

Engaging Pedagogies in Catholic Higher Education (EPiCHE)

Volume 2

Issue 1 *Pedagogy of Immersion*

Article 2

2016

Reflections on Skipping Stones to Diving Deep: The Process of Immersion as a Practice

Judith Liu Dr

University of San Diego, liuud@sandiego.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.stmarys-ca.edu/epiche>

Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), [Community-Based Learning Commons](#), [Community-Based Research Commons](#), [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Leadership Studies Commons](#), [Liberal Studies Commons](#), [Service Learning Commons](#), [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Liu, Judith Dr (2016) "Reflections on Skipping Stones to Diving Deep: The Process of Immersion as a Practice," *Engaging Pedagogies in Catholic Higher Education (EPiCHE)*: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 2.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18263/2379-920X.1011>

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.stmarys-ca.edu/epiche/vol2/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Saint Mary's Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Engaging Pedagogies in Catholic Higher Education (EPiCHE) by an authorized editor of Saint Mary's Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@stmarys-ca.edu.

Reflections on Skipping Stones to Diving Deep: The Process of Immersion as a Practice

Judith Liu

Reflecting upon over 30 years of teaching courses with a community service-learning and engagement component, this article is a personal piece that explores the author's journey through voluntarism, community service-learning and civic engagement, and how that path has led to embracing immersion as a critical pedagogical practice for community engagement.

As the Bob Dylan song goes, “the times, they are a changin’.” Campuses throughout the country continue to create and expand offices and centers designed to nurture methods that transform curricula in order to motivate students to become more involved in civic, social, and political arenas through pedagogical practices that are both in and out of the classroom. Courses that conscientiously and carefully integrate well-planned community engagement projects and community-based research components can be the means to achieve the goals of civic engagement and community-based research that meet the needs of the communities involved (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Jacoby, 1996).

Defining Moments

My own transformation began when I first started teaching at the University of San Diego (USD) in 1982. The university was similar to other institutions across the country with a predominantly white, male faculty teaching an affluent white population. As the first faculty of color in the Sociology Department, I wanted students enrolled in my lower-division courses to “see” the world from different perspectives and to become active participants within their expanding world. Coming of age during the 1960s had a profound impact on my worldview and using models from my own undergraduate experience where I was required to work on social issues of my own choosing, I decided to embed a similar experience in my own classes.

I plunged myself into readings that inspired me to take meaningful action (Alinsky, 1965, 1969, 1971; Arnstein, 1969; Illich, 1968). My education in sociology provided me with a lens for viewing the world and for fostering a view of collective social action that emphasized the importance of defending the idea of the public good while imagining a different reality that challenges the world as we know it and exposes the gap that exists between what is and what could be. Armed with a notion of public sociology that seeks ways to build bridges with communities by engaging with individuals from diverse backgrounds, I believed that meaningful connections could be created through arriving at mutual understandings. I hoped then, as I still do now, to inspire students to expand their academic boundaries by becoming socially engaged citizens (Agger, 2007; Alinsky, 1984; Barlow, 2007; Billson, 1984; Blau & Smith, 2006; Brewer, 2013; Burawoy, 2014; Freedman, 1984; Glass, 1984; Jeffries, 2009; Mills, 1959; Nyden, Hossfeld, & Nyden, 2011).

For my first two years I taught an introductory Sociology course, Social Problems, from a “social problems of the week” approach that provided numerous volunteer opportunities for students to become aware of the various social issues confronting the neighborhoods surrounding USD. But in 1984 I was shaken and awakened when a student in my class wrote in response to the prompt, “What is a Social Problem” that it was “Not having a date on Friday night”. After my initial reaction of “shock and awe”, I had to stop and seriously reflect on the answer. I came to realize that I played an important role in that response. By not providing a meaningful context, the response to the writing prompt was not only logical but reasonable as well. That realization shook me to the core and caused me to rethink how I was teaching.

