period” (Schall, 2006, p. 44). As this quote illustrates, many well-intended and well-structured service-learning programs focus almost exclusively on the student; that is, in many programs students are asked to reflect
on how the experience impacted them, student attitudes toward service before and after the experience are measured, or student involvement in the community is the goal. Although valid and worthwhile, often such outcomes are detrimental in that, “despite the complexity of the issues of service, students are encouraged to engage in service provision without a clear understanding of how their service is affecting the communities around them” (Maybach, 1996, p. 224). As Maybach notes, since the emphasis of traditional service-learning models and frameworks is concerned with student learning and reflection, a danger is that they overlook addressing systemic causes and structures that create a need for service, ultimately ensuring such needs will continue to exist. In essence, Maybach argues, “as a result of the service experience, the student indirectly supports the perpetuation of the needy situation as a mechanism to provide students with an opportunity to ‘do good’” (Maybach, 1996, p. 226). In other words, if students are not challenged to consider the causes for service and effects it brings, they are perpetuating an oppressive situation where privileged individuals provide services to or for a marginalized group.

Brazilian educator, Paulo Freire, argued that education cannot be neutral in that it either maintains or challenges the dominant social order. By extension, service-learning, as an educational methodology, cannot be neutral. For Freire, a man whose method of conscientização (consciousness raising) has grown to be a major force in educational praxis in the developing world, traditional pedagogical practices do little to question the inherent nature of the teacher-student relationship, which reflects the relationship shared between the privileged and the oppressed in the world at large. Freire maintains, “Pedagogy which begins with the egoistic interests of the oppressors (an egoism cloaked
in false generosity of paternalism) and makes of the oppressed the objects of its humanitarianism, itself maintains and embodies oppression” (Freire, 1993, p. 54).

Traditional service-learning programs seek to use the world and service as an educational tool, but if not carefully constructed, they unintentionally perpetuate what Freire regards as an oppressive social order.

For Freire, the role of the educator is essential in formulating service-learning experiences that seek to overcome this phenomenon. Freire notes,

One of the most important tasks of critical educational practice is to make possible the conditions in which the learners, in their interaction with one another and with their teachers, engage in the experience of assuming themselves as social, historical, thinking, communicating, transformative, creative persons; dreamers of possible utopias, capable of being angry because of the capacity to love. (Friere, 1998, p. 45)

Freire charges educators with the responsibility of advancing a critical pedagogy; that is, a pedagogy where both teachers and students can make sense of the world and their interactions therein – to engage and thus interact as participants (shapers) of history; rather than simply objects (passive recipients) to be acted upon, manipulated, and controlled… [Critical pedagogy] is enormously important for developing a theoretical framework that historically and socially situates the deeply embedded roots of racism, discrimination, violence, and disempowerment in this country. Instead of perpetuating the assumptions that such realities are inevitable, the theories presented in critical pedagogy invite the reader to further explore the
relationship between the larger historic, economic, and social constructs and their inextricable connection to ideology and power. (Brown, 2001, p. 19-20)

In this way, it is not enough for students to simply wish to “do good” and for teachers to provide opportunities to do service. Rather, service-learning must be an extension of a pedagogy rooted in examining the historical, economic, political, and social structures which create, contribute to, and maintain injustice and the need for service.

Similarly, Maybach contends that the emphasis on student growth and disregard for service recipients demonstrates that current service-learning programs are more adept at empowering students than individuals served (Maybach, 1996, p. 229). Maybach calls for a praxis to emerge that “attempts to move service-learning programming away from oppressive practices and toward an empowering experience for all individuals involved in the service-learning experience” (Maybach, 1996, p. 226). In order for such a shift to take place, Freire argues that students must “realize the socio-cultural influences on [their] thinking in order to have the ability to transform that thought process” (Maher, 2003, p. 93). Ultimately, service-learning for social justice must dismantle the power differential which separates the service providers from the service recipients.

Seeking to develop an alternative model of service-learning, Maybach suggests, “a focus on interactive reflection, engagement in continuing dialogue at the service site, accountability for growth of all individuals in the service relationship, an inclusive approach to the definition of terms, and the removal of the provider/recipient roles” (Maybach, 1996, p. 225). The goal of this alternative model is to promote social justice through service-learning. As this essay seeks to develop an alternative framework for
service-learning in the context of Jesuit education, we use the following definition of social justice:

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. (Cuban and Anderson, 2007, p. 145)

With this definition of social justice in mind, we will briefly examine three alternative frameworks for service-learning.

Brown (2001) establishes a framework for service-learning rooted in critical pedagogy and social justice. Brown identifies the following five key principles necessary for service-learning partnerships:

1) Tie research and education to concrete community issues by making curricula and educational activities responsive to community issues and needs.

2) Examine the characteristics of citizenship by studying systemic and historical contexts of issues and responses to issues.

3) Contribute to the function of education in discovering causes and long-term responses to social issues by engaging in activities through dialogue with communities.
4) Employ academic knowledge in community problem-solving through praxis and dialogue

5) Expand educational institutions’ participation in community (working with and for communities)

(Brown, 2001, p. 23)

This framework of service-learning for social justice illustrates rooting academic understanding within a context while also explicitly seeking to overcome the power differential between those serving and those served.

Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne (2004) developed a similar framework by delineating three types of citizens found in a democratic society. For Westheimer and Kahne, the Personally Responsible Citizen relies on good character to address societal issues and is likely to volunteer within the community. The Participatory Citizen seeks to solve social problems by taking on a leadership role in the community, recognizing the importance of community organizations and collaboration to address complex issues. Finally, the Justice-Oriented Citizen recognizes that changing systems and structures that reproduce patterns of injustice occurs through dialogue, debate, and a critical understanding of the social, political, and economic structures present (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004, p. 240). In order to facilitate the creation of justice-oriented citizens, Westheimer and Kahne advance a framework of critical and structural social analysis, personal responsibility, and collective responsibility for action (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004, p. 257-260).

Wade (2001) also acknowledges the shortcomings of traditional service-learning programs which she attributes with fostering self-esteem and civic responsibility but
failing to address whether an injustice created the need for service to exist. Similar to Westheimer and Kahne’s characteristics of a justice-oriented citizen, Wade states, “Democracy depends on citizens’ willingness and ability to examine current social problems, evaluate how they have developed over time and consider new directions in creating a better society” (Wade, 2001, p. 1). This emphasis on using historical precedents as a means of examining social problems reflects Freire’s pedagogical imperative. As a means of creating educational opportunities to promote social justice, Wade presents eight characteristics for developing service-learning projects with social justice goals. She maintains that programs must be student-centered (issues addressed must connect to lives of students), collaborative (peers, schools, service sites, and service-recipients work together), experiential (active engagement in community), intellectual (analyze multiple perspectives to gain knowledge of issue), analytical (examine root causes of problems), multicultural (inclusive approach, utilize multiple perspectives), value-based (examine controversial nature of issues and solutions), and activist (engage in direct action and advocacy for a just society (Wade, 2001, p. 3-4). Wade’s model takes into account all stakeholders in its emphasis on developing a commitment to social justice among students, teachers, schools, communities, and those served.

The frameworks presented by Brown, Wade, and Westheimer and Kahne “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” (Cuban and Anderson, 2007, p. 146). Service-learning for social justice moves beyond a student centered focus on service and learning through an
examination of the historical, political, and socio-economic context of issues while addressing their systemic nature. Such an approach is more integrated and value-oriented than traditional service-learning programs. As such, it can be approached and justified from a particular pedagogical perspective and value system. For the purpose of this study, we will do so from the perspective of Jesuit Pedagogy and Ignatian spirituality.

In the following chapter, a review of current research related to service-learning will be conducted. Such an analysis places this study in the larger context of research related to service-learning allowing this study to build upon previous research. Ultimately, this examination will serve as a starting point for developing a framework of service-learning informed by Ignatian pedagogy and Jesuit spirituality, the task of this study.
CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

Due to the complex and varied nature of service-learning content, design, and implementation, it follows that the focus of research on service-learning is equally complex and diverse. Studies of service-learning have focused on everything from identity development (Youniss and Yates, 1997; Jones and Hill, 2001; Jones and Abes, 2004) to the impact of requiring service-learning (Metz and Youniss, 2005; Jones, Segar and Gasiorski, 2008) to service-learning as a tool for promoting civic engagement (Metz and Youniss, 2003, 2005; Fiske, 2002) and beyond. As it is not possible to present such a broad basis of research in this study, the research presented here will reflect a narrowed focus. The Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm, as explained in the first chapter, centers on experience, reflection and action as they relate to the promotion of social justice as a means of forming what Fr. Pedro Arrupe, former Father General of the Society of Jesus, refers to as “Men for Others.”

Approaching research on service-learning from this perspective, the literature presented here will focus primarily on studies dealing with identity development, reflection, social justice, and cultural immersion programs. Research on identity development is presented in that Ignatian pedagogy seeks to be formative and transformative resulting in the creation of “Men for Others.” Likewise, reflection is an essential component of the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm, therefore an examination of the use of reflection as it relates to service-learning is pertinent. Additionally, the
Catholic and Jesuit imperative to work for social justice makes the inclusion of research pertaining to social justice and service-learning a logical component of the literature review. Finally, studies dealing with cultural immersion are presented here because Jesuit education compels its institutions to provide opportunities for students to work among victims of injustice in their local as well as global communities and cultural immersion can be structured to include a service-learning component. In addition, critiques of service-learning programs and implementation are presented as an examination of the shortcomings and pitfalls of service-learning can provide further insight into the development of a framework of service-learning for Jesuit secondary education.

**Identity Development**

A number of studies have focused on the role of service-learning in identity development. Youniss and Yates (1997) conducted a study of high school students who participated in a service-learning course. The study found that several years after completing the course, students still identified it as “a clear landmark” in the development of their identity (Yates and Youniss, 1997, p. 128). Students in the study also attributed “an empathetic outlook toward the other, reflectivity on the self’s agency, and relating one’s own agency to helping less fortunate individuals” to their participation in the service-learning course (Yates and Youniss, 1997, p. 129). In this way, an experience of service-learning acted as a catalyst for students to examine who they saw themselves to be while also situating their identity in the experience of “the other.” Doing so demonstrates an outside-in as well as an inside-out approach to identity development.
Similarly, Jones and Hill (2001) conducted a study focused on student understanding of diversity in the context of a service-learning experience. Their study noted the importance of building relationships across identity dimensions as crucial to cultural learning. As such, the service-learning experience provided a catalyst for students to interact with individuals of different races, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status. The results of their study suggest that student engagement with others through a service-learning experience provided increased opportunity for self-reflection.

Jones acknowledges that the 2001 study was limited in that interviews with student participants took place only one year after the service-learning experience concluded. Therefore, Jones and Abes (2004) sought to interview the same student participants two to four years following the initial service-learning experience. Based on interviews with these individuals, Jones and Abes note “one enduring influence of service-learning on participants’ identity was that it generated ongoing reflection about the self in relation to ‘the other’” (Jones and Abes, 2004, p. 153). Additionally, the study found that the experience of service-learning caused students to come to a new understanding of themselves as privileged while also causing them to reflect on values, beliefs and attitudes in a more profound way than other activities had done. Likewise, Jones and Abes found that participation in the service-learning course resulted in students being open to “experiences in which they might not have otherwise participated, ideas they had not previously considered and [being] open-minded about people different from themselves” (Jones and Abes, 2004, p. 158). The authors ultimately credit openness and exposure to new experiences as the foundation for student identity development in that it “caused students to develop some of their own values, associate with people who share
similar values, and pursue careers and jobs based on these internally generated values rather than external expectations” (Jones and Abes, 2004, p. 162).

**Reflection**

As mentioned above, Jones and Abes (2004) recognize the importance of incorporating occasions for self-reflection into service-learning experiences as a means of identity development. As this is the case, designing and facilitating opportunities for reflection are tools utilized frequently in service-learning programs for a variety of reasons. The process of reflection can assist in achieving and measuring the outcomes of a service-learning program, whether that is civic engagement, identity development, or examination of issues of social justice. Maher (2003) sought to examine the effectiveness of a set of reflection tools used with college students engaged in service-learning or cultural immersion trips. His research involved students who had taken part in immersion experiences in Pilsen (a Latino neighborhood in Chicago, IL), Mexico, and Cuba. During the immersion experience, student leaders facilitated group processing and group prayer designed to help students make connections between their own belief systems and personal experience. Upon returning, Maher interviewed twenty student participants (graduates and undergraduates). The interviews revealed that small group sharing assisted student participants in developing meaning and forming values based on their experiences. Maher states, “many students reported that examining their beliefs through group processing helped them prioritize or organize beliefs and values” (Maher, 2003, p. 92). Additionally, the interviews revealed how the immersion experience challenged self-perceptions as many students stated that they were “permanently shaped” or “changed forever” based on the experience (Maher, 2003, p. 93). In this way, Maher’s
analysis leads to a similar conclusion as Yates and Youniss (1997) in that experiences of
service or immersion can be “landmark” moments in both identity development and self-
reflection.

Stewart (2008) also addresses the importance and influence of reflection in
service-learning experiences. For Stewart, reflection acts as a structured opportunity to
challenge student attitudes, perceptions, assumptions and stereotypes. He emphasizes the
importance of utilizing reflection before (pre-service reflections) to discover and confront
presuppositions while also preparing students for possible culture shock. Additionally,
reflections conducted during a service experience assist students with the emotions,
questions, and challenges such an experience poses. Finally, reflections after a service
experience help create a bridge between the service activity and the concepts and theories
presented in class. By combining these three elements, Stewart states that “The
transformative power of reflection begins to help students take their experiences from
abstract to concrete, and from pointless activity to formal learning” (Stewart, 2008, p.
63). Stewart advocates for the use of reflection due to its positive impact on student
comprehension and critical thinking skills, saying, “just one hour spent reflecting on a
challenging situation with general questions and guidelines, alone or with assistance,
could significantly increase learning” (Stewart, 2008, p. 64). Lastly, he notes that
reflection should take many forms to account for the different ways in which students
learn and process experiences so that students are able to best express their understanding
of their service activity.

Koth (2003) recognizes that reflection is often utilized for the purpose of
deepening academic understanding (as articulated by Stewart) or developing belief
systems (as shown by Maher) but tends to lack any reference to spiritual reflection or development which he sees as “a missed opportunity to foster deeper contemplative practices among students” (Koth, 2003, p. 5). By incorporating spiritual components into service-learning reflections, Koth contends that facilitators are able to encourage stronger long-term commitments to service while also assisting students to explore vocation or “calling.” Additionally, doing so “offers students this critical opportunity to explore questions of spiritual meaning connected with service, embrace new perspectives, and perhaps cultivate a deeper sense of spirituality” (Koth, 2003, p. 6). Koth concludes his exploration with a few suggestions for educators regarding how to incorporate spirituality into service-learning reflections.

**Social Justice**

Conceptually, social justice incorporates social and political connotations (i.e. what role do social institutions or government have in ensuring equality or equity?) as well as personal meaning (i.e. what is fair?). Definitions of social justice include the promotion of equal rights and equal opportunities for all members of a community and often refer to issues of homelessness, poverty, substance abuse, violence, access to education, etc. Also, often involved in such social issues are matters of race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender, age, sexual orientation, etc. Addressing issues of social justice necessitates an examination of social institutions that may contribute to the perpetuation of inequity and inequality while also looking at what community organizations are doing to combat such issues. In that service-learning frequently places student participants with community organizations which seek to address social issues,
the connection between social justice and service-learning is a common theme of research studies.

Zyngier (2003) sought to establish the importance of social justice education, which he refers to as a “connected education.” He states, “the challenge to teachers and schools of a socially critical and connected pedagogy is advanced to explain the connection between social justice and connectedness in the classroom… [due to] the crucial role that pedagogy plays in the production and reproduction of educational advantage and privilege” (Zyngier, 2003, p. 41). Zyngier argues that all too often standard educational practices reinforce inequity while simultaneously preparing students for entry into the economic workforce but fail to develop critical thinking skills that may encourage students to challenge the status quo. In his opinion, “A socially just connected education must enable students to have more control of their lives, learn about individual and collective rights and be connected to a more participatory social vision than that of providing the human capital needs of industry and business” (Zyngier, 2003, p. 43). That is, connected education demands a pedagogy that contributes to both individual development and community empowerment.

