

# How Porous are the Walls that Separate Us?: Transformative Service-Learning, Women's Incarceration, and the Unsettled Self

*Coralynn V. Davis*  
*Carol Wayne White*

---

## Abstract

In this article, we refine a politics of thinking from the margins by exploring a pedagogical model that advances transformative notions of service learning as social justice teaching. Drawing on a recent course we taught involving both incarcerated women and traditional college students, we contend that when communication among differentiated and stratified parties occurs, one possible result is not just a view of the other but also a transformation of the self and other. More specifically, we suggest that an engaged feminist praxis of teaching incarcerated women together with college students helps illuminate the porous nature of fixed markers that purport to reveal our identities (e.g., race and gender), to emplace our bodies (e.g., within institutions, prison gates, and walls), and to specify our locations (e.g., cultural, geographic, social-economic). One crucial theoretical insight our work makes clear is that the model of social justice teaching to which we aspired necessitates re-conceptualizing ourselves as students and professors whose subjectivities are necessarily relational and emergent.

The other is that person occupying the space of the subaltern in the culturally asymmetrical power relation, but also those elements or dimensions of the self that unsettle or decenter the ego's dominant, self-enclosed, territorialized identity.

Ofelia Schutte, *Cultural Alterity*

## Introduction

As countless educators have pointed out, service-learning in higher education has constituted an exciting pedagogical intervention with the potential for advancing social justice aims. We agree with this assessment and will not rehearse its arguments here, yet remain troubled by one of the persistent, thorny issues of service-learning that has crucial ethical and political implications, namely, the dichotomy between those who

serve and those who are served (Henry and Breyfogle 2006; Pompa 2002). When left un-interrogated, this dichotomy often reinforces structural and ideological differentials of power and value. Feminism has been a critical resource in addressing this conundrum, as it has called attention to everyday and institutionalized forms of power in our social relations (hooks 1994; Larson 2005; Spelman 1985), and helped us interrogate “service” itself with its histories of gender,

racial, and class politics (Balliet and Hefferman 2000; Nakano 1992). As well, feminist discussions on pedagogy have placed significant emphasis on refining a politics of thinking from the margins (hooks 1984), and on enabling learners to participate actively in forms of knowledge that transform self and other (Kreisberg 1992, Lewis 1993).

In this article, we offer a pedagogical model that draws on the strengths of these feminist analyses and utilizes important insights from innovative service-learning and social justice education models. In the service-learning scholarly community, our considerations find kinship with Enos and Morton's "enriched form of reciprocity" (as cited in Henry & Breyfogle, 2006, p. 29), Schwartzman's (2007) and Pompa's (2002) "transformational" approaches, and Mitchell's (2008) "critical" approach to service-learning. Among social justice educators, we draw our inspiration particularly from Paulo Freire's (1970) notion of "praxis," Schniedewind's (1993) conceptualization of feminist pedagogy, and Ladson-Billing's (1995) theory of "culturally relevant" pedagogy. In entering this discursive space, we reflect on our experience of teaching a class consisting of women incarcerated at a rural prison and traditional college students enrolled in a four-year elite university (Bucknell University) in Central Pennsylvania, where both authors are on the faculty, one in the Women's and Gender Studies and Anthropology Departments and the other in the Philosophy of Religion.

As we taught, we often observed the re-configuration of traditional, established boundaries between teachers and students, between diverse institutions (prisons and universities), and among various types of community dwellers (disenfranchised, transient, local, and permanent). Hence, a major contention of this essay is that an engaged feminist praxis of teaching incarcerated women together with college students helps

illuminate the porous nature of fixed markers that purport to reveal our identities (e.g., race and gender), to emplace our bodies (e.g., within institutions, prison gates, and walls), and to specify our locations (e.g., cultural, geographic, social-economic). Employing the metaphors of pores (openings) and walls (boundaries) to reflect on this pedagogical model, we accentuate our experiences of witnessing the fluidity of fixed (or given) differences even as other (in)visible, established structures remained intact. Recognizing this type of fluidity leads to an important theoretical insight, namely, that the type of transformative pedagogy to which we aspired in teaching this unique course includes re-conceptualizing ourselves as students and professors whose subjectivities are necessarily relational and emergent.