While well meaning, this approach of “tossing students into the water” meant that students entered their sites more as privileged “tourists” than as actual community members. They were in the neighborhood today, but they were gone tomorrow. While students may have been touched by the experience and may have felt compassion for what they witnessed, their naiveté was still reflected in statements about being appreciative for parents who could afford to send them to a good college such as USD or for not having to grow up in Linda Vista—the community that surrounds the university. Tantamount to skipping stones across a neighborhood “pond”, unintentionally, I had reinforced stereotypes about poverty and low-income neighborhoods by having students briefly touch the surface of social issues by focusing on the “deficits” of Linda Vista. What was “missing” from the community only served to accentuate the differences between rather than to link to any similarities with Linda Vista residents that the students may have had. Thus, having my students merely interact with residents was not enough.

At the heart of my reflection was a desire to be a better teacher and the need to consciously dive deeper into how I was teaching in order to craft an environment that would simultaneously pique students’ intellectual curiosity while creating a connection with the community that showed respect for the residents rather than turning them in a “social laboratory” at best or a “zoo” at worst. This soul-searching led me to adopt a series of changes to the course that included narrowing the number of volunteer opportunities to a local after-school program, co-teaching the course with a teacher from that program, and designing activities that tried to turn didactic practice on its head by including residents of Linda

Vista. Year-after-year, as I witnessed small but discernible changes reflected in student writings, I continued to tweak the course based upon the increased awareness I obtained from working consistently with the same partners and USD's community service-learning professionals, attending as many professional conferences (National Society for Experiential Education, Continuums of Service) and reading the "latest" literature that had inspired me (Alinsky, 1984; Billson, 1984; Glass, 1984; Freedman, 1984).

These interactions and conscious revisions resulted in yet another defining moment when "Social Problems" was renamed "Contemporary Social Issues" in 1993. This change was the direct result of one middle-school student who, in the after-school partnership program, asked this poignant question: "If this course is called 'Social Problems', does that mean you see us as one?" Knowing full well how powerful language can be, it took the insight and wisdom of a middle-school student to make me see that a course name change for the department's curriculum was necessary. I championed the change, and although accused of capitulating to "political correctness", after some discussion, the department decided to vote to permanently change the course title and to continue its commitment to public sociology.

My reflections on this name change caused me to realize that I needed to work more closely with existing partners. This new awareness, in turn, motivated me to deepen three learning objectives for the course that would (a) challenge my students in a developmentally appropriate manner, (b) continue to incorporate the community's voice in structuring the course by collaborating on mutually defined projects and content, and (c) use the practical wisdom held by community partners as a means to decrease the perceived power differentials between "privileged" USD and "poor" Linda Vista. Inspired by the then director of the Center for Community Service-Learning (CCSL), Elaine Elliott, my desire to meet these learning objectives provided the impetus for creating a new community-based Sociology course entitled Community, Consensus, and Commitment (CCC) in 2004.

The course came at the right time. During the decades of the 1990s and 2000s, the number of publications on dismantling town/gown divides by cultivating genuine campus/community connections, integrating and assessing the impact of service-learning, creative curriculum development, diversity and multiculturalism, and best practices exploded on the scene igniting interest in finding meaningful ways to further the academy's role in creating "relevant" education (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 1997; Boyer, 1994a, 1994b; Coles, 1993; Cruz & Giles, 2000; DeVitis, Johns, & Simpson, 1998; Dewar & Isaac, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby, 1996; Palmer, 1998; Pigza & Troppe, 2003; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999; Zlotkowski, 2002). The course was creative in a number of ways. First, a community organization developed a course and approached local universities in San Diego to teach it. Adopting an academic setting was the Consensus Organizing Institute's

(COI) way to expand beyond its community-based focus through an academic partnership. Its mission was to train local leaders to work within their own communities by empowering them with the necessary skills to effectively create political networks and to forge links with local resource holders in order to address their civic concerns. Together with the professional trainers of the COI and Elaine Elliott, we developed a course where I became both a co-instructor as well as an ardent believer in the effectiveness of consensus organizing.

Second, the participants in CCC would be a mix of traditional upper-division undergraduate students and local Linda Vista residents. These Community Scholars would be invited through numerous outreach methods appropriate to Linda Vista such as speaking at churches and temples, recruiting at community gatherings and events held at the local community center, and asking local leaders for their recommendations and using their personal networks rather than by merely posting flyers.