To tackle the challenge of providing a connected education, Zyngier outlines four obstacles that need to be addressed. First, teachers must engage their students with the real world in an authentic manner (i.e., teachers need to make issues meaningful and connected to the lives of their students). Secondly, schools must occupy a transformative role in the community. As such, schools become a model for the outcomes of equality and equity they wish to achieve. Thirdly, connected education must challenge the “teaching to the test” mentality advocated through the use of standardized tests and the
university admission process. In this way, secondary education cannot simply function as a gatekeeper for higher education. Rather, pedagogy must reflect elements necessary to form critical thinkers and engaged citizens. Finally, society will need to accommodate a socially conscious, engaged (and in Zyngier’s estimation, possibly enraged) generation. In this way, “A connected critical pedagogy not only challenges social inequality but also changes the conditions that create them in the first place” (Zyngier, 2003, p. 45).

Zyngier’s concept of connected education is consistent with a pedagogy that advocates for service-learning in that student interaction with the “real world” is coupled with critical thinking skills.

Although he did not term his efforts as building a connected education, Butin (2007) sought to bring together school and community in a manner consistent with that described by Zyngier. Butin emphasizes the importance of joining the concepts of social justice and service-learning together noting, “Service-learning and social justice education, two distinctive pedagogical and philosophical movements, appear immediately and intuitively to do exactly such work: to broadly link the personal to the social and the classroom to the community” (Butin, 2007, p. 177). Butin makes the argument that service-learning is all too often linked to charity or individualistic efforts while social justice is commonly associated with liberal activism. His concept of “antifoundational service-learning” seeks to avoid an easily achieved end goal (i.e. charity or activism). Rather, Butin advocates for a “weak overcoming” which recognizes that while social justice education rarely leads to social justice, it is necessary and effective at undercutting dualistic and simplistic belief systems. Additionally, he concludes that “The sheer complexity of social reality – when carefully and systematically examined and reflected
upon – yields opportunities for the realization that justice (or the lack thereof) is contingent upon our engagement with the world” (Butin, 2007, p. 181). Ultimately, Butin lays the foundation for connecting service-learning and social justice as both process and goal.

Drawing upon Aristotle, John Rawls, and Carol Gilligan among others, Wade (2001) develops the concept of social justice to include distribution of benefits and burdens in society, fairness, care, relationships and responsibility. She maintains that justice is a core value of American society and as such has a place in education. Wade makes an argument for why service-learning should address social justice. As an educational tool, Wade notes,

An exclusive focus on such discrete outcomes and competencies [i.e. fostering self-esteem, empathy, problem-solving skills or political efficacy] limit service-learning’s power to effect broad-based changes in both students and the communities which they serve…rarely do students in service-learning programs consider whether some injustice has created the need for service in the first place. (Wade, 2001, p. 1)

For Wade, linking service-learning to social justice is a way to address an existing need for service and, as Butin (2007) points out, move away from charity models which may inadvertently perpetuate unjust systems. Wade advocates for developing service-learning opportunities that move students “toward fostering a critical perspective and action directed toward social change” (Wade, 2001, p. 2). To do so, she outlines eight essential elements (student-centered, collaborative, experiential, intellectual, analytical, multicultural, value-based and activist) and provides examples of what these
characteristics would look like in practice. Finally, she concludes with an analysis of the challenges to creating service-learning programs focused on social justice and strategies for teachers, administrators and policymakers to address them. Among these challenges are: developing consensus about and commitment to social justice, hesitance to question the status quo, limited time and curriculum resources and restrictions on the use of external funding (Wade, 2001, p. 5-7). Wade’s study provides a very practical resource to the theory behind service-learning for social justice as well as tips for designing and implementing a program.

Similar to the cautions noted by Butin (2007) and Wade (2001) against charity as an easily achieved end goal, Maybach (1996) notes that student participants often engage in a service experience only to hope to do such work again in the future or wishing for others to have similar opportunities. In this way, Maybach points out the inherent contradiction present – that works of charity seek to perpetuate the oppressive system that creates a need for them in the first place. For Maybach, service-learning cannot simply provide opportunities for students to “do good.” Rather, Maybach makes an argument for attempting to “move service-learning programming away from oppressive practices and toward an empowering experience for all individuals involved in the service-learning experience” (Maybach, 1996, p. 226).

For Maybach, service-learning must address the divide between service providers and service recipients in order to be effective. Maybach’s research indicates that typical service-learning programs continually address the needs of student participants while rarely consulting the service recipients regarding their needs and opinions as to how service is implemented. In this way, service is something done ‘by’ one group of
individuals ‘to’ another group, perpetuating a degree of domination and thereby supporting an oppressive system.

Maybach also takes issue with terminology related to service-learning. In fact, the terms “service provider” and “service recipient” (although descriptive) perpetuate a one-sided view of service. Instead, Maybach promotes the term *partners in service* as not just a politically correct term but to denote an actual change in the service relationship: emphasizing mutual respect for individual strengths and weaknesses each partner can bring to the service relationship, underscoring the give and take of the cooperation, supporting the equal role each should play in the service design and accomplishment of the community project they are engaged in, and reinforcing the equal concern for positive outcomes in both service partners.

(Maybach, 1996, p. 231)

In Maybach’s estimation, this cooperative model of service-learning engenders empowerment of all involved in the service relationship by acknowledging the wisdom and skills of all partners. Additionally, such a model moves away from works of charity and through reflection and investigation of the systemic causes of oppression in society promotes an approach to service-learning from a social justice perspective.

Zyngier’s concept of a connected education, as it relates to developing critical thinking by moving away from the importance of standardized tests, surfaces again in Hytten (2006). Through an analysis of a number of books and articles related to critical pedagogy, Hytten’s study maintains that “Schooling should fundamentally be about individual growth and social transformation; what we do in classrooms should be connected to efforts to challenge social inequalities and to build a better society” (Hytten,
2006, p. 222). To do so requires broadening the meaning of education to one that is not premised on recall of standardized information but rather is focused on problem solving, reflective thinking and thoughtful action. In her opinion, the

Almost exclusive attention to raising test scores has numerous problematic consequences that have been well documented…[such as] narrowed curricula where teaching is seen as little more than test preparation; compromises in students’ intrinsic motivation to learn and challenge themselves, as they are rewarded for correct answers, not complex, critical thinking; and diminishment in the richness of learning. (Hytten, 2006, p. 224)

For Hytten, there is an intrinsic connection between education, democracy and social justice; therefore, any attempt to bring about change in society (i.e. addressing social inequity and inequality) must involve changes to the educational system.

For Cuban and Anderson (2007), social justice and service-learning are separate but inter-related approaches to social change. Their analysis of institutionalizing service-learning for social justice at a Jesuit university seeks to address what it is, how it works, and why it is important. Cuban and Anderson define service-learning two ways; first, a technical conceptualization, which functions more as charity, focuses on changing student attitudes by incorporating service with academic purposes but only pays superficial attention to social problems. The second, a political conceptualization, reflects the work of Butin (2007) by addressing underlying societal problems, advocating for marginalized groups and placing educational institutions in a position of forwarding social change. This political conceptualization is indicative of service-learning from a social justice perspective. The authors then explore obstacles to institutionalizing
service-learning in this manner. These obstacles include resistance to social change, lack of commitment to social justice goals, the presence of a prescribed curriculum and lack of faculty competence in social analysis (Cuban and Anderson, 2007, p. 147).

Ultimately, Cuban and Anderson present a case study of the process of implementing a service-learning curriculum at a Jesuit University. Their findings regarding the process of implementing a service-learning program focused on social justice centered around four themes: 1) a social justice worldview (rooted in Jesuit mission and values, a social justice perspective permeates all aspects of university programs), 2) attention to developmental process (including student self-assessments, reflection and feedback), 3) blended outcomes (an increased level of critical thinking coupled with a stronger service ethic among students), and 4) recognition of fragile boundaries (students expressing a deeper sense of the complex nature of community organizations and the issues they attempt to address) (Cuban and Anderson, 2007, p. 151-152). What these findings demonstrate is the complexity of institutionalizing service-learning for social justice, even at institutions that have a justice orientation as a foundation.

Another study regarding service-learning as a means of addressing issues of social justice, Fox (2010) examined the use of integrating service-learning as a way of developing empathy toward and understanding of poverty. Fox maintains, “Young children need to be taught to work with their naturally caring heart and critical eye to develop a sense of social justice through explicit teaching” (Fox, 2010, p. 1). She also contends that service-learning is most effective when it is linked with existing school outcomes while emphasizing the need for reflection and analysis as a key component of
an effective service-learning curriculum. Finally, she includes sample lessons, complete with activities and assessments, as a guide for structuring service learning experiences around the topic of poverty (Fox, 2010, p. 1-9).

Fox’s research highlights the connection between classroom learning rooted in school outcomes while integrating service in the local community over the course of a school year. Her observation about the role of the institution’s mission and outcomes as important to the implementation of a service-learning program coincides with work done by Cuban and Anderson (2007). Fox’s research does not, however, address if or how a similar experience could be structured to include a short-term intensive program outside the local community or a possible international/cultural immersion component focusing on poverty. Additionally, although poverty could be considered a justice issue, Fox does not explicitly discuss developing a service-learning curriculum to address issues of social justice in general.

Due to its complex nature, social justice can easily become a lofty, unattainable goal. As Butin (2007) points out, for service-learning for social justice to be effective, social justice must be seen as both process and goal. Blundo (2010) incorporates this dual purpose. Blundo details the creation of a cross-curricular service-learning course whose goal was to create documentaries recounting the impact of desegregation on African American and First Nation peoples in North Carolina. Blundo points out that while social justice can be addressed conceptually in the classroom through readings or discussion, “Without an opportunity for students to work directly with members of an oppressed group on a project focused on social justice, they may have learned an abstract concept that lacks deeper complexity and meaning” (Blundo, 2010, p. 92). In this way,
Blundo relies on student experience in the community to act as a “second text” for the course. This emphasis on making social justice personal, accessible and rooted in an experience of service (in this case, making documentaries) is foundational for Blundo. He describes the process of making the documentaries this way:

This was a living emotional experience for the students, the community text was bringing life to abstract ideas and helping students change the way they viewed and understood their world. Social justice was a living thing that existed within the interactions and meanings created by human beings and expressed in their language, and social structures; between our students and the members of the community. (Blundo, 2010, p. 97)

Through the project, students addressed not only the justice issue of segregation and its effects, but also issues of race, power, privilege and dominant perspectives. Blundo’s work illustrates how service-learning and social justice can be integrated to produce positive outcomes for both students and the community.

Brown (2001) summarizes a pilot service-learning program as the basis for developing a framework for service-learning based on the principles of critical pedagogy. The framework she presents is grounded in the concept of critical pedagogy articulated by Paulo Freire. For Freire, critical pedagogy seeks to create active participants in the world (as opposed to passive recipients) through an examination of historical, economic, political and social constructs relevant to community issues. From such a vantage point, Brown is critical of traditional service-learning curricula in that it focuses primarily on outcomes for student participants (a critique similar to Maybach, 1996) which she sees as a missed opportunity to foster deeper, more lasting relationships between students and the
community and create active citizens. The framework she presents relies on a thorough examination of the historical context of issues and responses to issues as a way to utilize academic understanding for critical thinking and problem solving. As such, a service component cannot be something that is added on to a course, it must be an intrinsic element, or as Blundo terms it, a “second text.”

Brown’s study includes worksheets, workshop guidelines and contact information as resources for institutions seeking to develop service-learning programs. The resources she provides have been specifically designed for colleges and universities but could be adapted to guide the creation of a service-learning program at the secondary level.

Similarly, developing an active citizenry is the emphasis of Westheimer and Kahne (2004). Once again drawing on Freire, Westheimer and Kahne contend, “Educational programs that emphasize social change seek to prepare students to improve society by critically analyzing and addressing social issues and injustices. These programs are less likely to emphasize a need for charity and volunteerism as ends in themselves and more likely to teach about social movements and how to effect systemic change” (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004, p. 242). The authors categorize citizenship three ways: personally responsible citizens, participatory citizens, and justice-oriented citizens. The differentiation among the three is best articulated this way: “if participatory citizens are organizing the food drive and personally responsible citizens are donating food, justice-oriented citizens are asking why people are hungry and acting on what they discover” (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004, p. 242).

The authors examine these categories of citizenship through a study of two programs (referred to in the study as Madison County Youth in Public Service and
Bayside Students for Justice) using observations, interviews and pre and post survey data. The Madison program sought to promote civic participation (consistent with participatory citizenship) linked to academic content. Students utilized new understanding of civic engagement and expressed satisfaction at their ability to help with finding solutions to community issues (specifically curbside recycling, jobs for incarcerated individuals and a community fire and rescue plan). The authors found that such an emphasis enhanced student desire to participate in the community but was limited in that it did not examine race, social class, or historical context as it pertained to the issues. The Bayside program aimed to develop community activists by having students examine global child labor practices, access to education at juvenile detention centers and incidence of bias on standardized tests such as the SAT. The Bayside program focused on critical social analysis in a way lacking in the Madison program. By examining causes and consequences of issues, the authors found that the Bayside program was geared toward forming justice-oriented citizens.

While in the authors’ estimation both programs were successful in achieving their intended outcomes, they note, “the study indicates that programs that champion participation do not necessarily develop students’ abilities to analyze and critique root causes of social problems and vice versa” (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004, p. 264). The study makes clear that the authors are in favor of developing justice-oriented citizens and propose a framework incorporating critical and structural social analysis, personal responsibility, and collective responsibility for action in order to do so.
Cultural Immersion

While establishing working definitions in the previous chapter, we acknowledged that service-learning may take place within the context of a cultural immersion. As was discussed, cultural immersion and service-learning are similar, although immersion experiences may or may not incorporate service. As well, while cultural immersion need not necessarily take place outside of one’s country, it is often the case.

A study by Raj Mundra, a biology teacher at Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, addressed this international element of service-learning/cultural immersion at the high school level. Mundra accompanied teachers and students on a three-week service-learning/cultural immersion trip to Mumbai, India. Mundra stated, “I wanted the program to make a difference in both the lives of those who serve and those who are served – to move way beyond those travel programs that seem more like cultural tourism, ‘feel good’ experiences, and resume-builders for high schoolers” (Mundra, 2009, p. 94). Mundra maintains that effective service-learning must go beyond traditional community service to include understanding of underlying problems and context of the community in which service is taking place. Structuring programs in this way is consistent with the author’s definition of immersion and results in what Mundra refers to as “changemakers” – students who continue to be active members of their local and global community (Mundra, 2009, p. 96).

The international or cultural immersion aspect of Mundra’s study more closely resembles what is taking place at colleges and universities across the country. Taking students out of a familiar local environment for relatively short periods of time (one to three weeks) and using the experience as a means for understanding more complex social,
political, and economic issues has been a model for service-learning and cultural immersion programs and the focus of research in recent years.

A 1999 study by Christie and Ragans explored the importance of expanding international service opportunities for college students. Christie and Ragans maintain that international exchange experiences are essential to students who will live and work in a more interconnected global community than previous generations. Their program, Beyond Borders, links students at Florida State University with universities in Costa Rica, Jamaica, and Germany. The Beyond Borders curriculum moves away from traditional semester-long study abroad programs and instead focuses on three-week intensive immersion experiences. Christie and Ragans maintain that the benefits of this program include making studying internationally more affordable and accessible to students while also offering smaller groups of students a chance to become more immersed in the host culture. Christie and Ragans cite service as being the activity that transforms the college students from visitors to engaged members of the host community while simultaneously refuting stereotypes of those served (Christie and Ragans, 1999, p. 82). This study does a great deal to show the impact that a well-structured, but relatively short experience of cultural immersion can have.

