

# *Giving and Receiving Hospitality during Community Engagement Courses*

*Marianne Delaporte*

*When you give a luncheon or a dinner, do not invite your friends or your brothers of your relatives or rich neighbors, in case they may invite you in return, and you would be repaid. But when you give a banquet, invite the poor, the crippled, the lame, and the blind.*

—LUKE 14:12–13 (NRSV)

WHILE IT MIGHT be counterintuitive for those who think of community engagement in terms of charity, hospitality is more often received than given in community engagement classes, as students are sent out into the community to encounter the hospitality of others. This presents an important pedagogical point (especially in response to the CLEA model of teaching civic engagement discussed in earlier chapters of this book): In community engagement, the receiving of hospitality cannot be passive if it is to be successful. Rather, the receiving of hospitality must be thoughtful and engaged. As a professor who has recently begun being involved in community engagement courses I have found, time and again, that the most time-consuming, difficult, and possibly explosive part of the preparation for such a course is the question of hospitality. How do we prepare for an off-site experience with our students? How do we prepare the community partners to give hospitality to our students, and can we offer some form of hospitality to them in return? The importance of hospitality, of being able to both receive it and give it, has a great impact on our sense of civic engagement. By the very inclusion of the term “engagement,” civic engagement implies a bond or relationship with others. Most often the state of this bond is assumed and not thought through. By thinking in terms of hospitality one brings these assumptions to light. The

virtue of hospitality, therefore, makes explicit the implicit understanding that the civil sphere is one of reciprocity, relationship, and empathy, and that it is through attention to these relationships that societies thrive.

Engagement requires assent from both parties, and hospitality makes it clear that the bond created is not merely a utilitarian one but one of mutuality, as conveyed by the Greek terms *agape* or *philia*. In this chapter I give suggestions for preparing a class that will benefit both the students and the community partners. A theory of hospitality is presented, followed by a short discussion of the way in which hospitality functions both in and out of the classroom in a community engagement course.

In making these suggestions, I am linking hospitality to social justice.<sup>1</sup> However, while civic engagement and social justice are connected, they are not always understood as the same thing. Education in the United States has always been understood to be a place where civic engagement is taught. From teaching children the pledge of allegiance to requiring courses in political science, it has long been argued that the school is an appropriate place for preparing the young to take part in the civic lives of their communities. This limited understanding of civic engagement, however, can also lead to a broader understanding of the student as being a member of a larger social fabric than their classroom or family, and therefore to having a responsibility for and a stake in the social problems surrounding them. This realization, in turn, can lead to an emphasis on social justice in community engagement, as the morality of the society which we inhabit is questioned and the students feel a responsibility to make changes.

Often the line between civic engagement and social justice is much more of a semantic one, as social justice is seen as a “liberal” concern that has been attacked by conservative critics. One conservative think tank argues that “the university must never be used for political purposes, or as an instrument of social change or social justice as defined by particular social and political philosophies.”<sup>2</sup> Because of such associations, some universities avoid using the term “social justice” in connection with civic engagement so as to avoid the debate that this might engender. Others argue that it is not the job of academics to practice justice with their students, insofar as it dilutes the academic enterprise.<sup>3</sup>

At Notre Dame de Namur University, where I work, the term “community engagement” covers internships, immersion programs, community-based learning courses, and community-based research courses. Obviously, in some departments—business departments come to mind—community engagement takes on more of the internship side of the definition, as students are required to work for a company to fulfill their general education requirement—work which may or may not benefit society as a whole. In the Humanities this can also occur, as in the example of sending students to visit religious services, a form of community-based research which I discuss later. However, even here it can be

argued that the larger purpose of the engagement is social justice, as students seek to understand the diverse world around them, engage with it, and live in harmony with others. There is a distinction therefore between social justice work and community engagement. However, when community engagement involves itself in difficult questions concerning race, class, equality, and justice in general, there is the possibility of growth and openness. Critical thinking is one aspect of a university's desired learning outcomes that can greatly benefit from community engagement done in this way. As Dan Butin argues:

Justice learning is concerned most prominently with making visible the contingency of our present situations; that we are always-in-the-making of our beliefs, practices, and structures. This is radical undecidability in that all conditions are open to contestation and reconstruction. This leaving open of conversations—for instance, about race, about equity, about justice—short-circuits any attempt at dilution for the sake of simple (and simplistic) answers.<sup>4</sup>

If one attempts to take community engagement to the level of justice-learning, as is my hope for my courses, then the importance of hospitality to the community engagement experience is apparent. It is hospitality which opens the students to this new world and gives rise to the possibility of social justice. The radical nature of a pure form of hospitality cannot be underestimated, and while this purity cannot be achieved at the university level, it is well worth examining what it might mean and to work toward such an ideal.