Third, the curriculum was co-designed by the COI, the CCSL, and me. The course purposefully recognized that the wisdom of community members was a crucial part in creating knowledge and was also the foundation upon which community action had to be based. Community wisdom would be as equally valued as "book learning." Two new learning objectives emerged: (a) how to forge authentic relationships between USD and Linda Vista through a mutually sustained commitment to each other and (b) how to forge links between local community residents and city-wide resource holders.

The course itself has transformed over the years. Although no longer co-taught with the COI which has disbanded, I continue to co-teach the course with a former Community Scholar and a professional staff member from the newly renamed Mulvaney Center for Community, Awareness, and Social Action (MC CASA). Co-teaching and co-creating the course with community partners resulted in a reading list that is both accessible and practical, changing as the needs of the community shift. Most recently, the course has included local residents enrolled in an "open university" initiative known as the Cooperative Learning Academy (CLA) that is based at the Bayside Community Center, a long-standing community partner located in Linda Vista. These CLA members are the liaisons between USD and Linda Vista working with USD on community identified issues concerning education, health and wellness, and housing. While Linda Vista is still a main priority, Community Scholars are invited from across the San Diego region. Teaching the course has given me a greater appreciation of the ways one can immerse students into a community in a meaningful and sustainable way. It has also become the primary means for bringing community members into a class where they are the "local experts" who use their experiences to demonstrate their wisdom, and this process has helped them traverse a divide that previously they had considered impassable.

Border Crossings

Studying abroad or learning a new language are typically how students encounter the notion of immersion: one is “immersed” in a culture or language other than the US and through this process, the world becomes simultaneously both larger and smaller (Bingle & Hatcher, 2011; Bingle, Hatcher, & Jones, 2011). In January 2009, undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the CCC course traveled to Guatemala. Prior to leaving, mandatory meetings—that included lectures, readings, and guest speakers—prepared students for their impending travel. Having spent a considerable portion of her life there, director Elaine Elliott and VIA International, a trans-border partner of USD that is affiliated with non-profit organizations in Mexico and Guatemala, created an experience that involved working in a village that was decimated during the thirty-year civil war. The experience was made all the more meaningful because we collaborated on projects identified by the villagers, and together, we dug a foundation for latrines, painted a mural at an elementary school, and finished a concrete trough that brought running water to the school. Elaine was further able to coordinate guest speakers and arrange for local site visits to agencies and organizations who were engaged in community organizing efforts so we could witness how well-intended efforts can be muddied or clarified based on the level of community involvement in the planning and implementation of programs.

As opportunities for other international community service-based opportunities appeared, I embraced them as opportunities for me and for USD students to see community engagement efforts around the globe. When USD was invited to participate in Tsinghua University’s Rural Poverty Alleviation Program that sends teams of students from what is considered to be China’s top institute of technology and from abroad to teach at thirty sites throughout China, I jumped at the opportunity. The goal of the program is to inspire rural students from some of China’s most impoverished areas to continue their education by teaching subjects included in China’s national college entrance examination: biology, chemistry, math, and physics. Although English (grammar, vocabulary, and reading) is another examination subject, conversational English is not. The purpose of including USD students was to provide a more hands-on experience while simultaneously opening the eyes of participants in the project.

For four years, I joined the program and prepared USD students for the trip in pre-departure lectures using previous student participants, readings, and films. I had students prepare lessons about their lives—hobbies, education, family, sports—subjects with which students in China could relate. Although Tsinghua and USD students were deeply touched by their experiences, the impact on rural students was minimal. Tsinghua’s best intentions of trying to expose K-12 children in some of the poorest areas of China could not have a lasting effect because the experience was a “one and done” for both the foreign students and for the Chinese locals. Tsinghua’s

commitment to its thirty sites remains commendably the same, but connections to the communities are often only once a year and the interactions rarely touch on the real issues of rural poverty. A window to the world is briefly opened only to be quickly shut. This experience led me to reflect more deeply on the role of immersions and how to use these experiences as a springboard to diving deeper.

As such, I am increasingly abandoning the “study abroad” approach. The difference between a study abroad and an immersion experience is the level and degree to which the students are embedded in the local community. For students studying abroad, the main purpose is to take courses in a new and exciting environment, but immersion trips seek to go much deeper by actually working in the community. To be effective, immersions require thorough and thoughtful intellectual and ideological preparation prior to the actual experience followed by guided reflections integrated a number of times after the experience, but these aspects of immersion programs frequently meets with resistance from those students who expect the inherent tourist-like attraction of most study abroad programs. Consequently, I have now moved toward immersions closer to my own back yard because border crossings can occur anywhere and encounters with a new culture can originate by just leaving one’s campus.