In 2004, King conducted a study at the collegiate level of service-learning (which he terms “true service”) in contrast with charity and the importance of critical reflection as means to challenging assumptions (King, 2004, p. 135). His research centered around four university females engaged in a week-long cultural immersion trip to Tijuana, Mexico. King’s analysis was based on interviews, daily activity logs and reflections, as well as student application essays. King found that
When service-learning resembles charity, where it is motivated by pity and involves one party doing something ‘for’ another, critical reflection is unlikely to result. In such instances, students operate from a position of privilege and are unlikely to question their own motives, power, how their actions may be perceived by others, or how they might produce unintended consequences. (King, 2004, p. 135)

Rather, service-learning that operated in conjunction with local communities served to challenge assumptions of participating students and provided opportunities for critical reflection. King’s conclusions regarding the impact of a power differential on service relationships reflect Maybach’s (1996) observations about interactions between service providers and service recipients. To be transformative, King advocates for experiences that disrupt students’ belief systems as a basis for a critical examination of such beliefs.

Renner, Brown, Stiens and Burton (2010) also examine service-learning (more specifically cultural immersion) as a means of engaging critical pedagogy and social justice. Their study examines developing an international service-learning partnership in which the authors bring together students, teachers, social workers and physical therapists from Jamaica and the United States for mutual understanding and benefit. As the goal of the program is to overcome power differentials and effects of privilege the authors find inherent in a service relationship, Renner et al. are careful to differentiate social service from social change. Similar to the distinction made by Butin (2007) regarding charity and justice, the authors distinguish social service works which help individuals “get ahead” from social change which encourages communities to “get together” for social empowerment (Renner et al., 2010, p. 44). In this way, social service often acts in a
charitable way – addressing social issues, but not seeking to understand their root cause.

By contrast, social justice seeks to understand social issues as a systemic problem. The authors further distinguish charity from social justice in this way,

In terms of charity…the ‘server’ operates on the ‘served’ using a deficit model (i.e. ‘they’ are intrinsically inferior)…[which] presupposes that there will always be those who have and those who have not...[In contrast] social justice begins from a premise that…the condition of the poor is not only unacceptable, it is the result of structural violence that is human made. (Renner et al., 2010, p. 44-45)

If approached as a human made reality, operating within existing social structures often perpetuates issues of injustice. Therefore, Renner et al. advocate for structural transformation – developing critical consciousness of social realities and ultimately organizing to address issues of inequity and injustice. Working with their Jamaican counterparts, Renner et al. developed two necessary components to encourage such a transformation: “(1) any constructive social change will require the horizontal partnering of a segment of those privileged by the system with those oppressed by the system; and (2) this work cannot be completed without hope – a critical sort of hope that is characterized by love, creativity and a profound sense of struggle” (Renner et al., 2010, p. 52). In other words, societal transformation must include perspectives of both dominant and oppressed populations while believing that another social reality is possible and working together to achieve such a reality.

Although the previous studies featured international examples, this idea of cultural immersion need not necessarily take place abroad, as indicated by our definition. Luquet (2009) offers an example of domestic cultural immersion through an examination
of a 3-credit course offered by Gwynedd-Mercy College outside of Philadelphia taking place in New Orleans. The course began as an examination into the history and culture of New Orleans, however, following Hurricane Katrina, a service element was added. Luquet argues that the addition of the service element led to greater understanding and appreciation of the history and culture and that knowledge of history and culture made the service more meaningful. In this way, Luquet maintains that both components are necessary and essential to the effectiveness of the course (Luquet, 2009, p. 83-86).

Critiques

Studies of the impact and influence of service-learning are not all positive. Swaminathan (2007) investigated the “hidden curriculum” of service-learning, i.e. that which is taught by service site coordinators as opposed to course instructors. The study took place in a community school that had incorporated the characteristics of service-learning for social justice presented by Wade (2001). After conducting interviews and observations, Swaminathan found that site coordinators frequently viewed themselves as teacher-mentors responsible for teaching a particular set of values or objectives which was often at odds with the social justice curriculum intended by classroom teachers. Swaminathan categorized the hidden curriculum of the teacher-mentors as instrumental (focused on improving students’ work habits, i.e. time on task, punctuality, and professional appearance), developing social capital (networking, relationship building, resume enhancing), and learning cultural competence (understanding of issues faced by people of color and marginalized populations as a means of dismantling prejudice). The author discovered that classroom teachers were rarely aware of this “hidden curriculum” and while it reinforced positive outcomes it did not empower students to be change
agents, as the teachers had envisioned. Even though service-learning sites were connected to issues of globalization, distribution of power, or an exploration of race, “these issues lay dormant at the sites since mentors were interested in helping students acquire specific skills and traits” (Swaminathan, 2007, p. 141). Swaminathan concludes that it is “insufficient to allow experience to be its own teacher; it could lead to goals that are at odds with intentions of teachers” (Swaminathan, 2007, p. 142). In this way, he urges service-learning instructors to be more active and aware of the role played by community partners while also being explicit about expectations of them.

While most studies of service-learning tout the ability of service experiences to transform student attitudes and perceptions or provide opportunities to evaluate personal belief systems (Jones and Abes, 2004; Maher, 2003; Mundra, 2009; Christie and Ragans, 1999), Jones (2002) explores the “underside” of service-learning. She claims that despite developing well-structured programs, there is “some likelihood of service-learning experiences actually reinforcing the negative stereotypes and assumptions that students bring with them to the class environment” (Jones, 2002, p. 10). For Jones, these students who “don’t seem to get it” often fail to see the connection between course content and service experiences or are primarily concerned with their own ability to provide help that they proceed unreflectively through a service-learning course and emerge either unchanged or steadfast in previously held convictions (Jones, 2002, p. 11). Jones formulates that

What distinguishes those who get it from those who don’t has something to do with the intersection of the student’s own background (which becomes quite apparent in a service-learning activity), developmental readiness for such a
learning experience, and the privileging conditions that put a college student in a community service organization as a volunteer in the first place…One cannot help but notice, for instance, that the primary recipients of community service are those who society has deemed disadvantaged in some way, be it through their social class, race, ethnicity, ability, or any combination of these. Those who do community service…are generally young people who have more advantages than those they are serving. (Jones, 2002, p. 13)

She goes on to illustrate her point through personal stories of students who resisted or struggled to grow from a service-learning experience. In conclusion, she emphasizes that carefully planned course design and expectations incorporating high quality service placement, intentionally designed reflection, and opportunities to personalize social issues are necessary to diminish the likelihood of students “getting in over their heads” (Jones, 2002, p. 14).

Himley (2004) echoes the perspective presented by Jones that despite its potential and good intentions, service-learning does not always provide a transformative experience for all students. Although Himley characterizes problems with service-learning being everything from the inability of student participants to engage deeply, service experiences confirming student beliefs about the poor rather than transforming them, or service experiences providing students with opportunities to “save” those whom they serve, she specifically deals with the concept of “the stranger” as it pertains to service-learning (Himley, 2004, p. 417). To begin this exploration, Himley addresses the history of service in this way:
Service has roots in the volunteerism of white middle- and upper-class women in this country, where these hopeful and idealistic (and perhaps naïve) volunteers went out into poor and working class neighborhoods to improve the material and moral lot of the less fortunate they found living there. These volunteers had the social capital to move close to these strangers in order to re-script their lives within dominant discourses and values…Through service projects, these women also achieved a measure of public status and power by representing their work to public audiences and themselves as ‘good citizens’ taking care of those who were weaker and more vulnerable and (believed to be) more dangerous. (Himley, 2004, p. 419-420)

In her estimation, these roots of service impact the service provider/service recipient roles still present today. A service relationship, no matter how collaborative, still enables one party (the service providers) to come and go and determine the level of involvement, while the service recipients do not have such luxury. Himley refers to such phenomena as border inspections or border crossings (terms she attributes to Alexjandro Lugo). She points out the “very real symbolic and material violence of these border inspections and of the social hierarchies that are reinforced by the daily realities of who does and who does not cross borders, both psychological and national” (Himley, 2004, p. 435). Her comments reflect the potential danger for exploitation and voyeurism that exist in service relationships. She goes on to say that the reality of the service relationships places the student (service provider) in a privileged position (regardless of a student’s actual economic or social status) in that the student is the one to donate time and expertise, the one who serves, and the one who writes about it (Himley, 2004, p. 430).
Additionally, traditional roles of service provider and service recipient reflect power asymmetry and can result in a form of manipulation on the part of service providers. That is, while community organizations generally need volunteers and students doing so to meet school requirements fill such a need, the fact that student volunteers also “need” to tell stories about their experiences, write reflections and have discussions as part of a course requirement may encourage false relationships, leaving service recipients to wonder where they went once a particular number of hours is met (Himley 2004, p. 424).

To avoid, as much as possible, occurrences of voyeurism, exploitation or manipulation, Himley advocates for service-learning courses to incorporate a significant amount of preparation. For Himley, this specifically means learning about the community to be served prior to beginning service. That is, what are the social realities faced by members of a particular community? What historical, political or social events have contributed (or continue to contribute) to the existence of such realities? What are specific organizations doing to address relevant issues? By examining census data, Himley guides her students through a process of identifying issues and contextualizing an experience to place student experience in a community within a much larger context which she maintains will help students with personal experiences of “the stranger.”

**Implications**

This study seeks to build upon the research presented here by weaving elements of prior research in areas of identity development, reflection, social justice and cultural immersion with Ignatian pedagogy and Jesuit spirituality. That is, just as Ignatian pedagogy grew out of secular practices combined with the Spiritual Exercises of St.
Ignatius, this study seeks to merge best practices from current research and centuries of Jesuit educational tradition. The aforementioned studies related to identity development, reflection, social justice, cultural immersion and critiques thereof are presented with the intent that they provide a basis for this study’s exploration of what it means to develop a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context.

In the next chapter, we will examine what is currently taking place at Jesuit, private and secular secondary institutions with regard to service-learning. The goal of such an exploration is to discover what distinctions, if any, can be drawn between service-learning in a Jesuit context and that which takes place in other private (non-Jesuit) or secular institutions.
CHAPTER IV

SERVICE-LEARNING SCHOOL PROFILES: THEORY & PRACTICE

To this point, we have established definitions distinguishing service, service-learning and immersion and examined existing frameworks for service-learning. While such a theoretical understanding is important and relevant, the ideals described may not accurately match the reality of service-learning programs established within schools. Therefore, it is also necessary for us to examine what is taking place in schools and districts across the country with regard to service-learning. That is, what does service-learning look like in practice? And, do current practices match elements of existing frameworks (e.g. reflection, community relationship building, established curricular ties, etc.)? Undertaking such an examination will help us understand how theory is applied in practice and identify possible pitfalls or shortcomings before we put forth a framework for service-learning in Jesuit secondary schools. Therefore, this chapter is devoted to profiling schools or districts with established service-learning programs.

Currently, service-learning is taking place in numerous elementary and secondary schools as well as in universities across the country. Programs exist in both public and private schools, in parochial as well as non-religious school contexts. Due in part to such differing milieus, the design and implementation of service-learning programs vary from place to place. In this chapter, we seek to take a glimpse into some of the different programs in place in these varied settings by offering brief profiles of several service-
learning programs. We will look at public school service-learning programs, particularly those taking place in Maryland and the Chicago public schools. Maryland is included as it is the first state to mandate service-learning as a graduation requirement for high school students. We will also look at Chicago public schools as they represent a large urban district with both an elementary and secondary emphasis on service-learning. Chicago Public Schools have embraced service-learning as a teaching strategy stating, “Service-learning is a strategy for engaged learning that has proven successful among the most disengaged students and least successful schools, particularly those in an urban setting,” (Kielsmeier et al., 2010, p. 3). Additionally, as this research focuses specifically on service-learning at Jesuit secondary schools, we will look at two Jesuit high schools in the United States which currently have service-learning programs or courses. While some Jesuit schools require service, service-learning or cultural immersion for graduation, others do not. Both schools profiled here do require service, service-learning, or cultural immersion for graduation. As Jesuit secondary schools identify themselves as college preparatory institutions and often take curricular cues from higher education, analyzing the service-learning programs at a couple Jesuit universities may provide insight into characteristics that could be beneficial at the secondary level. With this in mind, we will also look at a Jesuit university with an established service-learning program. Finally, an investigation into service-learning at a private Catholic school is included to help determine any characteristics with may distinguish service-learning taking place in Jesuit schools from that taking place in other private institutions.

The goal of this analysis is to determine what commonalities exist among varied contexts (i.e. what characteristics should be included in a framework for service-learning
regardless of the setting) in addition to determining what characteristics, if any, distinguish service-learning in Jesuit schools from other contexts (i.e. what must a framework include to be characteristically ‘Jesuit’?). Likewise, attention will be paid to any shortcomings or drawbacks of existing programs (i.e. what lessons can be learned from existing programs that may assist in developing a framework for service-learning and Jesuit secondary schools?). It should be noted that this analysis does not serve as a measure of how effective or ineffective a particular program is, we simply seek to compare the structure and outcomes of a service-learning program with the actual implementation. That is, does the service-learning lessons or structure of a service-learning program reflect the program’s self-expressed characteristics?

**Maryland: State Mandated Service-Learning**

In July of 1992, the state of Maryland became the first in the nation to make service-learning a requirement for high school graduation and the class of 1997 the first to meet the new requirement (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 3). This requirement must be filled in one of two ways:

1. seventy-five hours of student service that includes preparation, action, and reflection components and that, at the discretion of the local school system, may begin during the middle grades

2. a locally-designed program in student service that has been approved by the State Superintendent of Schools.

(Ayers, 2003, p. 1)

At this time, all twenty-four districts in Maryland have chosen to design their own program (option 2) (Ayers, 2003, 1p.). Districts have worked to design programs closely
linked to existing curriculum and describe a continual process of evaluation as part of the ongoing implementation effort (Ayers, 2003, p. 1).

Since 1993, “Service-learning has been embraced in Maryland as an effective, experiential instructional strategy that allows students to apply what they learn in the classroom to the real world” according to the State Department of Education (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 4). With nearly twenty years of experience developing, implementing and evaluating service-learning programs, Maryland public schools could be considered national leaders in service-learning and have developed resources for other districts and schools seeking to implement a service-learning curriculum. One such resource was initially created in 1995 when the Maryland State Department of Education developed a list of seven best practices deemed necessary for high quality service-learning experiences based on interviews with seventy Maryland teachers who facilitated effective service-learning projects with their students (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 5). Updated in 2004, this list of seven ‘best practices’ states that effective service-learning programs do the following:

1) Meet a recognized need in the community
2) Achieve curricular objectives through service-learning
3) Structure reflection throughout the service-learning experience
4) Develop student responsibility
5) Establish community partnerships
6) Plan ahead for service-learning
7) Equip students with knowledge and skills needed for service

(Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 6)
These seven individual practices will be explored briefly in an attempt to better understand what characterizes each one.

Two of Maryland’s ‘best practices’ deal with community interaction. When it comes to meeting identified needs in the community (best practice #1), Maryland adheres to the Corporation for National and Community Service categories of health, education, environment, and public safety as possible areas in which students may participate in service-learning (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 7). Within those categories, students can engage in Direct Service (personal interaction with service recipients), Indirect Service (providing service, such as collecting resources, which assists community members without working with them directly) or Advocacy (working to eliminate the cause of a particular problem often through legal work, legislation or disseminating information) and students are expected to engage in all three forms of service-learning prior to graduation (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 7). The Department of Education notes, however, that

"While the preparation phase of a service-learning project is critical in establishing the need of the community and helps students understand the related issues, that phase should not dominate the total service-learning experience. Students need to be engaged in meaningful action for a sustained amount of time so that their projects can have a positive impact on the community." (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 7)

This emphasis on getting students out into the community is reflected in another ‘best practice’ focused on establishing community partnerships. Maryland’s Department of Education maintains that having students work closely with community organizations
achieves several goals. Students are exposed to various careers and the world of work, while schools broaden resources available to them through new partnerships and community organizations are able to interact with students in a positive manner (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 11). In this way, service-learning is regarded as mutually beneficial to the students, schools and communities involved.