### *Introducing Hospitality into the Classroom*

Hospitality, as faculty often tell students, is one of the basic and necessary duties of religious life. In reading the story of Sodom and Gomorrah we point out to students that the sin of Sodom was inhospitality; in telling the death of Buddha we point to Buddha's embrace of hospitality as a virtue, even to his death. Working in a Catholic university, I find myself stressing the stories of hospitality in the Bible repeatedly, as they are inevitably linked to those of social justice and peace. Preceding the story of Sodom is that of Abraham's hospitality to three strangers; together these stories tell a story about hospitality and its link to social justice (Genesis 18–19). They define hospitality from the biblical standpoint as a welcoming of God in the welcome of the stranger. In both stories the visitor is a foreigner, not a neighbor or family member, and yet the host welcomes them and treats them with respect, giving them the best of what they have. In the story of Sodom, the host goes as far as to offer up his daughters in exchange for his guests' protection.

Reading these stories closely, my students come to see the link between giving hospitality, welcoming others into our home, and social justice—questioning who are these others, the respect which they deserve, and the way in which welcome into our space gives us a responsibility toward them. The students come to define hospitality more broadly, expanding upon the idea of hospitality from being something we do to strengthen existing relationships to building relationships with strangers. We discuss the components of biblical hospitality as portrayed by Letty Russell and others: the creation of community, advocacy for the marginalized, mutual welcome, and the hidden face of the divine.<sup>5</sup> Hospitality in this sense is radical and dangerous: It requires a leap of faith, as we open our homes and ourselves to the foreign, the unknown; we invite the stranger in and as we say, “my home is your home,” so the stranger becomes the host. The host is responsible for the guest’s safety and comfort, but more than that, they must make them feel at home.

Returning to the story of Abraham, Marianne Moyaert argues that the story of the three strangers reinforces Judaism’s emphasis on universality over particularity. As she points out, this story occurs soon after Abraham has been circumcised. He is recovering from an operation that deals with the particulars of his faith, yet the invitation to strangers, not to members of his tribe, becomes the central story.<sup>6</sup> The central message of openness to the stranger continues in Christianity, as is argued in the World Council of Churches in their 2006 document on “Religious Plurality and Christian Self-Understanding,” which bases its theology on the virtue of hospitality and its transformative aspects. Just as community engagement ideally transforms its participants, so does hospitality. Both leave its members in a different, more open state. The document declares:

Because of the changing world context, especially increased mobility and population movements, sometimes we are the “hosts” to others, and at other times we become the “guests” receiving the hospitality of others; sometimes we receive “strangers” and at other times we become the “strangers” in the midst of others. Indeed we may need to move to an understanding of hospitality as “mutual openness” that transcends the distinctions of “hosts” and “guests.”

Hospitality is not just an easy or simple way of relating to others. It is often not only an opportunity but also a risk. . . . Further, dialogue is very difficult when there are inequalities between parties, distorted power relations or hidden agendas. . . . Christians have not only learned to co-exist with people of other religious traditions, but have also been transformed by their encounters.<sup>7</sup>

This emphasis on the centrality of the virtue of hospitality, and its inherent danger and possibility, harkens back to Derrida's many discussions on the subject.

Immanuel Kant had argued that hospitality delimits borders because it relies on reciprocity and duty; this is the hospitality of diplomats and family members. In response to this definition Derrida argues for an ethics of infinite and unconditional hospitality that is at the very foundation of ethics and culture.<sup>8</sup> This ideal hospitality, which Derrida calls "the hyperbolic law" of hospitality, calls for a meeting with the stranger in which we do not try to interpret or understand the other, since such an interpretation, even one done in good faith, always does violence to the other. It is a hospitality which is unconditional and which requires us to go beyond the very understandings of home and property which allow us to be hospitable in the first place. In this understanding, ethics equals hospitality; it is not merely a subset of ethics but its foundation. While we are limited in our achievement of this ideal of hospitality by the needs and responsibilities of our institutions and individual states, we still need to strive to maintain this ideal.<sup>9</sup>

### *Guests and Hosts: Working Out the Basics*

Having begun to establish the connection between a host's responsibility to their guests and social justice with a discussion of Abraham, the question then becomes: What are a guest's role and responsibility? How are these related to social justice? Here I often discuss the importance of eating together found throughout the Bible, the meaning of sharing a meal, and how rejection of such is seen as a rejection of the other's humanity. This brings Buddha's story, as extreme as it might first seem, into alliance with the story of the angels, who seemingly don't need Abraham's food or Lot's protection but accept them with grace and thanks. There is reciprocity and vulnerability involved in hospitality which can transform both the host and the guest.