Being near the Mexican border puts USD in the uncommon position of having an international border less than an hour from the campus. This proximity was the source for transforming yet another upper-division Sociology course, Social Change: Global Perspectives. Students enrolled in the class were informed that an international experience was a required component of the course. When an e-mail was sent to the students prior to the start of the course, the initial enrollment of 35 dropped to 17. Given the level of negative press about crime and drug-related violence in Mexico in 2010, students told me that their parents considered Mexico too dangerous to visit and that their parents would not allow them to remain enrolled in the course.

Working again with VIA International, the class traveled to Mexicali. Originally, the immersion was to be in Tijuana, but when violence erupted in the city, the site was changed to Mexicali where the students worked with VIA’s micro-finance partners. We prepared students “intellectually” for the immersion, but the “emotional” impact of the immersion was equally as educational. Recognizing the privilege of living on one side of an arbitrary line as opposed to the other shook-up the students. The driving question for the remainder of the semester turned out to be similar to Leon Trotsky’s “What Then Must We Do?” Students felt a degree of collective guilt when, for example, seeing the consequences of US corn-based ethanol subsidies on Mexican maize farmers first-hand. Locally grown maize is more expensive than the subsidized corn pouring in from the US. Our desire to produce an ethanol-based alternative for gasoline has had the unintended consequence of forcing many of these farmers off the land

because they cannot economically compete against cheaper, imported American corn. Thus students saw the consequences of neo-liberal economic policies driven by world-wide capitalist practices that we studied in class. Rather than falling into despair, after the class was over, some felt empowered to join international NGO efforts, attend graduate programs, and to take the CCC course the next semester. Some of these students joined me for the Tsinghua program in China that summer. These students continued to dive deeper, to ask questions and reflect at every opportunity in an effort to learn more about what one person could do to make the world a more equitable place. I would argue that they grew as students and people as a consequence of their experiences in this course.

Recognizing the fears of parents and trying to ensure the students' safety, a US border experience was created for the next iteration of the course. In this case, we stayed on the US side but visited sites that had global implications. Thus, we visited the San Diego-Tijuana River Estuary where water originating in Mexico flows north into the US and examined the issues of environmental pollution and the ecological ramifications for both countries. A visit to the border fence afforded students the opportunity to talk with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents and with a representative of the Border Angels (an organization devoted to address the plight of migrants attempting to cross the border). Witnessing an actual attempt by a man to cross the border provided students with two countervailing perspectives on the emotionally-charged political, economic, and social questions of immigration. During the debrief of the experience, students could articulate the policy implications for controlling immigration but the human impact of why so many were willing to die in order to live was difficult to reconcile with what they had read and heard in the media versus what they actually saw. The remainder of the semester was spent grappling with these complex issues through discussions that helped students go deeper into the material and deepening their understanding.

Because immersions can take place anywhere, in spring 2015, students enrolled in the CCC course also participated in an "Alternative Spring Break" to New Orleans. Students delved into course content materials, the recent history of New Orleans, and USD's ten-year relationship within the community before engaging with the organizations that emerged as a result of community activism following Hurricane Katrina. When we actually met with the authors, filmmakers, and community organizers who shared their wisdom in person, the experience was made more meaningful as we began to develop an understanding of the situation in New Orleans that transcended being mere sightseers (or site-seers); rather, we became invited members of the community.

The Invitation

My community engagement efforts are directed toward

creating a vibrant learning environment in which students can (a) increase their knowledge of a community, (b) enhance their commitment to envision and to strive to create a more just world, and (c) encourage students to consider what it means to include a life-long commitment to the greater community as part of their identity: goals that are intrinsic to the practice of public sociology.

The revised CCC course with the immersion component added an additional perspective that offered an important lens for social analysis. By analyzing power structures, by looking to community assets for insight and wisdom, by seeing where to exert pressure, and by examining the importance of collaboration, it becomes possible to foster individual, as well as actual social change. This process offers the opportunity for students to consciously reflect upon their own social locations, to critically think about their own personal narratives, and to understand how they, as individuals, connect to the larger issue of social justice. It also highlights that solidarity can only be achieved through an enduring commitment over time (Daloz-Parks, 2000; Nolan, 2012).