The Maryland Department of Education’s description of these ‘best practices’ clearly emphasizes the role of the student – students gain exposure to the ‘real world,’ community partners come to view students positively due to their contributions to the community, and students are responsible for determining what is needed by the community. Additionally, all of this needs to occur rather quickly so that students have ample time to design and implement a project to fill the need. A potential drawback of this narrow focus is that community organizations may not function as actual partners. Rather, if students are rushed into identifying perceived problems in a community without understanding from the perspective of community members what they believe the problems to be, projects may meet superficial needs but lack the depth to create any real change in the community and may lead to anger or resentment on the part of community organizations or members.

Next, Maryland’s Department of Education emphasizes the importance of tying service-learning to curricular objectives and the significance of planning ahead. The main goal here is for service-learning opportunities to provide a real-world setting in which to engage knowledge and skills gained in the classroom. According to the Department of Education, “Service-learning adds relevancy and purpose to the curriculum” (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 8). Similarly, they
maintain, “Well-planned projects are strongly linked to existing curricular goals and objectives” (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 12). This curricular tie and plan to include a service component as an instructional strategy sets service-learning apart from service alone. What is implied is that to be effective, service-learning projects cannot be add-ons to an established curriculum; rather, service-learning must be a deliberate, integrated portion of a course or unit of study.

Consistent with other frameworks for service-learning, Maryland includes reflection as an important element of effective service-learning programs. Reflection activities may take the form of journaling, class discussions, interviews, self-evaluations, etc. According to the Department of Education,

The reflection portion of the service-learning experience is much more than an opportunity for students to describe personal learning…Through reflection, students may discover other potential projects that could be carried out. Students grow intellectually, personally, and socially by engaging in meaningful reflection activities. (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 9)

What seems to be lacking, however, is any explanation of how to structure reflection so that it moves students beyond personal learning. That is, what constitutes what is referred to as “meaningful” with regard to reflection?

The final two ‘best practices’ focus on the student’s role in service-learning. First, Maryland’s Department of Education states, “High quality service-learning allows students to take leadership and ownership of the projects performed” as a way of developing student responsibility (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 10). In order for this to happen, students must have an understanding of the issue(s) they will
be addressing, another ‘best practice’. Gaining this understanding requires that students “conduct research, read articles, and listen to guest speakers discuss the issue” as means of gaining the knowledge and skills necessary to engage in service (Maryland State Department of Education, 2005, p. 13). The ‘best practices’ include a description that as students mature, the amount and type of research involved increase, as does the level of student responsibility for design and implementation.

In order to examine the service-learning program in the state of Maryland a little more closely, we will analyze a service-learning project idea in light of their ‘best practices.’ The first, shown in Figure 5, is a literature project idea for secondary students whose goal is to promote diversity by reading literature and partnering students from one school with students with
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In Figure 5, Maryland Service-Learning (Maryland Student Service Alliance, 2004, p. 17)
disabilities at another school. With regard to the ‘best practices,’ it is not clear who identified the need for greater understanding (the classroom teacher, the students with disabilities, or teachers at the school for children with disabilities). The students complete a significant amount of preparation – listening to speakers, engaging in simulations, planning activities and reading novels, activities which correspond to adequate preparation for service-learning and student responsibility for the project. Reflection, in the form of written letters and discussion is included, meeting another ‘best practice.’ The curricular tie seems somewhat lacking. While the students read four works of literature focused on diversity and differences and then interact with students with disabilities, it’s not clear how the instructor plans to integrate the literature and the action component. Does the reading simply provide examples of people dealing with differences that serves as a foundation for a personal experience of people with differences? The link to Helen Keller’s story seems clear, but how are growing up in Harlem, an autobiography from a concentration camp and love between feuding families addressed by the action component of working with students with disabilities? The project details a clear service element and the inclusion of four works of literature certainly constitutes learning, however, the connection between the two which would clearly identify the project as ‘service-learning’ could be more clearly defined and articulated.

Although just one of the numerous lesson plans included in Maryland’s service-learning materials and countless lessons taking place in the state’s schools, this example helps to illustrate that a defined set of ‘best practices’ does not ensure that the criteria are met in practice. Including some form of evaluation as a ‘best practice’ may help to
maintain the integrity of any service-learning program and is a characteristic that should be considered as we construct a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit context.

**Chicago Public Schools: An Urban Service-Learning District**

Continuing with profiles of public schools, we will now look at the Chicago Public School (CPS) system, a district which, according to the CPS website is responsible for educating roughly 410,000 students annually. CPS requires that all secondary students complete a minimum of 40 hours of service between 9th and 12th grade as a graduation requirement (Schmidt, 2002, p. 8). While the requirement speaks of service hours, further examination of the districts’ guidelines for eligible activities makes clear that the intent is to require service-learning. For instance, acceptable activities include: “Classroom projects that are tied to a curriculum and meet a community need, after school projects that meet a community need and have a clear academic objective, [or] individual or small group service-learning experiences that have been scaffolded by the classroom teacher” (Schmidt, 2002, p. 8). Conversely, activities such as assisting a teacher or volunteer work without an academic tie do not earn service hours. Such distinctions clearly illustrate that the intent of the CPS requirement is to encourage service-learning opportunities, not to simply require service.

To help achieve this goal, Co-Director of Service-Learning for CPS, Jon Schmidt states, “All schools generate opportunities for classroom-integrated service-learning experiences with students. All students participate actively in service-learning experiences to build higher order academic skills, strengthen relationships, and develop civic skills” (Schmidt, 2002, p. 8). The intent, according to Schmidt is to,
Deepen and extend classroom instruction for CPS high school students in all subject areas to improve academic achievement, build social skills, and develop civic skills and attitudes. Through participation in curriculum-integrated service-learning projects, students will have opportunities to work toward the common good as they develop a strong sense of social responsibility and civic awareness. (Schmidt, 2002, p. 8)

CPS designates specific components necessary to ensure service-learning: Preparation, Action, and Reflection (Schmidt, 2002, p. 8). Service-learning coaches at each school work with teachers and students to develop service projects which incorporate these elements and which contain an explicit curricular tie or academic objective.

To help illustrate the service-learning program in the Chicago Public Schools, we will examine a sample lesson (“The Economics of Hunger”) using the components of Preparation, Action, and Reflection designated by CPS as essential element of service-learning.

The Economics of Hunger: In an Economics course, the teacher wanted students to understand the economics of hunger. Using concepts such as supply and demand, government intervention, and wage/price controls, the teacher hoped to demonstrate that hunger is not an individual issue, but is the result of various forces at work within society. In order for students to get a better understanding of the magnitude of hunger, they spent a day at the Greater Chicago Food Depository packing and re-packaging food for distribution among local food pantries. As a follow-up activity, student teams were asked to identify a local food pantry, research the organization, and volunteer at least one afternoon. Student
groups returned to class and reported their findings. The teacher incorporated their findings into a broader discussion about both private and public responses to hunger. (Schmidt, 2002, p. 8)

In this lesson or unit of study, one could argue Preparation comes in the form of learning about the economic concepts of supply and demand, government intervention and wage/price controls. The Action element takes place when students spend a day at the Greater Chicago Food Depository preparing goods for local food pantries as well as spending an afternoon at a local food pantry. Finally, the Reflection component is present in the discussion of public and private responses to hunger.

While the sample lesson meets the framework of Preparation, Action and Reflection designated by CPS, it is important to consider whether the framework is an adequate gauge of the presence of service-learning. That is, are there additional elements that would further distinguish service from service-learning? For instance, the CPS model does not address the relationship between community organizations and students as was done in the Maryland model. Does the exclusion of this element place singular focus on the student and diminish the relationship building opportunities presented by service-learning? Or, is this aspect implicitly implied in the Preparation stage of the CPS service-learning model? Additionally, as was observed in Maryland’s program, the CPS model does not include an evaluation component. Including some form of evaluation in the essential elements of a service-learning program may help to ensure lessons and activities are meeting the established framework. Therefore, while concise, the CPS model may benefit from an expanded explanation of characteristics of each of the elements of its model and the inclusion of an evaluation element.
It is also important to note that the model present in CPS of Preparation, Action and Reflection is reminiscent of the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm of Context, Experience, Reflection, Action and Evaluation. As we attempt to create a framework for service-learning that is explicitly ‘Jesuit’ we will not be able to rely on the IPP alone, as it is clear these elements are incorporated into service-learning programs in the public sector as well.

**Father Ryan: Service-Learning at a Private, Catholic High School**

Next, we shift from public schools to a private, Catholic secondary school. Situated in Nashville, TN, Father Ryan High School educates roughly 900 students annually according to a self-report on the school’s website. For Father Ryan, the rationale for doing service is rooted in the Catholic, Christian faith tradition. The school’s philosophy for including service-learning in the curriculum illustrates this belief. According to the school’s Service-Learning webpage,

Faith, justice and service are inseparable components to fulfilling the Gospel mission…Father Ryan service-learning program allows its students to accept the responsibility…by becoming living examples of the Gospel with their actions and deeds….Service-learning allows students to link school-based knowledge with the experience of actively living the Gospel. It encourages students to take the teachings of Christ beyond the textbook, and by so doing, become actively engaged in their Christian faith. It helps them to become other-centered in a culture that focuses solely on self. (Service Learning, 2010, p. 1)

Students at Father Ryan complete a specified number of service-learning hours each year. Similar to the Maryland program, Father Ryan is deliberate in distinguishing three
different types of service: direct service (where the student has contact with the person(s) being served), indirect service (student does something for an individual or group, but does not interact with them), and advocacy (working to affect social change by addressing the root cause of a community problem) (Service Learning, 2010, p. 2). The school determines how many hours each year (Freshman through Junior) can be spent among the three types of service and clear emphasis on direct service is present (e.g. Junior year a minimum of 15 hours can be spent in direct service while no more than 5 hours can be devoted to advocacy) (Service Learning, 2010, p. 2).

Service-learning projects at Father Ryan are completed individually. That is, students submit a plan to their theology teacher who determines whether the student’s project and choice of service site qualifies as service-learning. Once approved, the student performs the service. Finally, each student submits a reflection paper which asks the students to talk about where the service took place, what hardships were witnessed at the service site, how the service benefited the poor or marginalized, and in what ways the service complemented classroom learning (Service Learning, 2010, p. 2).

Father Ryan states that it uses a model of reflection, action and reflection in a continual cycle to guide its service-learning program (Service Learning, 2010, p. 2). In the way the program is structured, however, it seems that much is left to the student. Students are encouraged to reflect upon a choice of site and to find an organization that is of interest to them, but it does not appear that they are guided in this process by the faculty. Additionally, the paper that is submitted following service leaves integrating the experiences of service with classroom learning to the students. While Father Ryan seeks to form students who, “act justly in regards to poverty, oppression, and marginalized
[and] to help guide students in the spiritual exercise of reflection, action, reflection,” it is not clear that the implementation of the service-learning program supports these goals (Service Learning, 2010, p. 1-2). For instance, it does not appear that class time is spent processing student service experiences or helping students to understand how their service work is connected to larger justice issues. Instead, students are expected to do so in their reflection paper with little guidance. With reflection as two of the three steps of the service-learning model, it is clearly a valued exercise for Father Ryan. It seems that providing multiple avenues for reflection (i.e. written, oral, individual, or collective) would benefit the service-learning program.

**Service-Learning in Jesuit Secondary Schools**

Having looked at a statewide service-learning program from the East coast, a public school district in the Midwest, and a Catholic high school in the south, we will now examine two Jesuit secondary schools on the West coast, Jesuit High School Sacramento and Jesuit High School Portland. Jesuit High Sacramento (JHS Sacramento) is a secondary school responsible for educating approximately 1000 young men annually. JHS Sacramento demonstrates a commitment to service by requiring service hours for graduation and devoting a department within the school to ‘Christian Service.’ According to the school’s website, "The spiritual dimension of the students’ development is fostered through their incorporation into a community where Catholic beliefs, morals and values, inspired by faith in the Gospel and belief in the full brotherhood and sisterhood of the human family, are taught, professed and experienced, and where personal action is proposed as a response” (Jesuit High School Sacramento, 2011). From this perspective, service comes as a response to a particular set of beliefs, namely the
Catholic tradition. As the quote illustrates, JHS Sacramento views the commitment to service as a way to encourage the spiritual development of students by providing them with opportunities to work in the community. The goal in this structure is for the community to act as a ‘classroom’ or ‘teacher’ where students witness beliefs and values important to the Catholic tradition in action.

Requiring service, however, does not necessarily imply the presence of service-learning. Therefore, JHS Sacramento is deliberate in stating,

Opportunities to reflect on the Christian dimension of service are part of the curriculum at all four levels…reflection is seen as an indispensable part of Christian Service. In Jesuit schools, learning is expected to move beyond rote knowledge to the development of the more complex learning skills of understanding, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Jesuit education insists that students consider the significance of what they learn and to integrate that meaning into their lives. Reflection helps students make connections between their personal experience of service and the larger issues of social justice” (Jesuit High School Sacramento, 2011)

Therefore, reflection is the tool ensuring that an experience of service is connected with issues of social justice, topics JHS Sacramento maintains are addressed in the curriculum throughout four years of study.

This is a different form of service-learning than we saw in Maryland and Chicago. As explained here, the learning that results from an experience of service followed by reflection has less to do with a specific lesson, topic or unit. Rather, the learning goals stem from the Catholic tradition (e.g. love of ones neighbor, acting on behalf of the least
of God’s people) and are tied to issues of social justice (e.g. poverty, homelessness), an important characteristic of both Catholic Social Teaching and Jesuit education. As stated by Fr. Pedro Arrupe,

Today our prime educational objective must be to form men and women for others; men and women who cannot even conceive of love of God which does not include love for the least of their neighbors. The education imparted in Jesuit schools must be equal to the demands of justice in the world. What kind of people are needed in the world today? Men and women for others. (Arrupe SJ, 1991, p. 1)

In this way, service-learning is incorporated into school life as a way to give lived experience to the substance of Jesuit/Catholic beliefs.

JHS Sacramento identifies some necessary characteristics for its service-learning program. The program seeks to:

A) Allow for direct contact with those who are marginalized in our culture;
B) Expose the root causes of marginalization;
C) Work to counter the causes of marginalization;
D) Enable [students] to reach out to others in Christian fellowship

(Jesuit High School Sacramento, 2011)

This is accomplished through a guided discernment process which helps students select a partnering organization and prepare for a service experience there. Additionally, reflection is utilized to assist in exposing the root causes of the marginalization students witness through their work at organizations and to place any work to counter those causes in the context of the Catholic tradition.
Once again, we will examine a specific example to see how these elements are addressed in practice. Figure 6 has a description of one site placement available to students during their Junior year at JHS Sacramento. The following description is part of a larger document that outlines general information about community organizations, who is served by the organizations and what the expectations for student involvement would be.

In this example, a student spends one period per day at a private park assisting the homeless. As this project happens within the context of the school day and is integrated into the curriculum through reflection, it would qualify as a service-learning experience. Examining the Friendship Park placement with regards to the characteristics outlined by JHS Sacramento’s Christian Service program, the site clearly allows for direct contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JHS Sacramento Service-Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement: Friendship Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: (Loaves &amp; Fishes)12th &amp; No. B Sts., Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact: Mr. Jim Peth/Mr. Garren Bratcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times: 3rd Period (11:00-12:00 p.m.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description: The heart and soul of the Loaves and Fishes program, Friendship Park is a private park that provides activities, information and a safe environment for our guests during the day. 307,278 cups of coffee were filled in 2007 as well as 218,967 pastries served for morning breakfast. The Park provides telephones and free local telephone calls to our guests. There is an Information Service Center (916 446-9316) to assist and sign up guest for services: Noon meal, hair cut vouchers, toiletries, and locker storage. With the help of donations from the community, Loaves and Fishes has built a Wash House which provides laundry service for our homeless guests as well as a place for men to shower and shave (with toiletries included).