One of the courses that I have taught over the years, Theologies of Liberation is a community-based learning (CBL) course. At our university all students must take one CBL course in order to graduate. These courses are meant to simultaneously help students reach the learning goals of the class and help communities change in a positive manner.<sup>10</sup> Theologies of Liberation is an obvious choice as a CBL course, since liberation theology is engaged and active theology. In order for the course to fulfill the CBL requirement at my institution, the community engagement must not be separate from the classroom learning. Instead, the two must be blended and work together; the CBL must be part of the pedagogical structure of the course. This can only be done if the professor works closely with the community partner and spends time both in and out of the classroom, with students making sense of their outside experience with the readings they have done in class.

Exploring the meaning of hospitality and its link to social justice at the beginning of this Theologies of Liberation course allows students to see the connection between all of their engagements with “strangers” and social justice, and to understand the reciprocity which is necessary in a partnership with an outside community organization, replacing the model of charity for one of hospitality, and a model of hierarchy for one based on mutuality. Having discussed biblical understanding of hospitality and its obligations, one can imagine an absolute hospitality in which nothing is asked of the guest and everything given. How does this differ from the carefully circumscribed hospitality which we experience daily? While this absolute hospitality may be impossible in an academic setting, it is worthwhile to push our students to imagine how far hospitality can be taken and what the implications would be for our society.

This chapter does not delve into detail as to how to choose a community partner, nor does it show how to work with your university to get the help you need communicating with partners and students throughout the semester, even though these are important topics. Choosing and developing relationships with community partners is a time-consuming task which must be done before the semester begins.<sup>11</sup> Here I presuppose these things and focus on ways in which hospitality occurs during the semester in community engagement, using examples both from my teaching and from that of my colleagues at Notre Dame de Namur University.

### *Giving Hospitality: Inviting Community Partners into the Classroom*

How would you feel if someone came to your house for dinner five times but when you came to their house to drop off their child after a play-date, they left you on the doorstep and never once asked you in? This feeling of rejection is one that can be created if, as is often the case, hospitality is one-way in a community-engagement course. In the majority of cases students are the guests, the community partner is the host, and we drop off our “children” without setting foot in the home of the other or inviting them into ours. Yet we know from our daily experience that we feel more intimacy and trust for others when we are invited into their homes and they are willing to visit ours.

As noted before, students and faculty in a community-based learning course will more often receive hospitality, as they are sent out into the community to engage with others, than give that hospitality. However, for the community engagement to truly work one must model hospitality, both toward one’s students and toward the community group with whom one is working. At its most basic, hospitality involves the first visit of the community partner into the classroom.

It is the teacher's role as host not only to make the community partner feel welcomed but also to foster respect for the partner among the students.

According to Derrida, as noted earlier, one of the most revolutionary or difficult parts of being a host is the interruption of one's life, the giving away of one's power. This sharing of power is often the most difficult thing for a professor to do. As teachers we are used to being the kings of our little realms: the syllabus is the rulebook and our word is law. However, by inviting our community partners in, we give up that absolute rule: we step aside and share power with someone whose needs and beliefs about education and community may be quite different from our own. This will mean giving up some of our own desires for the class, working with someone as a partner before the first day of class, and then, when class begins, sharing the stage and the locus of authority. As the hosts we must invite our community partners to have this authority and we must support them when they take it, sharing in giving grades and assignments if they so choose.

While it is common and expected to invite a representative of the community partnership into the classroom for a presentation, it is less common to extend this hospitality to the whole community one is engaged with. Being the host can come in many forms. At our university a biology professor invites a classroom of elementary school students to come to our campus for the day, where they use the labs and end the day blowing coke rockets into the air on the quads. This exercise not only teaches science but also allows the children to get a glimpse at the lives of the university students who have been coming to their classrooms regularly to teach science; it is a form of intimacy which is appreciated by children. What child does not ask to see another's bedroom when they come for a visit? By extending the visit outside of the classroom and onto the general campus, the children are brought into an intimacy with the college students which would not occur otherwise.