The importance of creating a significant and on-going community-based collaboration is always a goal; yet, the creation of campus-community partnerships that are both authentic and sustainable continues to be a challenge because of the inherent power differentials between the campus and the community. A prosperous private institution working with a low-income community can be intimidating for both groups. When tensions emerge, power and privilege dynamics are highlighted. While significant progress in embedding a culture of commitment has evolved at USD through community engagement efforts and community-based research projects, interchanges between the campus and community are still largely unidirectional, not bidirectional, with students and faculty going out into the community but with community members rarely entering USD (Liu, Elliott, Loggins, & Nayve, 2006).

As such, it is important to encourage invitations from the local community. Invitations that encourage student involvement in the local community can help to break down the traditional town-gown divide and make the perception of the university seem less formidable and more hospitable. I became aware of USD's success in this regard when Mama J, of the Community Bookstore in New Orleans, extended a dinner invitation when we first arrived for our spring immersion. Lovingly prepared, her food nourished both body and soul. Despite the fact that most of the students had never been to New Orleans much less to that bookstore, the invitation to join the community was genuine, and it showcased a collaborative process of integration that went in both directions. When tensions emerged during the visit which is to be expected even in the most loving relationships, the source revolved around the perceived motivations for why students enrolled in the course. Accusations were made about the nature of interactions—were they transactional or relational? Was a trip to New Orleans the

“real reason” for enrolling in the class? Those with a preference for introversion and the need for quiet contemplation were overwhelmed by those with a preference for extroversion who wanted stimulation through more and more social interactions. We were invited to dive deep within ourselves to give voice to fears, frustrations, and feelings through the reflection facilitation of another community member who championed that vulnerability is a virtue and not a sign of weakness. Although the experience felt at times as if we were drowning during the immersion, the reflection was another lesson in taking risks and “jumping off the deep end” rather than avoiding confrontation, conflict, and challenge.

On Authenticity

Deep learning entails cultivating curiosity, embracing optimism, fostering a capacity to be empathic through generosity, compassion, and care, and helping students, community partners, and ourselves to live consciously and fully. Working at a faith-based institution that has maintained its identity with a commitment to Catholic intellectual and social justice traditions provides an advantage in terms of commitment and understanding of these values being held by the entire campus community that may not be the case at other institutions, but it can also exacerbate the contradictions that exist between these idealized goals and real world conditions.

While all institutions have contradictions, how to effectively deal with them is an on-going challenge. Working in a Catholic institution has provided a haven for engaging in activities that reward efforts to be contemplative, introspective, and reflexive both in our pedagogy and in our lives, but the church is also an inherently conservative institution. Rather than fall into despair, I choose to live with these contradictions and seek ways to go around or go through them. Letting students see my own attempts to navigate through troubled waters helps them realize that we all struggle and that becoming who we ultimately want to be only comes about through ongoing ideological work (Berger, 1981), by taking risks, by being persistent, and by seeking collective action.

My latest defining moment comes while writing this very piece. While meeting with prospective contributors, the one community partner present posed a crucial question: “Who is this writing for?” since all the rest of us who were present were academics. His question raised a fundamental issue that ultimately comes to the heart of who benefits from “scholarship” and the nature of power, status, and privilege. I appreciate and genuinely understand the comments from local residents who suffer from “survey fatigue” about being constantly asked and interviewed about issues confronting their communities; yet, their stories are used frequently for “photo ops” but are otherwise ignored, forgotten or quoted in reports that languish on some shelf gathering dust. Research bereft of community voice and wisdom no matter how noble the intention is somewhat exploitive. Jargon laden,

inaccessible prose may score “academic points”, but it is pointless for those with whom we claim to be working.