Within the confines of the Park is a Library Reading Room where guests can appreciate a full service library with books, daily newspapers, and periodicals. The library allows quiet time and space for studying and writing. Friendship Park’s Day Labor (916 832-5510) employment referral services referred over 1,877 jobs to our homeless guests in 2007. Participants are willing and able to work in a wide range of jobs including yard work, construction and moving. Often disconnected from family and friends, our guests who have died are remembered through memorial services at the Memorial Wall where their names are etched in stone never to be forgotten. The Memorial Wall is located over a waterfall and pond in a peaceful corner of the Park.

One Jesuit student works in the Service Center, distributing lunch tickets, answering questions and generally assisting the homeless community guests.

Figure 6. JHS Sacramento Service-Learning (Jesuit High School Sacramento, 2001)
with a marginalized population, namely the homeless of Sacramento. By assisting with meals, working in the Service Center and answering questions, the selected student will certainly work closely with the homeless. Additionally, placement at this site would accomplish the goal of reaching out to others in Christian fellowship. That is, the student is feeding the hungry, helping to provide a more dignified life (through job placement, access to a library and washroom) and death (through the Memorial Wall) to a marginalized population.

At the same time, the characteristics of exposing the root causes of marginalization and examining appropriate means to counter these causes are not explicitly addressed here. It may be that these characteristics are addressed through classroom reflection, however, this is not made explicit in the description of the placement. That the JHS Sacramento program is tied to the curriculum through a set of values and beliefs rather than an explicit lesson or unit of study does create a situation where many of the curricular connections are left to the student to make. As well, since students are serving at a variety of locations, the diversity of experience may allow students to view issues such as poverty or homelessness from a variety of perspectives. The danger, however, is that such a wide variety of experiences, if not processed adequately and collectively, may not uncover the root causes and connection to the Catholic and Jesuit traditions as desired.

The program at Jesuit High School Portland (JHS Portland) addresses some of the potential shortcomings and pitfalls of the JHS Sacramento program. Once again, service is required of all students, beginning with eight hours per year for all freshmen and sophomores and culminating with a 65-hour final project to be completed during junior
and senior year (Powers, 2010, p. 8). The final project is structured according to the following components: orientation, service work, journaling, writing a final paper and enrollment in a Peace and Justice class (Powers, 2010, p. 8).

As was the case in Sacramento, students are required to complete the service component of this final project by working with a marginalized population. According to the Christian Service Director, Scott Powers, acceptable activities include working with people who are homeless, disabled, victims of domestic violence or elderly, tutoring, or participating in a local or international immersion program. Also, the programs are similar in that the learning component of the service-learning dynamic is connected to Catholic and Jesuit beliefs and values rather than a specific unit of study. However, unlike the program in Sacramento, JHS Portland students are required to enroll in a Peace and Justice class where issues of social justice are examined as part of the explicit curriculum. Additionally, students at JHS Portland are required to complete the service hours and final project outside of school hours. This final project, as described could qualify as a service-learning experience in that it incorporates personal experience with reflection while addressing issues of social justice as part of a course curriculum.

Figure 7 gives the description of the requirements for JHS Portland’s final project (Powers, 2010, p. 8). We will examine the description to see how the elements of orientation, service work, journaling, written paper, and enrollment in the Peace and Justice course are incorporated.

As the document describes, the orientation element takes place during the sophomore year. Orientation, in this sense, refers to introducing students to the requirements of the program, the organizations with which students can work and social justice issues these
organizations address. This begins a process of discernment wherein the students seek to
determine with which organization they will work. When selecting an agency or organization,
students are encouraged to consider,

Who will challenge you the most. Christian Service is a learning experience, and
therefore a good time to work with people who make you uncomfortable, because
you can grow tremendously by being uncomfortable. We also want you to
consider your interests, talents and strengths, your schedule, and what
transportation you will need to get to your placement. (Powers, 2010, p. 8)

Once students have been paired with a local organization, they engage in service
work a minimum of 65 hours. It is evident by reading the project description that
building relationships between students, community organizations and the marginalized
populations served is a goal. Students are expected to complete the full requirement at
one site whenever possible. In this way, students may come to better understand issues
of social justice and the role of the organization in addressing/combating such issues.

The next element, journaling, appears to provide a two-fold purpose. First, it acts
a means of ensuring students are completing required hours regularly as journal entries
are required after each visit. Secondly, it promotes reflection, a key tenet of Jesuit
education. Frequent journaling provides students with regular opportunities to think
about what is happening at their service site and how it makes them feel. It can also be
an opportunity to reflect on issues of social justice witnessed through their service.
Figure 7. JHS Portland Service-Learning Project
While engaged in service, students are concurrently enrolled in a Peace and Justice course. The course is,

Designed to help students consider the unjust as well as the life-giving aspects of modern culture and social structures in light of the student’s service experience and Catholic social teaching. After an overview of scriptural and theological justice principles, students will be guided through an educational process of context, social analysis, theological reflection, and pastoral action. These tools will then be applied to such issues as poverty, discrimination, homelessness, just-war theory, pacifism, and other issues of human rights. Jesus Christ’s call to reform the injustices of society in fulfillment of the Reign of God as expressed in scriptures and the social teachings of the Catholic Church will be the focus. (Powers, 2010, p. 8)

As such, the course provides a foundation for exploring and understanding complex social justice issues. The academic content provided by a course devoted to social justice issues provides a context when students encounter these issues through their service placement.

Lastly, the final paper is the opportunity for the student to demonstrate what he/she has learned through the service experience. As explained on the website, the task of the student is to:

Demonstrate what you learned from your service work and how you have applied those lessons to your life. Such a paper helps each student to formulate his or her vision of what it means to work for social justice as a Christian today. The support for your thesis should be your own stories, experiences, and examples from your
journal, and the reflections shared with religion teachers, classmates, advisor, or placement supervisor. Remember, YOU are the focus of this paper; you and what you have learned from the people you served. (Powers, 2010, p. 8)

It appears that the goal of the final paper is to be the incorporation of all the previous elements. The paper acts as a link between the active element of service, the cognitive element of the Peace and Justice course and a culmination of journaling. In this way, it serves as the concrete expression of service-learning at JHS Portland; a written account of hands-on experience, personal reflection and the social justice curriculum.

In comparison, it seems that the goals of the two programs are similar; the importance of providing opportunities for students to work with marginalized populations as a means of better understanding issues of social justice and the Catholic/Jesuit response to such issues. In contrast, the program at JHS Portland appears to have more structures in place to facilitate the service-learning process.

**Jesuit Higher Education: St. Joseph’s University and Service-Learning**

We must therefore raise our Jesuit education standard to ‘educate the whole person of solidarity for the real world.’ Solidarity is learned through ‘contact' rather than through ‘concepts'….When the heart is touched by direct experience, the mind may be challenged to change. Personal involvement with innocent suffering, with the injustice others suffer, is the catalyst for solidarity which then gives rise to intellectual inquiry and moral reflection. (Kolvenbach, 2000)

In 2000 in his role as Superior General for the Society of Jesus, Peter-Hans Kolvenbach addressed Jesuit colleges and universities regarding their responsibility in promoting justice through education. As the above quote illustrates, Kolvenbach believed that
contact and direct experience with those that are marginalized in society is an important first step in understanding and addressing injustice. In that service-learning incorporates direct experience, intellectual inquiry and moral reflection which Kolvenbach mentions, it has become a way for Jesuit colleges and universities to begin to “educate the whole person of solidarity for the real world” (Kolvenbach, 2000). While numerous institutions have service-learning programs or courses, the program at St. Joseph’s University (SJU) will be profiled here. This particular program has been selected as it explicitly links service-learning to Ignatian Pedagogy and has established particular criteria for service-learning courses based on this connection.

At SJU, the service-learning program is housed under the Faith-Justice Institute. According to SJU’s Faith-Justice Institute website,

Service-Learning is a form of experience-based education where students engage in service as part of their academic course work. We believe that doing service work can help students better understand the abstract concepts presented in their classes. Likewise, the ideas learned in class can help students make sense of the human and social problems they encounter through their service work. A Service-Learning class combines academics with experience and reflection. Lectures, texts, and tests are enhanced by weekly service engaging schools and non-profit agencies that are making a difference in the Philadelphia area. Topics such as poverty, AIDS, violence, mental illness, and racism are explored both in the classroom and in the community. (Jursca Kefffr, 2010)

Not only do service-learning courses offer an opportunity to combine academics with experience and reflection, SJU explicitly views service-learning as a method for
incorporating Ignatian Pedagogy. As such, SJU outlines five specific course criteria 
(Academic Rigor, Critical Reflection, Reciprocity, Learning Objectives, and Learning 
Outcomes) essential to a service-learning course (The Faith Justice Institute, 2011, p. 2). 
These criteria are used by a faculty committee to determine whether course proposals 
qualify as service-learning. This examination stems from SJU identifying their Service-
Learning Program as,

An interdisciplinary curriculum based on a pedagogy emphasizing the integration 
of traditional coursework, reflection and mutually beneficial community partnership. Rooted in Ignatian Pedagogy and Catholic Theology, service-learning 
seeks to foster a commitment to developing the whole person (conscience, 
competence and compassion) through a lived experience of the Jesuit mission, 
especially solidarity with those most in need. Service-Learning courses rigorously 
challenge students intellectually, interpersonally and intrapersonally. These 
courses examine systemic issues of social justice through two different learning 
environments – the traditional classroom and the local community. (The Faith 
Justice Institute, 2011, p. 1)

Next, we will examine the five core course criteria as defined by SJU.

The first criterion, Academic Rigor, stems from the belief that, “In a Jesuit school, 
the focus is on education for justice. Adequate knowledge joined to rigorous and critical 
thinking will make the commitment to work for justice in adult life more effective” 
of meeting this imperative, the service-learning program at SJU approves courses that 
provide opportunities for students to “examine systemic issues of social justice…[as well
as] learn and test theories through their classroom experience and from work at their service sites” (The Faith Justice Institute, 2011, p. 1). As described, Academic Rigor also requires courses to include service as a learning objective, allow service-learning sites to have input into student’s grades and require attendance both in the traditional classroom and at a service site (The Faith Justice Institute, 2011, p. 1).

The next criterion, Critical Reflection, is included due to the belief that reflection “forms the conscience of learners (their beliefs, values, attitudes, and their entire way of thinking) in such a manner they are led to move beyond knowing to undertake action” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 16). SJU’s description of Critical Reflection is careful to point out that, “assignments are intended to deepen learning by explicitly linking service site experience with course content and social justice [so that] reflection clarifies the link between classroom learning and the students’ growth as persons and citizens and their appreciation of issues of social justice” (The Faith Justice Institute, 2011, p. 1). To do this, Critical Reflection must occur regularly and in a variety of forms (i.e. written and oral). Critical Reflection, in this way, is not just an opportunity for students to share experiences and observations; rather, the crux of reflection lies in tying student service experience and classroom knowledge to issues of social justice.

At SJU, the third criterion of Reciprocity is seen as addressing the Jesuit understanding that “To the extent that we develop a wide-ranging web of respectful and productive relationships, we fulfill Christ’s priestly prayer that they may all be one” (34th General Congregation, 1995, p. 551). That is, SJU’s program advocates for service-learning courses that work to establish mutually beneficial relationships with
community partners. For SJU, this means that the service provided by students must be relationship-based rather than task-oriented, that the service meets a need expressed by the site, and that the service fulfills a “real need in a course syllabus and is integral to the learning in the course” (The Faith-Justice Institute, 2011, p. 2). In this way, a service-learning course that demonstrates Reciprocity must work diligently to ensure that the service performed is meaningful to the course, the student and the service site.

Next, service-learning courses at SJU must clearly address Learning Objectives, a fourth criterion. According to Ignatian Pedagogy, meaningful learning, “calls for the infusion of approaches to value learning and growth within existing curricula rather than adding courses…What is needed is a framework of inquiry for the process of wrestling with significant issues and complex values of life and teachers willing to guide that inquiry” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 4, p. 14). For service-learning courses at SJU, this means incorporating at least three of the following objectives on a course syllabus:

- Students will integrate their service-learning experiences and academic course work through class discussions, writing assignments, or both.
- Students will reflect on their service experiences through classroom discussions, reflection activities, writing assignments, or some combination of the above.
- Students will explore concepts of systemic injustice through analysis of their service experiences.
- Students will engage in relationship-based service-learning on a weekly basis.
• Students will engage in discernment activities and reflect on their personal values in connection with systemic injustice.

• Students will produce final papers or projects that integrate service-learning with course content.

• Students will explore concepts of reciprocity, diversity and solidarity through reflections on the service experience and course material when appropriate.

• Students are challenged to consider existing social values and priorities in light of Gospel values and faith-based traditions of social justice.

(The Faith-Justice Institute, 2011, p. 2)

These objectives incorporate elements of the other criteria (i.e. reflection, reciprocity, academic rigor) while also including an emphasis on social justice. Requiring the inclusion of a minimum of three of these objectives acts as a way to focus instruction and course content in a particular way so that service is an essential and influential part of the course. Likewise, these objectives articulate what is meant by service-learning at SJU; that is, a mutual relationship between course content and service experiences.

Lastly, the final criterion of Learning Outcomes “ensure that students’ service site experiences are employed as an instructional method which informs theoretical course content” (The Faith-Justice Institute, 2011, p. 2). That is, the service component is an additional “text” for the course, not simply an added requirement. Therefore, attendance at service sites must be a requirement of service-learning courses. Because of this emphasis on service and the role of community partners in service-learning courses, “it is essential to reflect community-based work as [an] integral part of [the] educational
experience” (The Faith-Justice Institute, 2011, p. 2). For SJU, this includes sharing service-learning course products with community partners when appropriate. That is, if as part of a service-learning course a student or group of students create something that would be useful to a service site, it should be shared. The example provided by SJU mentions Physician Referral and Patient Assistance Programs which were developed by students in a course looking at patient access to healthcare which were then shared with a partnering clinic (The Faith-Justice Institute, 2011, p. 2).

The service-learning program at SJU serves as a clear example of a framework tied to Jesuit pedagogy. While this program takes place at the university level, many of the characteristics described could be adapted or modified to suit a secondary context. As we create a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context in the next chapter, we will revisit this connection.

**Common Elements**

Having looked at service-learning programs in a handful of public, private, Catholic, Jesuit, secondary and post-secondary institutions, our next task is to determine common and distinguishing characteristics. That is, what aspects of the programs profiled here appear universal and should be included in the framework we will create? And, are there any characteristics observed which distinguish programs at Jesuit institutions from the others?

One common characteristic among the programs profiled is for service-learning to be required. In fact, all of the programs profiled here (with the exception of SJU) require service-learning for graduation or promotion. What varies, however, is the rationale for its requirement. For the programs in Maryland and Chicago, service-learning acts as an
avenue to promote civic engagement, participation in the community, and a way to foster healthy partnerships between community organizations and local schools. For the Catholic and Jesuit schools (Father Ryan, JHS Portland, JHS Sacramento, and SJU) the rationale for service-learning stems from Gospel values and Catholic social teaching. That is, service is seen as a way to imitate Christ or to care for the less fortunate. This differentiation becomes more apparent when we consider that the Catholic and Jesuit schools profiled here use service-learning as a way to explore and address issues of social justice. Connected to social justice is that these same schools require that students’ service benefit the poor and marginalized. While working with poor and marginalized populations may be the case in the Maryland and Chicago programs, it is not an explicit goal or requirement of the two programs. Additionally, the two Jesuit high schools, JHS Sacramento and JHS Portland each offer cultural immersion programs as an alternative method for meeting the service requirement. These distinctions may help us to better articulate a framework that is characteristically Jesuit.

Another recurring characteristic is for service-learning to be integrated into the curriculum. This is explicitly the case for the programs in Maryland, Chicago, and at JHS Sacramento, JHS Portland and SJU. In that service-learning is defined as connecting service with academic learning, this common element is not surprising. Once again, though, we see some distinction between the public institutions and the private, Catholic and Jesuit schools. For the programs in Chicago and Maryland, service-learning means connecting service to a particular lesson or unit of study. In this way, service activities are tailored to fit with a curricular topic (e.g. doing a river clean-up as part of a biology course). Conversely, while the programs at the Catholic, Jesuit schools may be tied to
specific courses (as is the case at SJU, JHS Sacramento and JHS Portland) the service-learning goals are often tied to a set of beliefs, namely Catholic Christian values such as Catholic social teaching. In this way, the learning goals reflect the ideology and belief system and service acts as an avenue to explore the social responsibilities of mature persons of faith. That is, as a student of a Catholic or Jesuit school, what responsibilities do I have to the poor and marginalized? In this way, the learning that occurs is often bringing together an experience of service with the social demands of a faith tradition.