Dr. Don Stannard-Friel of the sociology department at Notre Dame de Namur takes his students into the Tenderloin district in San Francisco for community engagement courses. But he reverses this process once a year. College students who come from marginalized backgrounds first speak to the youth in the Tenderloin. Teenagers from the Tenderloin are then brought to the university campus, sit in on a class, visit the campus, and eat lunch at the cafeteria with the students they have already met. In this way the teenagers are introduced to the possibilities of college, and that opportunity is made tangible. The college students are also given the chance to share their lives with those who have shared theirs already, bringing about a circle of mutuality and trust.

In other cases, the community partner can best be served by giving hospitality of a more general kind. Non-profit organizations may be in need of space in which to hold meetings or fund-raisers. They may need access to the library

or other resources of the university. For example, our university has hosted an art exhibit for at-risk youth in our library that has been very well attended and a basketball camp for children in our gym. An in-depth conversation, first with the university administrators and then with the community partner, can unearth a variety of ways in which hospitality can be given rather than imposed.

Hospitality involves intimacy, as noted in the preceding examples, and this intimacy and vulnerability are part of the reason academics may feel discomfort with the community engagement model. We have been trained to separate our emotions from our knowledge, to discuss social justice and ethics in the abstract rather than in how they affect our own lives. In teaching feminism and women's spirituality I have encountered this discomfort repeatedly, as the feminist maxim, "The Personal Is Political" is dissected and examined in class but then rarely put into action.<sup>12</sup> Once one has accepted the premise that our academic lives are not separate from our personal lives, the breach has been made and one can discuss hospitality and its implications for intimacy. This intimacy is not one-sided. It is not only learning the personal stories of the community partners—something which is expected as we peer into the lives of others—but also sharing our own stories and hearing those of our students, something that can cause much more discomfort.

Stannard-Friel told me of a case in which one of his community partners, a former drug addict, came into the classroom to discuss his drug abuse and the larger problems of drug abuse in society. After his presentations students came to him asking for help for their siblings, friends, and themselves. Teachers will also find students coming to them. While students may, from the outside, appear to be the "advantaged" persons, as opposed to the community's "dispossessed," the intimacy fostered by a community engagement project can lead to discoveries of students who have been homeless, addicted, abused, and marginalized. These discussions would not happen as frequently in a non-community engagement class, but the boundaries broken by these courses as we share food and transportation can lead to a much more intimate bond between learning and life, and we must be sure to offer hospitality to our own students as well as to our community partners.

Learning to integrate these personal experiences into the more traditionally academic goals of the course can lead to improved student learning outcomes, as we all learn better when the knowledge is meaningful. This requires assignments that show a connection not only between the community engagement and the classroom work but also between these two and the students' own lives. Good reflection exercises can make this productive for all. Welch has developed a reflection technique which ensures that students cover the cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects of the community engagement experience. Reflections are graded on whether they cover all three of these aspects of the community



engagement activity, and in addition are graded on the depth at which students show reflective awareness, ranging from “self” to “systemic/global.” I have found that it is often the reflection exercises that allow students to bring together the outside activity, their own life experience, and the critical thinking being done in the classroom. If reflections are left vague, students will often fall back on “I learned how lucky I am” and will not tie the experience to the readings in any way.<sup>13</sup> The professor also needs to carefully word the assignments and grading so as not to appear to be grading the student’s life experience.

### *Receiving Hospitality: Site Visits and Being a Guest*

Being a guest in community engagement is as important as being a host, and this also requires preparation on the part of the professor and students. In my experience there are two very different sorts of community engagement which require differing preparation and expectations of the guest: site visits and engaging in work in the community.

In my World Religions course I require all students to make a site visit, participating in a religious ceremony outside of their own faith tradition. This is the most basic form of community engagement, as students step outside of their comfort zones and depend upon the welcome of strangers who are very much at home. This sort of engagement requires a simple preparation for hospitality. I remind students to dress appropriately, to call ahead and find out if the date they have chosen is a good one, to participate as much as they comfortably can, and to thank their hosts—yes, it can feel like being their mother, but I have found time and again that these reminders are necessary for undergraduates.

While this assignment is simple and does not have as much depth as other community engagement courses, I have consistently discovered that it succeeds in one of the primary goals of hospitality: strangers become neighbors, people we care about and seek to understand. Students are often resistant to this exercise, but most come back enthusiastic and amazed at the hospitality which they received. They begin to see themselves as part of the larger community outside the borders of the university and are able to examine the particular as well as the theoretical when it comes to world religions. While this activity is simple, it is based in the bedrock of hospitality: that of expanding our borders and knowing experientially, as well as through an embodied encounter with that love well captured by the Greek term *philia*, mutual friendship or affection. Once this foundation of hospitality has been set up, then the structure can be made more complex and more durable with repeated exercises and relationships within the community.