So I write because it forces me to articulate the things I care about—being part of meaningful relationships with students, colleagues, and community partners, and these relationships ultimately hold me accountable for being true to my beliefs and values. I write to be inclusive of the voices I hear and to let those who read their words know that I have truly listened to what they have said and to be mindful that I speak authentically with, not merely for, the community. I write with community partners using their words constantly checking and rechecking with them about whether or not what I have written is true to their spirit and intent. In co-written pieces, co-authors add to the growing body of knowledge about creating and sustaining meaningful relationships. Writing about our collective experience is also an important means of sharing best practices with a wider audience because writing is not just a creative accounting practice of merely switching out one set of words for another, but it is also a means to examine the transformative nature of community engagement. My writing reflects how teaching has become a reciprocal process for me as I, too, have learned from my interactions with students, colleagues, and community partners. By including their voices in community-based research, the possibility of a “win-win” scenario is possible because their wisdom is incorporated into revisions of my courses as well as into my own research (Liu & Kelly, 2010a, 2010b; Liu with Leppard & Nayve, 2012).

Practice, Practice, Practice

As with all mastery, practice is essential, and cultivating immersion as a practice is no different. Establishing a strong relationship based on caring and commitment takes time because expressing solidarity is not the same as establishing rapport with the community. Every potential partnership begins by skipping stones, touching on a number of issues. Analogous to learning how to swim, it is better to start at the shallow end of the pool and work slowly and steadily to the deep end rather than hastily jumping into the deep end. Going back to the community time and time again is needed. Each encounter is an opportunity to dive a little deeper through mutual reflection because we are in the process of creating a community of memory where our persistent efforts will finally be rewarded by affecting substantive social change.

In the current culture of fear with its overemphasis upon security at the expense of taking any risks, we are creating new physical and psychological borders. The challenge of cultivating curiosity requires students to be less fearful, and immersions can be a means of bringing the voice of the “other” into the classroom to try and dispel the anxiety of crossing boundaries. I want to create a space for social interaction and cultural interchange, a reinterpretation of the concept of borders. In conventional usage borders are limiting, they are seen as something that delineates a specific territory and imputes a

concomitant identity upon its inhabitants. Borders are frequently seen as a boundary that cannot or should not be traversed, but actual borders are less defined than we make them out to be. That is, borders are a region where social differences are fluid and cultural interchanges are constantly occurring. Immersions provide the opportunity to connect with communities in a meaningful manner, to strengthen and build trusting relationships, and to deepen learning through reflection (Welch, 1999; Welch, 2010). If USD is to become the anchor institute to which it aspires, then we need to create greater not fewer opportunities to connect, engage, cooperate, and reflect co-intentionally.

Thus, when working with students and community partners, immersions may provide occasions for them to test the waters of mutual engagement but we cannot force them to take the plunge. The hope is that we can motivate them by modeling our own practices for them, but at the same time, we must be willing to dive even more deeply and purposefully into unknown waters and to share our experience with them once we resurface. After all, if we ask this of our students and community partners, then shouldn't we expect the same of ourselves?

References

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

Agger, B. (2007). *Public Sociology: From social facts to literary acts*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Alinsky, S.D. (1965). The war on poverty-political pornography. *Journal of Social Issues, 21*, 41-47.

Alinsky, S.D. (1971). *Rules for radicals: A pragmatic primer for realistic radicals*. New York: Random House.

Alinsky, S.D. (1969). *Reveille for radicals*. New York: Random House.

Alinsky, S.D. (1984). Community analysis and organization. *Clinical Sociology Review, 2*, 7-24.

Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 35*(4), 216-224.

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 251-263.

Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). Executive Summary: How Service-Learning Affects Students. University of California, Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Barlow, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Collaborations for social justice: Professionals, publics, and policy change*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Berger, B.M. (1981). *The survival of a counterculture: Ideological work and everyday life among rural communards*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Billson, J.M. (1984). Saul Alinsky: Contributions of a pioneer clinical sociologist. *Clinical Sociology Review, 2*, 25-34.

Blau, J., & Iyall Smith, K.E. (Eds.). (2006). *Public sociologies reader*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Boyer, E.L. (1994a). The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 49*(7), 18-33.