Incorporating reflection is another characteristic present in all of the programs profiled here. Reflection may take place in written form (e.g. a summative paper or journal) or may be verbal (e.g. classroom discussions). The inclusion of reflection across the various programs emphasizes the importance of providing students with opportunities to process their service experience. Reflection can also serve as a way to bridge service and learning. The universal presence of reflection across various programs as well as its connection to Ignatian Pedagogy points to its inclusion when our framework for service-learning is constructed.

Lastly, the role of the community and the nature of the relationship between the school and the community is addressed in several programs. For instance, SJU emphasizes reciprocity so that service is meaningful to both the student and the site. Additionally, SJU encourages that student projects be shared with community partners whenever appropriate. The programs in Maryland and at Father Ryan make distinctions between direct service, indirect service, and advocacy; illustrating multiple ways in which the student can interact with the community. As was mentioned before, JHS Sacramento, JHS Portland, SJU and Father Ryan are explicit about designing programs to
serve the poor and marginalized, which designates a particular type of community within which students serve.

The recurring and distinguishing characteristics described here have been summarized in Table 1 at the conclusion of this chapter. The hope is that a visual representation will assist with identifying common and distinctive elements of the various programs. The goal is that these similar and distinguishing characteristics will serve as a starting point as we move toward the creation of a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context. The next chapter will be focused on the creation of such a framework. The goal will be to address what criteria, if any, must be present to make an experience of service-learning characteristically Jesuit? Additionally, we will examine if the inclusion of particular structures of a service-learning program qualifies such a program as “Jesuit” in nature?
Table 1

*Characteristics of Service-Learning Program Profiles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Maryland Public Schools</th>
<th>Chicago Public Schools</th>
<th>Saint Joseph’s University</th>
<th>JHS Sacramento</th>
<th>JHS Portland</th>
<th>Father Ryan High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required for Graduation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated as Part of an Academic Course</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale: Civic Engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale: Religious Values and Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Connected with Specific Unit or Lesson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Connected to Religious Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Poor and Marginalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates Concepts of Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguish Direct Service, Indirect Service and Advocacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tied to Academic Course Outcomes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection (written, oral or both)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Building Community Relationships</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Immersion Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


CHAPTER V

SERVICE-LEARNING IN JESUIT SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A FRAMEWORK

The end goal of this study has been to produce a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context. In order to establish a sufficient foundation for doing so, previous chapters have investigated the core documents of Jesuit Pedagogy (chapter I), examined what defines service-learning and how it has been studied (chapters II and III) and analyzed existing frameworks of service-learning and looked at service-learning programs in a variety of educational settings (chapter IV). Building from such a foundation, the task of this chapter is the culmination of this study, that is, to build a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context by identifying characteristics of a service-learning program that must be present in order for such a program to bear the distinction ‘Jesuit,’ if such a distinction is possible. Specifically, are there particular elements of a service-learning program that must be present to meet the demands of Jesuit pedagogy? What are they? As well, are these elements distinctive? That is, does the presence of certain characteristics necessarily ensure that a service-learning program is ‘Jesuit,’ or do they simply reflect ‘best practices’ regardless of institution? This twofold focus, to build a framework that fulfills the demands of Ignatian Pedagogy and determine if such a framework is characteristically and uniquely ‘Jesuit,’ is the goal of this chapter.

We begin by briefly revisiting Ignatian Pedagogy and the components of the Ignatian pedagogy and the IPP (context, experience, reflection, action, evaluation) as a
starting point for the development of a framework.

**Ignatian Pedagogy Revisited**

While both Ignatian Pedagogy and service-learning have been described in chapters 1 and 2, the connection between the two has so far not been explicitly established within this study. Therefore, before a framework is developed, service-learning, as defined in Chapter 2, will now be analyzed as a means of achieving particular goals of Jesuit education. That is, why does service-learning have a place in Jesuit schools? What is its particular instrumental purpose in the context of Jesuit education? In answering this question, service-learning will be clearly connected to the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm. Doing so involves establishing how the elements of the IPP relate to the design and implementation of a service-learning program in Jesuit education.

**The Outcomes of Jesuit Education: Ignatian Pedagogy and Service-Learning**

In his 2007 article, *Ignatian Pedagogy at the Service of Lay Mission*, José Leonardo Rincón, SJ, provides a concise summary of the key features of Ignatian Pedagogy. His summary is presented here as it provides a means for connecting service-learning to Ignatian Pedagogy and a starting point from which a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit context can be developed. While Rincón details fifteen elements in all (Care of the Person, Evangelizing Significance, Discernment, Flexibility, Balance, Sense of the Body, Integral Formation of the Human Being, Quality, Contemplation in Action, Magis, Minus, Freedom, Ordered Affections, Service, and Use of Methods), only those that relate most directly to service-learning will be discussed here. Such an analysis is done to establish that in order for service-learning to be ‘Jesuit,’ characteristics of Jesuit education must be identifiable within a service-learning program. That is to say,
relevant criteria for establishing how service-learning meets the characteristics of Care of the Person, Flexibility, Balance, Ordered Affections and Service will be analyzed.

The first element presented by Rincón, *cura personalis*, or Care of the Person, speaks of each individual as the center of his/her own education. As discussed earlier in the first chapter, the roots of *cura personalis* can be traced to Ignatius and the first Jesuits who recognized that achieving the kind of social justice imagined in their work with the dying, the imprisoned, and the economically disenfranchised called for the formation of social leaders who would rule towns, cities, and countries with an ethic of care – a *cura personalis socialis*. They saw in the education of youth the occasion to develop people with the moral imagination (*pietas*) that conceived and implemented social policies in service to the common good…The ethic of care for the whole person integral to the Spiritual Exercises forms the Jesuit commitment to education for justice today as much as it did in the sixteenth century. (Scibilia, Giamario, and Rogers, 2009, p. 52)

Or, as Rincón articulates, “personalized pedagogy, active and always constructive…is the heart of Ignatian humanism” (Rincón SJ, 2007, p. 39). Therefore, to be ‘Jesuit,’ education must be, to a certain extent, individualized. In that the design of service-learning programs often allow individual students to have some input regarding the selection of service sites and it is possible for service experiences to be organized around student interest, service-learning as a teaching method can support the pedagogical element of *cura personalis*. Additionally, once students are placed at specific sites, service-learning usually takes place in an environment which is strange to the student.
Working in unfamiliar settings poses challenges to student participants who rely on the teacher as a reference point from a more familiar world. In this way, the teacher becomes an emotional resource that students can use to get a grounding in the unfamiliar world within which he or she is immersed. How students cope with such challenges is highly individual and requires the support and care of a teacher, a clear indication of cura personalis. Therefore, service-learning tends to force cura personalis from the background to the foreground in the teacher-student encounter. Finally, by providing experiences where students engage with the world around them, Jesuit education offers opportunities to build a cura personalis socialis, fostering a commitment to the common good among students.

Rincón also speaks of Flexibility, “knowing how to adapt oneself to ‘times, places and persons,’” an idea encompassed in the Grad at Grad outcome of Open to Growth (Rincón SJ, 2007, p. 39). Students of Jesuit schools are expected to be exposed to and adapt to a variety of experiences. It follows, then, in order for service-learning to qualify as Jesuit pedagogy, openness to new people, places and things (characteristics of flexibility) must be included into the structure and goals of the program.

Next, Rincón presents Balance as an essential element of Ignatian Pedagogy. For Rincón, this means “a connection between theory and practice…seeking to overcome the dichotomy between human realities which are apparently polarized: poverty and means, freedom and obedience, among others” (Rincón SJ, 2007, p. 39). In that service-learning is a combination of service and learning, it represents a connection between theory and practice and has the potential to assist students in bringing together such “polarizing realities” as poverty and wealth. As such, service-learning, “is an avenue through which
students…can construct more meaningful and relevant experiences that directly align with the learning goals of a particular course so that theory and practice are taught in unison” (Wright, Calabrese, and Henry, 2009, p. 274). Therefore, in order to meet the criteria for Balance as described by Rincón, service-learning must be structured in a way so as to explicitly connect theory and practice.

With regard to ‘Ordered Affections,’ Rincón is referring to the idea that human beings are both rational and emotional. While traditional education often focuses on reason and intellectual pursuits, he explains that humans are “also feelings, heart, affections, and these have to be educated and ordered” (Rincón SJ, 2007, p. 40). Ignatian pedagogy advocates for educational experiences which address both facets of the human person – the rational and the emotional. By joining the personal/emotional aspect of service to the rational component of curriculum, service-learning combines academic understanding and personal reflection in order to qualify as Ignatian pedagogy. If structured in a way that encompasses both the emotional and the rational, service-learning may act as a conduit for ‘ordering affections’ as explained by Rincón.

Finally, Rincón mentions Service as an essential component of Ignatian Pedagogy. According to Rincón, education in not simply a “personal or egoistic objective;” instead, “It has to be done in community and for its service, especially of the poorest and weakest. From this emerges being for others and with others” (Rincón SJ, 2007, p. 40). Doing service situates education in a broader context – the school, local, or global community. “Jesuit education has stressed that Christian faith reaches out to others and does not rest content with a doctrine of personal fulfillment” (Muldoon, 2001, p. 14). When service-learning includes acts of service among the poor and marginalized,
it meets the criteria of Jesuit education. In addition, acts of service cannot be egoistic, thus it is necessary to ensure that service benefits both the student and the community. With this in mind, service-learning programs which incorporate service experiences and personal growth, act as a means of ensuring education is not merely an individualistic pursuit. Such programs would meet the demands and further the goals of Ignatian pedagogy.

**The Process of Jesuit Education: The IPP and Service-Learning**

While Ignatian Pedagogy (as explained by Rincón) addresses the goals and outcomes of Jesuit education, the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm describes how such education is to take place. That is, the characteristics of Ignatian Pedagogy presented by Rincón as educational outcomes are incorporated into the process of the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm (IPP) as Context, Experience, Reflection, Action and Evaluation. Recall that in Chapter 2 through a conceptual analysis and an empirical discovery of service-learning programs, a definition for service-learning was established as, “educational experiences which incorporate curricular goals with needs identified by the local community wherein student reflection is essential for integrating knowledge and experience through an examination of cultural, political, religious, and socio-economic context so that student experience informs knowledge and knowledge informs experience.” Service-learning described this way implements the elements of the IPP: establishing context within a community, providing educational experiences, reflecting on those experiences, acting to integrate knowledge and experience, and evaluation to ensure knowledge informs experience as well as experience informing knowledge. As such, service-learning is a tool Jesuit educators could use as a way of incorporating the
IPP into academic courses. This is not to say that the only way the IPP can be utilized is through service-learning; rather, service-learning is presented as a separate strategy that is conducive for use in a Jesuit educational context.

With regard to context, Kathleen Maas Weigert, Research Professor and Provost Advisor at Loyola University Chicago, contends it is necessary for Jesuit institutions to acknowledge that “Engaged pedagogy takes place in real contexts of some kind. One such context is clearly historical: simply stated, the world is what it is because of what has gone on before. We must provide our students with some of that history as they participate in our CBL courses [i.e. service-learning] and domestic and global immersion experiences” (Maas Weigert, 2008, p. 5). Coming from a Jesuit secondary setting, Scibilia, Giamario, and Rogers express a similar sentiment, stating, “The realities in play during a class belong not only to the subject matter or people related to the subject matter; a teacher must know what the student’s world is like” (Scibilia, Giamario, and Rogers, 2009, p. 54). Understood this way, context refers to placing students within a larger historical narrative while also attending to the individual lived experience of each student. While context, as described, would apply to any classroom setting, service-learning provides a unique opportunity to situate a student’s experience of service within the community as part of the context of a larger historical reality. In other words, service-learning provides an opening to connect a student’s personal narrative with a broader social and communal history through an experience of service.

Additionally, Weigert identifies the need to “frame…experiences in the context of the rich tradition of social teachings, thinking and tradition of the Catholic Church” (Maas Weigert, 2008, p. 6). Therefore, establishing the context of a service-learning or
immersion experience at a Jesuit school requires not only historical context (i.e. how did this particular reality come to be? What historical, social, political, or other factors contributed?) as well as an understanding of the student’s world (i.e. how have life experiences and surroundings shaped each student?) but also demands an examination of Catholic social teaching (i.e. what is the position of the Catholic Church on a particular reality?). While service-learning itself implements Jesuit Pedagogy, attention to Catholic social teaching is needed to make service-learning genuinely ‘Jesuit’ or ‘Ignatian’. The framework established here will need to address these various elements of context in order to respond to the Jesuit imperative.

The experience of serving others, being out in the world, is simultaneously foundational to a Jesuit worldview (as discussed in Chapter I) as well as essential to service-learning (Chapter II). From a Jesuit perspective,

Just as the Spiritual Exercises are to be experienced, not read, so learning is not a matter of reading for only mastery of content of skill. Ignatian Pedagogy welcomes teachers and students into a rigorous encounter with knowledge of God, human beings, and nature. The experience of knowledge is moral and spiritual as well as cognitive. (Scibilia, Giamario, and Rogers, 2009, p. 53)

This description of Ignatian Pedagogy, where knowledge is experienced and encountered, coincides with the active, involved nature of service-learning.

While experiences of service are valuable, Ignatian pedagogy insists on the formation of a particular type of relationship with those served and a clear understanding of the systemic causes of injustice. That is, service-learning in a Jesuit context demands an emphasis on the poor and marginalized and an understanding of service as a means of
working for social justice. With this in mind, it is important to consider the ramifications and responsibilities schools have when placing students into local and global communities. In an essay addressing the current approaches and challenges of Jesuit international education, Dennis Gordon, Director of University International Programs at Santa Clara University, states,

As Jesuit schools establish community-based and service-learning around the globe, it is important to recognize the potential for inadvertent exploitation which exists when comparatively rich and privileged students are interjected into disadvantaged communities. (Gordon, 2003, p. 7)

These points echo those of Maybach (1996) presented in chapter 2. Maybach was concerned with overcoming the power differential between service providers and service recipients and its potential for perpetuating oppressive systems. Gordon goes on to caution that to “go where the action is…can lead to short-term programs which extract much from the local community (even exposing members to risk), and then pull out as the immediate crisis dissipates (though its underlying causes remain)” (Gordon, 2003, p. 7). For Gordon, responsible programs need to be cognizant of the community in which they will take place. According to Gordon, “programs must not interject themselves into a community lightly. The relationship needs to be multifaceted and sustained” (Gordon, 2003, p. 7). Mass Weigert reiterates the importance of the role of partners, stating,

Without on-the-ground relationships, domestic and global, we could not offer these kinds of transformative educational experiences. [It is important to consider] how is such a relationship conceived; who is responsible for it; how do
we nurture it; what financial arrangements are involved; and how do we continue to grow such partnerships?” (Maas Weigert, 2008, p. 7)

This emphasis not only on service, but also on how the service is performed, a focus on social justice and the role of the relationship with the community helps to characterize what an experience of service-learning should look like at a Jesuit institution. Once again, this qualitative addition, while not required by the IPP is necessary to characterize service-learning as truly ‘Jesuit’.