Preparing to receive hospitality in a more sustained community engagement environment, where one is doing volunteer work with a community partner, for

instance, is much more time-consuming. In order for the community engagement exercise to be successful one must be very clear—with oneself, the community partner, and the students—as to what the goals of the experience are. This should be set up first with the community partner, and then, explicitly and with continued discussion, with the students. I have found that most often it is best not to begin the “guest” part of the community engagement course until several weeks into the semester, when the students and faculty have bonded and trust each other. We must remember that we are hosts to our students, in any classroom situation, before we can be hosts to others.

One year I was involved in a Freshman Experience class in which all freshmen were sent out to various community partners to do a day of volunteer work with their professors before the semester began. This assignment had several goals: to bond the students who had just met, to introduce them to their new community, and to have them start thinking about social justice, which is part of our school’s mission. My group was assigned a family shelter, and we were given bus tokens and sent on our way. I packed twenty-five students onto a bus, which I vaguely believed to be taking us in the right direction. Problem one: Never send people off without very good directions and a carefully pre-planned route. We did make it to the shelter after a bit of confusion, only to encounter problem two—a much greater one. Our community partner had not been warned that we would be arriving with such a great number of students or that we were expecting to be there for five hours. The community partner was unprepared for both our arrival and our numbers. Gallantly, they strove to make us welcome and to include us in their activities. They found things for us to do, and our students gamely cleaned and played with the children. However, it was clear that our presence was more of an imposition than a help, as we quickly finished our assigned tasks and students wandered aimlessly, attempting conversation with sleepy mothers getting their children breakfast.

Here I have demonstrated at least two of the reasons why John Eby argues that service learning is bad: We had diverted the community agency’s energy away from their primary work, as they greeted us, spent lunch time talking with us, and looked for work for us to do, and we had “diverted attention from social policy to volunteerism.”<sup>14</sup> The experience was not tied into the course in any substantial way. Students wrote a short essay about their experience, with no background discussion. I was told to hand the essays in to the dean of students, and the whole thing disappeared into the ether. Not surprisingly, the students did frame their reflections as ones of volunteerism. With no prior discussion of hospitality, of social justice, and no connections between themselves and their teacher (it was my first day meeting them also), the experience had little meaning and felt like just one more freshman orientation hoop through which they must jump. We might have been better served with a community picnic in

Golden Gate Park, achieving the first two goals. We could then have waited until the class had developed the trust with the teacher and each other that is needed for effective community engagement, and subsequently moved on to discussions of social justice.

Rooted within a class whose goals are clear and consistent, community engagement can avoid these pitfalls. As noted earlier, a community engagement class should be one in which the community partner shares in the teaching and goal-creation of the class. The needs of both sides must be taken into account and made clear to all. Prior to the beginning of the semester the professor should sit down with the community partner, bringing in the syllabus and copies of the textbook. Together they can revise the syllabus as the partner sees fit and discuss how much the partner wishes to be involved in class work or grading. The community partner will experience the students in ways which differ from the professors and are often the best judge of the student's growth in a particular area. Hospitality which has been first offered by the university, by inviting the community partner into the classroom, will prepare the class for receiving hospitality and giving it meaning. In addition, one must not forget to give hospitality to the students or to ensure that they give it to each other. This means encouraging them to build trust in each other and taking the time to have conversations, both in the classroom and outside of it. Several successful community engagement teachers have told me that it is the conversations on the bus, or in a café after the community engagement experience, which really affected their relationships with the students and the students' development. The classroom setting is perfect for certain kinds of work, but it can also limit students' comfort in discussing their own life experience and its relationship to the larger subject being studied. Don't be afraid to take your students out of the classroom, even if it is only to lie on the grass one afternoon for a discussion.

By taking a critical approach to the exercise of hospitality which is implied in any community engagement experience, students will see the connection of hospitality to ethics and to religious foundations and be able to understand the difference between the ideal of an ethics of hospitality and the limits set on this hospitality by their institution, their country, and their own needs. Examining this separation between the ideal and the lived, and discussing how that ideal can be striven for, is part of a pedagogical practice which advances hospitality as a political and ethical need in our society while teaching critical thinking skills and allowing for a more nuanced understanding of service learning. In order to self-consciously advance hospitality as an ethical and political goal the pedagogy used must engage students on both social and personal scales, as well as asking them to think critically about the social and personal and its interactions.