We also raise a vital question in this particular teaching context: Given the material realities involved in bringing together members of a dominant group (college students and professors) with those of a subaltern one (incarcerated women), how does one achieve and promote radical forms of knowledge and transgressive politics? In addressing critical literacy, Colin McFaren and Peter Lankshear have suggested that in order to reclaim their right to live *humanly*, marginalized groups must not only theorize and analyze but also confront, in praxis, those institutions, processes, and ideologies that prevent them from, as Paulo Freire puts it, "naming their world" (1994:146). We take on this challenge, considering ways in which feminist professors can achieve or possibly advance Freire's notion of fearless praxis within the context of teaching incarcerated women. In so doing, we focus on the complex, myriad constraints confronting those who seek to promote liberating knowledge within our penal and educational institutions, which often preserve and perpetuate themselves through targeted and generic consolidations of power. We believe

that our critical approach to service-learning as social justice education can help envision ways to reverse such consolidation (Cone and Harris 1996; Deans 1999; Liu 1995; Schwartzman 2007; Swords and Kiely 2010) by creating “counternarratives” (Adams 2007:25). Tackling these pedagogical concerns, and offering concomitant theoretical insights, we hope, will shed light on the benefits to be gained from teaching incarcerated women together with college students -- a task we believe is an essential one in the process of disseminating knowledge aimed at transformation of self and other -- indeed, in thinking from -- and remaking -- the margins.

### **I. Envisioning and Teaching a Course on Women and the Penal System**

In Spring 2005, the authors co-taught “Women and the Penal System: Knowing Ourselves, Our Communities and Our Institutions.” This course took place at a correctional facility for women in central Pennsylvania, and at Bucknell University, a highly selective liberal arts institution with approximately 3,500 students. The correctional facility is a close-security prison that serves as the diagnostic classification center for the state’s incarcerated women and houses all of its female capital cases. This pedagogically unique and challenging course entailed weekly class sessions held within the correctional institution, where traditional university students and incarcerated students participated as peers in the classroom.

In the course, the professors addressed the topics of women’s incarceration and relational selves with three major objectives in mind: (1) to extend feminist principles and methodologies to our understanding of women in the penal system particularly and of our lives (beyond that of student and educator) more generally; (2) to give students a fuller comprehension of the historical realities of women’s incarceration through experiential learning that recognizes diverse parties as co-learners and co-teachers within encompassing communities; and (3) to enhance academic learning for all students as we engage each other in an atypical educational setting, with the overall aims of gaining insight into ourselves, strengthening a sense of interconnectedness, and strengthening our transformative capacities. In keeping with the pedagogical model we employed, in this article we designate the traditional college participants in the course as “outside” (and occasionally Bucknell) students, while we call the incarcerated participants “inside” (and sometimes incarcerated) students. In doing so, we recognize the irony in referring to the more systematically disenfranchised group of students as “inside” and visa-versa. Our very use of the metaphor of “porosity” reflects our recognition that the answer to the question of who is “inside” and who is “outside” is at once partial and contextual.

The development of empathetic understanding is frequently cited as a goal of service-learning (Boyle-Baise 2006; D’Arlach, Sánchez, and Feuer 2009; Schwartzman 2007) as well as of social justice education (Adams 2007:30). Our course offered the outside students an opportunity to engage in empathetic understanding of the experience of incarceration, enhancing their understanding of the United States’ penal system with the perspectives and reflections of incarcerated women themselves -- not merely relying on the perspectives of prison staff, policy makers, scholars, and the general public. In anticipation of teaching both sets of students, we also wanted to offer them opportunities to reflect on the inextricable ways that communities and institutions shape their lives and affect personal views, experiences, and choices (past and future). Our commitment to the incarcerated students, in particular, was to foster an academic setting that would showcase their intellect, creativity, and

knowledge. Toward this aim, we employed pedagogical methods that enabled learning on multiple levels and in various directions, with all students contributing to the production of knowledge through classroom discussions and exercises. In so doing, our efforts seemed to fit Dan Butin's useful definition of service-learning as "the linkage of academic work with community-based engagement within a framework of respect, reciprocity, relevance, and reflection" (2010: xiv).