Reflection, the next element of the IPP, is once again present in both Ignatian Pedagogy and secular models of service-learning. According to a study of education for justice in Jesuit secondary education by Scibilia, Giamario and Rogers, “Reflection is the formative dimension of education for justice. Reflection results in conscientization wherein students grasp the creative or destructive difference that knowledge makes for human beings, nature, and their relationships with God” (Scibilia, Giamario, and Rogers, 2009, p. 54). Scibilia et al continue by saying,

The encounter between the student and new knowledge leads to reflection. Teachers join students as they discern the essential meaning, significance, or application of what they learn, especially as it relates to their search for justice. Reflection on experience, judging what one sees, develops a student’s critical consciousness. (Scibilia, Giamario, and Rogers, 2009, p. 54)

In this way, reflection is essential for connecting prior context to the experience. Without reflection, Ignatian Pedagogy would argue that the “learning” is left to chance.
In another study, McNally, Sonntag, and Hughes (2006) compared service-learning models at Loyola University Chicago and in doing so addressed the importance of reflection. McNally et al state,

Any well-oriented Service-learning curriculum should not stop following the “completion” of its service aspect, but rather should continue to encourage and engage students in an interactive and democratic course of critical reflection in order to more effectively process and understand the beginnings of perspective transformation that the Service-learning curriculum helped to unearth. (McNally, Sonntag, and Hughes, 2006, p. 10)

Gordon (2003) agrees with this sentiment by stressing the importance of “creating predeparture and reentry programs for students” so that there is continuity between the context, experience, and reflection (Gordon, 2003, p. 10). In both cases, the emphasis on reflection as a means of processing an experience in order to find meaning emerges as essential for service-learning programs implementing the IPP in Jesuit schools.

Action, the next element of the IPP, is included to ensure that the process of context-experience-reflection does not simply result in personal gain or personal fulfillment, as Muldoon (2001) cautioned. In this way, the goal of Jesuit education is to compel students to act on their new understanding, to become “women and men for others.” Scibilia et al express it this way,

The conscientizied student desires ‘to do something consistent with their new convictions’…Conscientization makes students aware that injustice requires more than philanthropy and charity. During and beyond class, education for justice affords students the opportunity to become the social agents. Students choose to
take action that addresses social injustice within the school, the school’s neighborhood, state, nation, and world. (Scibilia, Giamario, and Rogers, 2009, p. 55)

This goal is consistent with the outcomes of service-learning programs. That is, service-learning programs often seek to benefit not only the student, but also the community, service sites, and those served by community organizations. In this way, education for social justice presupposes that every student can positively contribute to the common good. It is vital that no student be denied the opportunity or motivation to contribute to a just world (to do so would be unjust). Education for justice is a remarkably personal academic concentration. Likewise, every student will understand how to achieve justice and contribute to the common good differently. (Scibilia, Giamario, and Rogers, 2009, p. 57)

Therefore ‘action’ refers to the individual response of the student. That is, what does each student do with the new understanding gained from an experience of service-learning? Through collaboration of the various partners, reflection and continued action of the part of the student, service-learning programs in a Jesuit context seek to create lasting change and can be a tool for promoting social justice.

The final element of the IPP, Evaluation, is once again commonly present in models of service-learning. From this perspective, both the IPP and the philosophy behind service-learning recognize that no program or experience will ever be perfect. Rather, an ongoing process of evaluation is necessary to ensure that learning goals are being achieved and any shortcomings are addressed in future implementations.
Evaluation pushes the educational process to continue, circling back to other experiences. Put another way, “Actions become the experiences, the stuff of education, for ongoing judgment, discernment, assessment, and further action” (Scibilia, Giamario, and Rogers, 2009, p. 55). Furthermore, Evaluation encourages students to read the signs of the times as personal, social, and global; and to contemplate, evaluate, imagine perspectives, reach judgments, and weigh alternatives for the sake of creating conditions in which people flourish and we sustain the environment. Learning in a Jesuit school moves from seeing (reading, experiencing, experimenting) through judging (assessing, weighing) to action. (Scibilia, Giamario, and Rogers, 2009, p. 53)

As this quote illustrates, elements of action and evaluation need not necessarily occur in order. Action may lead to evaluation while evaluation may lead to action. Regardless, the intent is that students do something with their newfound understanding garnered from experience and reflection.

Additionally, from both perspectives, evaluation refers to ensuring student accountability as well as maintaining academic rigor. Evaluating student understanding may take many forms (i.e. a written paper synthesizing experience and understanding, a student self-evaluation, a traditional test, an plan of action for further involvement with a particular issue, etc.) and is necessary to check for student understanding. Gordon acknowledges the limitations of existing methods of evaluating how an experience has impacted a student. He states, “It is also important to develop more sophisticated assessment tools to verify the personal growth that is assumed to result from an experience” (Gordon, 2003, p. 10). That is, determining how students were impacted
personally by the experience, what have they learned about a particular issue and its causes through the experience, or how an experience of service-learning will compel them to act in the future is difficult and needs to be developed further.

**Distinctive Nature of Service-Learning in Jesuit Education**

While the IPP is distinctly ‘Jesuit,’ that is, the term and definitions of each element are explicitly defined by core documents of Ignatian Pedagogy and grounded in Ignatian spirituality, the pedagogical ideas are not unique to the Jesuits. Establishing context (tapping into students prior learning), experience (engaging students in learning), reflection (processing learning experiences), action (new knowledge leads to new experiences), and evaluation (assessing student knowledge and understanding) are characteristics found within non-Ignatian teaching methods. In fact, a popular teaching technique, K-W-L (What I know, What I want to know, What I’ve learned) incorporates many of the same elements (Instructional Strategies, 2009, p. 1). What makes Ignatian Pedagogy distinctive is its clear grounding in faith (Chubbuck, 2007, p. 244). Therefore, as the task of creating a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context is undertaken, it will be necessary to consider the IPP while not relying on it solely, as the elements of the IPP while distinctly Jesuit, are not unique.

As Chubbuck maintains, what distinguishes the IPP from simply being good pedagogy is its grounding in the Catholic faith tradition and commitment to social justice. Ignatian Pedagogy seeks to form young men and women who will be “leaders in service, in imitation of Christ Jesus, men and women of competence, conscience and compassionate commitment” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 13). Therefore, the steps of the IPP (context, experience, reflection,
action, evaluation) are infused with a moral obligation to work for social justice as modeled by the life and teachings of Christ. The process of forming young men and women in Jesuit schools is not simply to produce educated and prepared graduates; rather, Ignatian Pedagogy seeks to instill social responsibility, a preferential option for the poor, a comprehensive understanding of the systemic causes of injustice and the knowledge and skills to find creative solutions to some of the world’s most pressing issues. Graduates formed in such a manner fulfill the Grad at Grad outcomes of Open to Growth, Religious, Loving, Intellectually Competent, and Committed to Doing Justice. Consequently, while various secular pedagogical approaches may include pedagogical elements similar to those of the IPP, their inclusion is not based upon the same moral imperative nor is their intended outcome a commitment to the poor and marginalized while working for social justice.

**Building a Framework**

In order for service-learning to reflect Ignatian Pedagogy, the framework developed here will be explicitly linked to the Catholic faith tradition and social teaching contained therein, a commitment to the poor and marginalized, and an emphasis on working for social justice.

In the process of developing a definition for service-learning in Chapter II, examining existing studies of service-learning in Chapter III, and conducting an analysis of service-learning programs in Chapter IV, recurring characteristics of service-learning programs have emerged. For instance, an explicit tie to the academic curriculum helps to distinguish service from service-learning (Schaffer 2004; Arenes et al 2006; Terry 2004; Meisel 2007; Masucci and Renner 2001), utilizing reflection as a way of processing an
experience of service or connecting service to the curriculum (Maher 2003; Koth 2003), and the method of forming community relationships (Maybach 1996; Freire 1993, Brown 2001; Wade 2001; Westheimer and Kahne 2004) were the focus of previous studies and frameworks. Separately, this study considered Ignatian Pedagogy and Jesuit education and the demands therein. In that the task at hand is to develop a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context, we will draw both from service-learning in general (i.e. how do such common elements or ‘best practices’ help with the formation of a framework?) and Ignatian Pedagogy (i.e. in order for the framework to exist within a Jesuit school, how are characteristics of Ignatian Pedagogy evident?).

Jesuit education aims to educate students through exposure to and involvement in the world around them.

We must raise our Jesuit educational standard to 'educate the whole person of solidarity for the real world.' Solidarity is learned through 'contact' rather than 'concepts.'... Students, in the course of their formation, must let the gritty reality of this world into their lives, so they can learn from it, think about it critically, respond to its suffering and engage it constructively. They should learn to perceive, think, judge, choose and act for the rights of others, especially the disadvantaged and the oppressed. (Kolvenbach, 2000)

The framework presented here seeks to address this active role of education as well as the ‘gritty reality’ of which Kolvenbach speaks.

Ignatian Pedagogy demands an active role of the student, a commitment to the poor and marginalized of society, reflection as an essential element incorporated into a comprehensive academic curriculum. With such diverse, yet connected, elements, the
framework presented here is equally as diverse and interconnected. Developed from an examination of Ignatian Pedagogy and a contextual analysis of service-learning frameworks and definitions, the following five elements have been deemed essential for service-learning taking place in a Jesuit secondary institution: Social Justice, Solidarity, Service, Reflection, and Academic Rigor. To help explain the rationale for the inclusion of these specific elements, each will be connected to characteristics of Jesuit education, the IPP, and Grad at Grad outcomes.

As discussed in Chapter I, Jesuits view faith, justice and education as necessarily interconnected.

The mission of the Society of Jesus today is the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement…The goal of the faith that does justice and works for peace is a new type of person in a new kind of society, in which each individual has the opportunity to be fully human and each one accepts the responsibility of promoting the human development of others. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 74, p. 76)

This becomes evident in the IPP as Context, the social and personal reality within which education takes place. Therefore, the first component of this framework, Social Justice, seeks to address the need for rigorous social analysis of the structural causes and factors contributing to various social realities and injustices which will be encountered through an experience of service-learning while also focusing on the individual student’s personal context. In this way, cura personalis (attention to the individual student) is also evident in the element Social Justice. Additionally, Jesuit education aims to form students with a ‘commitment to doing justice’ (a Grad at Grad outcome) approaching service-learning
from a justice perspective is necessary. As well, an analysis of social justice includes a
faith response which can lead a student to action, another element of the IPP.

Emerging from a perspective of social justice, Jesuit education also demands a
preferential option for the poor. That is, education, both in who is educated and how that
education occurs, must be done with a particular emphasis on the poor and marginalized.

This commitment is evident in the *Characteristics of Jesuit Education* which states,

> Reflecting on the actual situation of today’s world and responding to the call of
Christ who had a special love and concern for the poor, the church and the Society
of Jesus have made a ‘preferential option’ for the poor. This includes those
without economic means, the handicapped, the marginalized and all those who
are, in any sense unable to live a life of full human dignity. In Jesuit education
this option is reflected in…those values that promote a special concern for those
men and women who are without the means to live in human dignity. In this
sense, the poor form the context of Jesuit education; ‘Our educational planning
needs to be made in function of the poor, from the perspective of the poor.’

88)

This emphasis on the poor and marginalized appears again in the Grad at Grad outcome
of ‘loving’. That is, Jesuit schools seek to develop compassionate graduates with care
and concern for others, particularly those most vulnerable in society. In terms of service-
learning, the focus on the poor and marginalized becomes evident in who is served and
how relationships with community organizations and those served are created and
maintained. Used here, the term Solidarity refers to operating from a perspective of a
preferential option for the poor which emerges from a concern for the promotion of social justice. This position of Solidarity should be evident in how a service-learning program is structured within a Jesuit school.

Solidarity and Social Justice cannot be realized without direct, personal contact with the poor and marginalized. Therefore, Ignatian Pedagogy also requires opportunities for students to have contact with the world of injustice. As is stated in the *Characteristics of Jesuit Education*:

Jesuit education helps students to realize that talents are gifts to be developed, not for self-satisfaction or self-gain, but rather, with the help of God, for the good of the human community. Students are encouraged to use their gifts in the service of others, out of a love for God: ‘Today our prime educational objective must be to form men and women for others; men and women who will live not for themselves but for God and his Christ—for the God-man who lived and died for all the world; men and women who cannot even conceive of love of God which does not include love for the least of their neighbors; men and women completely convinced that the love of God which does not issue in justice for men and women is a farce’. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 82)

That is, education must be done for and with others in order to avoid an over-emphasis on personal fulfillment. Jesuit education aims to form such ‘men and women for others’ who, through active commitment, work for social change. Including Service in this framework is indicative of the ‘experience’ element of the IPP and the Grad at Grad
The element of Service also incorporates the characteristics of Ignatian pedagogy which Rincón terms Service and Flexibility. As in the IPP, education is not complete with experience, reflecting on the experience is essential. Consequently, the framework presented here includes Reflection as an essential component.

In preparation for life commitment, there are opportunities in Jesuit education for actual contact with the world of injustice. The analysis of society within the curriculum thus becomes reflection based on actual contact with the structural dimensions of injustice….To be educational, this contact is joined to reflection. The promotion of justice in the curriculum, described above, has as one concrete objective an analysis of the causes of poverty. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 80, p. 90)

As the above quote illustrates, contact with the world of injustice and social analysis must lead to reflection so that the experience (in this case service) is educational and incorporated into the curriculum. Additionally, as reflection is an inextricable part of Ignatian Spirituality evident in the Spiritual Exercised of St. Ignatius, its inclusion in this framework is logical. In this way, Reflection addresses the Grad at Grad outcome of ‘religious’ and provides opportunities for Balance (connecting theory and practice) and Ordered Affections (bridging the rational and the emotional) as described by Rincón.

Finally, in its pursuit of the magis, Jesuit education strives to develop intellectually competent graduates capable of comprehending and combating injustice.

In a Jesuit school, the focus is on education for justice. Adequate knowledge joined to rigorous and critical thinking will make the commitment to work for
justice in adult life more effective...The curriculum includes a critical analysis of society, adapted to the age level of the students. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 53)

Emerging from this goal, Academic Rigor becomes the final element of this framework for service-learning in a Jesuit context ensuring that social analysis and reflection are done in a manner which promotes critical thinking. Academic Rigor, in this way, is reminiscent of the ‘evaluation’ stage of the IPP which maintains, “Ignatian pedagogy, however, aims at formation which includes but goes beyond academic mastery” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 64). That is, academic mastery alone is not a sufficient goal; instead, rigorous social analysis must be joined to experience, reflection and a commitment to social justice within the context of the academic curriculum. Described this way, the characteristic Academic Rigor encompasses a connection between theory and practice, described by Rincón as Balance.

As presented, the five elements of this framework (Social Justice, Solidarity, Service, Reflection and Academic Rigor) do not represent a linear progression. Rather, the interconnected and overlapping nature of the elements reflects the goals of Ignatian Pedagogy, the structure of the IPP and the characteristics graduates of a Jesuit school should embody. The next task of this chapter is to address each of these five elements individually to further explain how such a framework for service-learning fits within Jesuit secondary education.
Social Justice

As has been demonstrated, working for social justice and developing students committed to doing justice are goals of Jesuit education. Therefore, any service-learning program at a Jesuit secondary school must address this imperative. In terms of a service-learning program, this means examining the historical, political, socio-economic, religious and social context wherein the service will take place in an effort to examine the root causes of social issues commonly addressed through service-learning (i.e. poverty, access to education, access to healthcare, etc.). Doing so means addressing such questions as:

- What larger issues have created or are sustaining the need for service?

- How do factors such as race, gender, wealth, education, healthcare, etc. play a role in the unjust situation?

- What structures are in place allowing the perpetuation of the injustice?

- Who benefits from maintaining the unjust situation?

- Who is marginalized? Are particular populations (race, ethnicity, age, gender, etc.) impacted more than others?

- What does Catholic Social Teaching say regarding the existence of the particular injustice being examined?

- What is the role of the Catholic church, and by extension individual Catholics, in addressing injustice?

Additionally, examining and understanding an issue of injustice requires students to identify their own personal starting point through self-analysis. That is, asking students to consider questions such as:
- Do I have any firsthand experience of this issue? Have I, or do I know someone, who has suffered or is suffering due to this injustice?
- What biases do I have about a particular issue?
- Does learning about this issue make me uncomfortable? Why might that be?
- How does my life experience influence how I perceive injustice?