## *Conclusion*

In my Liberation Theologies course students have spent a long weekend at Dorothy's Place in Salinas. There they fed the homeless, but they also ate with them, worked with them, and slept in a room provided by the Franciscan organization. This extended hospitality to our students allowed them engage in the many aspects of hospitality which make it so central to ethics. Sharing a meal is one of the basics of hospitality: It humanizes the other, as the roles of host and guest become fluid through the passing of food and drink. The intimacy of sharing a meal is often recreated between students and teachers as they travel to their community partners' locations. It is in these moments, over a cup of coffee, that the personal is brought into the theoretical, that the boundaries of the academic break down. This form of hospitality serves one of the objectives of the CLEA model of civic engagement noted by Locklin and Posman: the objective of empathetic accountability. By stepping outside of the classroom and testing the roles of both host and guest, students negotiate multiple perspectives, acknowledging their own limitations and seeking out knowledge and connection with an other. This objective is also linked to the second objective of civic engagement, that of "frames of reference and social location" as the practice of hospitality helps students not only reflect upon their own social location but recognize the power dynamics occurring both on campus and off, and the limits which these power dynamics impose upon the possibility of radical, absolute hospitality.

Jesus notes in the Gospel of Luke that one should not expect anything in return when one is a host, and this is the absolute hospitality which Derrida describes as the basis for ethics: encounter not as a social obligation or *quid pro quo* but for its own sake and for love. This hospitality given is not, however, equal to charity, as it involves knowing the stranger and letting oneself be known by them while acknowledging that they are truly other and can never be fully known. Hospitality, given and received, is at the basis of religious ethics as it is at the basis of relationship. In hospitality we view the other not as a means to an end, not as an "other" but as an aspect of the divine, one which demands mutuality and vulnerability and which enriches both sides.

## *Notes*

1. This suggests an analogy with how empathy and motivated action are related, but not the same, in the CLEA model.
2. California Association of Scholars, *A Crisis of Competence: The Corrupting Effect of Political Activism in the University of California*. National Association of Scholars, April 2012. [http://www.nas.org/images/documents/A\\_Crisis\\_of\\_Competence.pdf](http://www.nas.org/images/documents/A_Crisis_of_Competence.pdf) (accessed June 7, 2013).

3. See Stanley Fish, *Save the World on Your Own Time* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).
4. Dan W. Butin, "Justice-Learning: Service-Learning as Justice-Oriented Education," *Equity and Excellence in Education* 40 (2007): 4.
5. Letty M. Russell, *Just Hospitality: God's Welcome in a World of Difference* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2009).
6. Marianne Moyaert, "Biblical, Ethical and Hermeneutical Reflections on Narrative Hospitality" in *Hosting the Stranger*, ed. Richard Kearney and James Taylor (New York: Continuum Publishing Group, 2011), 102.
7. World Council of Churches, 2006 Assembly, "Religious Plurality and Christian Self-Understanding." <http://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/assembly/porto-alegre-2006/3-preparatory-and-background-documents/religious-plurality-and-christian-self-understanding.html>.
8. M. W. Westmoreland, "Interruptions: Derrida and Hospitality," *Kritike* 2 (2008): 3.
9. Irwin Jones, *Derrida and the Writing of the Body* (Burlington VT: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2010), 157.
10. Notre Dame de Namur University, "Community Based Learning," Notre Dame de Namur University website (accessed June 7, 2013). [www.ndnu.edu/academics/community-based-learning](http://www.ndnu.edu/academics/community-based-learning).
11. See Marshall Welch, "O.P.E.R.A.: A First Letter Mnemonic and Rubric for Conceptualizing and Implementing Service Learning," *Issues in Educational Research* 20 (2010): 76–82; and Christine M. Cress, Peter J. Collier, and Vicki L. Reitenauer, *Learning through Serving: A Student Guidebook for Service-Learning across the Disciplines* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2005), chapters 2 and 3.
12. See bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (New York: Routledge, 1994).
13. Marshall Welch and Regenia C. James, "An Investigation on the Impact of a Guided Reflection Technique in Service-Learning Courses to Prepare Special Educators," *Teacher Education and Special Education* 30 (2007): 278.
14. John W. Eby, "Why Service-Learning Is Bad," Villanova College website, March 1998. <https://www1.villanova.edu/content/dam/villanova/artsci/servicelearning/WhyServiceLearningIsBad.pdf> (accessed July 7, 2015).