Boyer, E.L. (1994b). Creating the new American college. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Creating-the-New-American/93483/>

Boyte, H., & Hollander, E., on behalf of participants in a Wingspread conference on civic education, Wingspread declaration on renewing the civic mission of the American research university. (1999). Retrieved from <http://compact.org/wingspread-declaration-on-the-civic-responsibilities-of-research-universities/>

Brewer, J.D. (2013). *The public value of the social sciences*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Bringle, R.G., & Hatcher, J.A. (2011). International service learning." In R.G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S.G. Jones (Eds.), *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research*. [IUPUI series on service learning research]. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Bringle, R.G., Hatcher, J.A., & Jones, S.G. (Eds.). (2011). *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research*. [IUPUI series on service learning research]. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Burawoy, M. (Ed.), (2014). Precarious engagements: Combat in the realm of public sociology. [Special Issue]. *Current Sociology, 62*(2).

Coles, R. (1993). *The call to service: A witness to realism*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Cruz, N., & Giles, Jr., D.G. (2000). Where's the community in service-learning research? [Special issue]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*, 28-34.

Dewar, M., & Isaac, C. (1998). Learning from difference: The potentially transforming experience of community-university collaboration. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 17*(4), 334-347.

DiVitas, J.L., Johns, R.W., & Simpson, D.J. (Eds.). (1998). *To service and learn: The spirit of community in liberal education*. New York: Peter Lang.

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

Freedman, J.A. (1984). Saul Alinsky: A recollection. *Clinical Sociology Review, 2*, 39-41.

Glass, J.F. (1984). Saul Alinsky in retrospect. *Clinical Sociology Review, 2*, 35-38.

Green, P. & Johnson, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Crossing boundaries: Tension and transformation in international service*. (Forward by R. G. Bringle). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Illich, I. (1968). To hell with good intentions. Conference on Inter-American Student Projects. Cuernavaca, Mexico. Retrieved from http://www.swaraj.org/illich_hell.htm

Jacoby, B. (Ed.). (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Jeffries, V. (Ed.). (2009). *The handbook of public sociology*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

- Lazarus, F., Rauner, J., & Willis, V. (2004). University of San Diego: A commitment to collaboration for service-learning. In M. Langseth and W. Plater (Eds.), *Public work and the academy: An academic administrator's guide to civic engagement and service-learning*. Bolton, MS: Anker Publishing Co., Inc.
- Liu, J. & Kelly, D.P. (2010a). "Democracy is hard"/"Democracy is messy". *Journal for Civic Commitment*, XVI(1), 1-13.
- Liu, J. & Kelly, D.P. (2010b). Just a community organizer: Community/campus connections through organizing. *Metropolitan Universities Journal: An International Forum*, 20(3), 47-60.
- Liu, J., Elliott, E., Loggins, J., & Nayve, C. (2006). Toward common unity: From silent to more equitable partnerships. *Metropolitan Universities Journal: An International Forum*, 17(1), 104-115.
- Liu, J., with Leppard, E., & Nayve, C. (2012). "Nothing about us without us is for us": Civic engagement through consensus and commitment. *Journal for Civic Commitment*, 19, 1-20.
- Mills, C.W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morton, K. (1995). The irony of service: Charity, project and social change in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2(1), 9-32.
- Nyden, P., Hossfeld, L., & Nyden, G. (Eds.). (2011). *Public sociology: Research, action, and change*. Newbury Parks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Palmer, P.J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Parks, S.D. (2000). *Big questions, worthy dreams: Mentoring emerging adults in their search for meaning, purpose, and faith*. New York: John W. Wiley.
- Pigza, J.M., & Troppe, M.L. (2003). Developing an infrastructure for service-learning and community engagement. In B. Jacoby, Ed., *Building partnerships for service-learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nichols, L. (Ed.). (2007). *Public sociology: The contemporary debate*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Nolan, A. (2012). Four stages of spiritual growth in helping the poor. As recounted by Keith Meyer in *Spiritual Rhythms in Community*. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Stanton, T.K., Giles, Jr., D.E., & Cruz, N. (1999). *Service-learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Welch, M. (1999). "The ABCs of reflection: A template for students and instructors to implement written reflection in service-learning". *Evaluation/Reflection*. Paper 16. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceeval/16>
- Welch, M. (2010). "OPERA: A first letter mnemonic and rubric for conceptualising and implementing service learning". *Issues in Educational Research*, 20(1): 76-82.
- Zlotkowski, E. (Ed.). (2002). *Service-learning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility*. [Monograph No. 34]. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.