This process is similar to what Freire terms ‘conscientization,’ or "the process in which men, not as recipients, but as knowing subjects, achieve a deepening awareness both of the sociocultural reality which shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality" (Freire, 1993, p. 93). The inclusion of social justice as a necessary element provides the foundation from which an experience of service can take place. Students are equipped with enough knowledge and background information to proceed into a service experience with an initial understanding of the larger context within which their service takes place. Doing so moves students away from a charity model focused on service to a justice model that seeks to understand and address systemic causes of social issues. Additionally, helping students identify their own personal starting point situates the service experience within their own life experience. Doing so enables students to process their experiences of service in light of a better understanding of themselves and the context wherein the service takes place.

**Solidarity**

As service-learning relies heavily on relationships and Ignatian Pedagogy requires a preferential option for the poor, a focus on creating and maintaining relationships indicative of this commitment is important. Service-learning requires the creation of numerous relationships: the school as an institution must establish relationships with
community organizations, students serve within the organizations thus creating their own relationship with an organization while also developing personal relationships with the individuals the organization serves, and the teacher-student relationship develops over the course of a service-learning experience. With relationships playing such a pivotal role in service-learning, how those relationships are created and maintained is crucial for reflecting the nature of Jesuit education. In this regard, the concept of Solidarity dictates the formation of a particular type of relationship.

Jesuit education is compelled to demonstrate a commitment to the poor and marginalized of society. Therefore, a framework for service-learning in Jesuit secondary schools must exhibit such a commitment. This commitment emerges from the perspective that,

Since the truly human is found only in relationships with others…Jesuit education stresses – and assists in developing – the role of each individual as a member of the human community. Students, teachers, and all members of the educational community are encouraged to build a solidarity with others that transcends race, culture or religion. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 33)

Solidarity, in this sense, implores the development of a close, personal relationship with the poor and marginalized (or the ‘other’), regardless of race, culture, religion, economic means, etc. Doing so acts as a means of breaking down an ‘us – them’ mentality which can permeate an experience of service, separating those who serve from those served. Acknowledging this dynamic, Solidarity seeks to overcome the distinctions between ‘service providers’ and ‘service recipients’ which Maybach (1996) cautions against.
Doing so requires developing relationships that reflect a commitment to the poor and marginalized while carefully avoiding to perpetuate oppressive situations. In this way, solidarity cannot be separated from social justice. That is, students are expected to witness and experience injustice from a human perspective while critically considering the factors which create and sustain the need for their service. Solidarity recognizes that all involved in the service relationship stand to benefit, grow, learn from and potentially be transformed by the experience.

As such, solidarity cannot be developed quickly and easily. In order for solidarity to be an element of a service-learning program, sustained involvement is required. Programs should be structured in a way which enables and encourages students to be involved with a particular issue and organization for a sustained amount of time. Additionally, from a pedagogical perspective, the ability of students to engage the ‘other’ should develop over time. That is, students in their first year of high school may not be capable of developing the same depth of relationship or understanding of solidarity which students in their fourth year are able.

**Service**

While an examination of injustice is important and the concept of solidarity a worthy one, neither can be fully understood nor achieved without personal experience. Therefore, including an experience of service in this framework is essential. Ignatian Pedagogy recognizes the importance of experiences of service; stating,

The Jesuit school provides students with opportunities for contact with the poor and for service to them, both in the school and in outside service projects, to enable these students to learn to love all as brothers and sisters in the human
community, and also in order to come to a better understanding of the causes of poverty. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 89)

It is through service, direct and personal contact with the poor and marginalized, that students are able to have a personal experience of justice issues previously considered cognitively. Doing so encourages students to come to a greater understanding of the toll such issues have on people while also considering the systemic causes of such issues.

The nature of how service takes place is important. To meet the demands of Jesuit education, students must be given the opportunity to interact with the poor and marginalized, working with populations and dealing with issues with which the students may be unfamiliar. Experience, in this sense, is a pedagogical tool, bringing meaning to theory. The goal is that as students witness injustice firsthand and develop relationships with those affected, they will be compelled to consider their role in working for social justice by creating lasting change.

**Reflection**

Including reflection is essential in a framework for service-learning at a Jesuit secondary school. Helpful both as a tool during as well as following an experience of service, reflection joins the elements of social justice, solidarity, and service by providing the opportunity to consider deeper questions and their meaning. As a fundamental element of the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm, reflection means encouraging close cooperation and mutual sharing of experiences and reflective dialogue among students. It relates student learning and growth to personal interaction and human relationships. It proposes steady movement and progress toward action that will
affect the lives of others for good. Students will gradually learn that their deepest experiences come from their relationship with what is human, relationships with and experiences of persons. Reflection should always move toward greater appreciation of the lives of others, and of the actions, policies or structures that help or hinder mutual growth and development as members of the human family. This assumes, of course, that teachers are aware of and committed to such values. (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1989, p. 76)

As mentioned above, the role of the teacher in structuring and facilitating opportunities for reflection is important. Ignatian Pedagogy advocates for the teacher–student relationship to mimic that of spiritual director–retreatant outlined by the Spiritual Exercises. Therefore, teachers act as a guide for the student, contextualizing experiences of service with a critical analysis of social justice and guiding the formation of relationships based on solidarity. Doing so requires frequent opportunities for students to reflect upon and process their experience of service in light of their understanding of social justice and solidarity. Reflection should take many forms; individual or collective, written or oral; so that students are exposed to a variety of methods and encouraged to incorporate a habit of reflection into their daily lives.

As the above quote mentions, one goal of reflection is to lead to action. By participating in reflection, the hope is that students identify their role in the particular injustice they have considered and experienced through service. That is, can students begin to identify the root causes of a particular injustice? Can they determine/imagine an alternative? What role, if any, do they play (actively or implicitly) in perpetuating an injustice due to their racial, socio-economic, cultural, political, or religious affiliations?
What role can they play in working to combat injustice? How do their life choices support, maintain, or challenge the present system? Considering questions such as these can help students to process an academic understanding of a justice issue with a personal, relational experience of service.

Additionally, reflection should encourage students to give attention to their own personal feelings or responses. That is, how does working with an organization make me feel? Am I comfortable? Awkward? How do I relate to the individuals I have met? Has this experience challenged or reinforced stereotypes I held previously? Has this experience challenged or changed my personal or professional goals? By engaging in a process of ongoing reflection, students are encouraged to internalize a habit of reflection, a lifelong practice which Jesuit education seeks to instill.

**Academic Rigor**

A framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary school would be remiss without discussing academic rigor, as it is an emphasis characteristic of both Jesuit education as well as service-learning programs. Ignatian Pedagogy believes that knowledge joined with critical thinking results in enabling more effective work for social justice.

Used here, the term Academic Rigor in a Jesuit secondary school implies that “Justice issues are treated in the curriculum,” therefore, an emphasis on academic rigor is woven into the study of social justice issues discussed as the first component of this framework (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 78). That is, an examination of social justice is comprehensive, rigorous, and academically challenging. Students should be expected to read articles, engage in class
discussion, and undergo a critical social analysis of the causes and factors sustaining various injustices. Additionally, courses should include “a solution that is in line with Christian principles [as] a part of this analysis. The reference points are the Word of God, church teachings, and human science” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 78). In this way, students are challenged to consider not only the factors contributing to social issues but are also directed to think about solutions from both a scientific as well as a faith perspective. This is reflective of the belief that, “Jesuit education tries to develop in students an ability to know reality and evaluate it critically. This awareness includes a realization that persons and structures can change” (International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education, 1993, p. 58).

Including academic rigor as an essential component of this framework means that service-learning is integrated fully into the curriculum. As a pedagogical practice, service-learning without the academic piece (the ‘learning’) is simply service. Therefore, maintaining a strong academic focus, in line with Jesuit values of social justice, solidarity, reflection and service to others rounds out a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context.

**Identifiable Characteristics**

At the beginning of this chapter, two goals were presented; first to establish a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary context and secondly, to determine if such a framework is characteristically ‘Jesuit.’ The framework presented here clearly reflects the values and outcomes evident in the core documents of Jesuit Pedagogy. The distinct focus on the poor and marginalized, a realistic knowledge of the world, the inclusion of reflection and maintaining excellence through academic rigor are recurrent
themes found in *The Characteristics of Jesuit Education, The Profile of the Graduate at Graduation,* and *Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach.* Therefore, an argument could be made that in order for service-learning to be characteristically ‘Jesuit,’ these elements must be present. That said, these five elements are not unique to the Jesuits. Social Justice and an emphasis on the poor and marginalized are evident in Catholic social teaching, a body of writing which encompasses a much broader spectrum of Christians than Jesuits alone. Additionally, the use of reflection as a tool in service-learning programs and the goal of academic rigor are common among numerous secular and parochial, Jesuit and Catholic, secondary and post-secondary programs.

With this in mind, what can be concluded is that in order for a service-learning program to meet the demands of Ignatian Pedagogy in a Jesuit school, the elements of Social Justice, Solidarity, Service, Reflection, and Academic Rigor as described previously must be present. However, the converse of this relationship is not true. That is, the presence of these five elements as part of a service-learning program does not necessarily indicate that the program takes place within a Jesuit school.

This observation does not negate the importance of establishing such a framework. While it may not be possible to identify a program as ‘Jesuit’ solely based on identifiable characteristics, building such a framework has clearly articulated the common themes of Ignatian Pedagogy as they relate to service-learning. Therefore, if service-learning is taking place in Jesuit secondary schools and any one of the elements of the framework presented here is missing, the program does not conform to the pedagogy put forth by the core documents of Jesuit education. Additionally, as the elements of social justice, solidarity, service, reflection and academic rigor emerge both from an examination of Jesuit pedagogy
and best practices, service-learning in a Jesuit secondary institution which does not include these elements faces critique not only as poorly structured service-learning but also as poorly structured Jesuit education. Meaning, in order for service-learning in Jesuit schools to meet the demands of Ignatian pedagogy, these five elements must be present. Consequently, an examination of these five essential characteristics may provide the foundation for designing and implementing service-learning programs at Jesuit secondary schools. While beyond the scope of this study, the framework presented here may be useful in such endeavors in the future.

To summarize the framework presented here, a table of the five service-learning characteristics, their connection to Jesuit pedagogy and indicators has been included on the following pages.
Table 2

*A Framework for Service-Learning and Jesuit Pedagogy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service-Learning Characteristic:</th>
<th>Connection to Jesuit Pedagogy:</th>
<th>Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Social Justice**               | - *Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, 74  
- *Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, 76  
- *Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, 78  
- Grad @ Grad: Committed to Doing Justice  
- IPP: Context | ○ Examines historical, political, socio-economic, religious, and social context  
○ Addresses systemic causes of social issues (e.g. poverty, access to education, etc.)  
○ Provides opportunities for students to conduct self-analysis |
| **Solidarity**                   | - *Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, 33  
- *Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, 85  
- *Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, 88  
- Grad @ Grad: Committed to Doing Justice  
- Grad @ Grad: Loving  
- IPP: Experience | ○ Demonstrates a commitment to the poor and marginalized  
○ Program provides opportunities for students to develop a close, personal relationship  
○ Overcomes the distinction between service providers and service recipients  
○ Student involvement for a sustained amount of time |
| **Service**                      | - *Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, 82  
- *Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, 89  
- Grad @ Grad: Open to Growth  
- IPP: Experience  
- IPP: Action | ○ Direct, personal contact with poor and marginalized  
○ Provides opportunities for students to witness injustice firsthand  
○ Goal of service is to compel student action for justice |
| Reflection | - Characteristics of Jesuit Education, 76  
- Characteristics of Jesuit Education, 80  
- Characteristics of Jesuit Education, 90  
- IPP: Reflection  
- IPP: Evaluation |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
|                | o Used as a means of connecting social justice, solidarity and service  
|                | o Structure of reflection takes various forms (individual or collective, written or oral)  
|                | o Instructor’s role mimics that of spiritual director  
|                | o Assists in identifying root causes of injustice  
|                | o Encourages students to consider their role in combating injustice  
|                | o Provides structured time for students to take note of personal feelings and responses to participating in service  
|                | o Promotes an ongoing habit of reflection |

| Academic Rigor | - Characteristics of Jesuit Education, 53  
- Characteristics of Jesuit Education, 58  
- Characteristics of Jesuit Education, 64  
- Characteristics of Jesuit Education, 78  
- Grad @ Grad: Intellectually Competent  
- IPP: Evaluation |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
|                | o Joins knowledge with critical thinking skills to enable work for justice  
|                | o Justice issues treated in the curriculum  
|                | o Examination of social justice is rigorous, comprehensive and academically challenging  
|                | o Involves reading articles, having class discussions and undergoing critical social analysis of the causes and factors sustaining injustice  
|                | o Asks students to consider solutions from a scientific and faith perspective |
CONCLUSION

In developing the framework presented here, Jesuit Pedagogy, reflecting centuries of research and refinement connecting Ignatian spirituality with contemporary educational practices, has been joined with one such current practice, service-learning. The active, world-affirming nature of the Jesuit charism compels the educational practices taking place within Jesuit schools to embody the engaged, academically rigorous, socially just characteristics present in the core documents of Jesuit Pedagogy. Service-learning, as a method of integrating academic understanding with a commitment to service among the community, serves as one means of furthering the goals of Jesuit education. As the framework presented articulates, in order for service-learning to be identifiably ‘Jesuit,’ the criteria of social justice, solidarity, service, reflection and academic rigor as described must be met.

While Ignatian Pedagogy and Jesuit education necessitate the presence of such characteristics, these same characteristics are present among many service-learning programs (secular or private) and therefore also reflect educational best practices. Such overlap of educational best practices and Jesuit Pedagogy is not entirely surprising as Jesuit schools seek to respond to and adapt to the ever-changing world. Just as Ignatian Pedagogy began as a collection of educational best practices of the time guided by Ignatian spirituality, a similar dynamic is present in the manner in which service-learning can be utilized as a teaching methodology within Jesuit schools.
Although no study or research project goes completely according to plan, much of the study presented here proceeded as I had originally envisioned. Having already been fairly knowledgeable of the tradition of Jesuit education and Ignatian Pedagogy as well as somewhat familiar with service-learning programs, I believed that weaving the two together would not only be possible but would enable the formulation of specific criteria for service-learning from a particular pedagogical tradition. Consequently, this study drew upon the rich tradition of Jesuit education and Ignatian Pedagogy as well as the vast amounts of research on service-learning theory, frameworks and programs. The result is a framework for service-learning suitable for use in Jesuit secondary institutions.

While the resulting framework achieved my initial goal, it failed to be characteristically ‘Jesuit’ which came as a surprise to me. During the initial conceptualization of this study, I believed that it would indeed be possible to design a framework that would not only satisfy the guiding principles of Jesuit education but would also be distinctive. That is, a framework for service-learning in a Jesuit secondary school would have some necessary element, some component or characteristic unique to Jesuit institutions. During the course of my research, what I found was that since Ignatian Pedagogy was initially and continues to be informed to an extent by secular teaching methodologies, best practices for service-learning at both Jesuit and secular institutions would be similar. I then explored grounding service-learning in Catholic social teaching only to realize that may make a framework characteristically ‘Catholic’ but not necessarily ‘Jesuit.’ Finally, the importance of social justice for the Jesuits appeared as an avenue to distinguish this framework from others. However, a substantial body of research from a variety of perspectives (secular, Catholic, as well as Jesuit) exists
linking service-learning and social justice making a focus on social justice a non-
distinguishable characteristic. Therefore, while the resulting framework meets the
demands of Jesuit education, I was unable to articulate a framework that would stand on
its own as distinctively ‘Jesuit.’

This study, situated within a large body of research dedicated to both service-
learning and Jesuit education, proposed a framework of characteristics which must be
present in order for a service-learning program to meet the demands of Ignatian
Pedagogy. What is articulated is a framework of characteristics necessary for service-
learning to meet the demands of Jesuit pedagogy. The hope is that such a framework can
assist Jesuit secondary schools in the creation of service-learning opportunities for
students or contribute to the evaluation of the Jesuit nature of programs currently in place
within Jesuit secondary schools. Although the focus of this research has been the
secondary level, the characteristics found within the framework could also serve as a
resource for post-secondary programs.
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