In his overview of scholarly and methodological approaches to service-learning, Butin identified four perspectives: technical, cultural, political, and anti-foundational. The political perspective focuses on practitioners' "leveraging of the cultural, social and human capital of higher education" to enact a form of "border crossing" through which participants are led to "question the predominant and hegemonic norms of who controls, defines, and limits access to knowledge and power" (2010:11). The anti-foundational perspective, in Butin's model, focuses "as much on the process of undercutting dualistic ways of thinking as on the product of deliberative and sustainable transformational change" (2010:13). In comparison, Lee Bell defined the goal of social justice education as "enab[ling] people to develop the critical analytical tools necessary to understand oppression and their own socialization within oppressive systems, and to develop a sense of agency and capacity to interrupt and change oppressive patterns and behaviors in themselves and in the institutions and communities of which they are a part" (2007:2). As we show later, the political and anti-foundational service-learning perspectives dovetailed with our aims and methods of social justice education.

### *Crucial Preparations Before Teaching the Course*

Prior to designing the course, neither instructor had expertise in criminal justice, but both were well-versed in feminist theories and practices regarding the intersections of race, ethnicity, class, gender and sexuality. In summer 2004, we began planning a course that would focus on women and the penal system and involve service-learning activity at the nearby correctional facility for women. In meetings coordinated by the Director of the Office of Service Learning at Bucknell, we discussed with prison administrators possible options for service by Bucknell students, such as tutoring incarcerated women, or helping them with résumé creation and other job-seeking skills. Our thinking about the overall structure of the course changed radically, however, after Davis returned from a workshop offered by the Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program. As we were to discover, these training workshops are invaluable to college and university professors interested in applying its model and philosophy to their own teaching.

Inside-Out was established in 1997, according to its own mission statement,

to create a dynamic partnership between institutions of higher learning and correctional systems, in order to deepen the conversation about and transform our approaches to issues of crime and justice" (<http://www.temple.edu/inside-out/>, accessed 07-17-11).

Its semester-long courses bring college students (often those studying in the criminal justice field) together with incarcerated men and women to study as peers in seminars behind prison walls. Accordingly, students gain insights enabling them to create a more effective and humane criminal justice system. Inside-Out also

challenges men and women on the inside to place their life experiences in a larger social context, rekindles their intellectual self-confidence and interest in further education, and encourages them to recognize their capacity as agents of change -- in their own lives as well as in the broader community (Ibid).

As a result of our encounters with the Inside-Out program, our notions of what we wanted to engage in shifted from what we saw as traditional service-learning, where serve and served are clearly distinguished, to one in which all parties are involved in novel experiences linked to academic learning, as well as personal and social transformation (Balliet and Heffernan 2000; Enos and Morton 2003; Henry and Breyfogle 2006; Jacoby 1996; Walker 2000).

#### *Key Features of the Course*

The demographics of the class are worth noting, as we believe they helped constitute the level of success and particular dynamics we experienced in teaching the course. For the most part, each set of students exemplified, except as noted, the demographic characteristics representative of each institution as a whole. For example, only a small number of the outside students were from working class backgrounds and just one disclosed that he had an incarcerated family member, while very few of the inside students could be identified with class and educational privileges. In Spring 2005, thirteen of the University's students enrolled in the course; twelve were seniors, and two were men. Four of the students were African American (in one case, Afro-Caribbean American). For a typical seminar, this is an overrepresentation of African-American students vis-à-vis the larger student population, which has less than 10% of students of color and international students. The rest of the students were white; all were traditional col-

lege aged. Furthermore, of the two professors, one was African American, the other, white/European American. An equal number of students drawn from the population at the prison facility participated in the course. The racial and ethnic make-up of the inside students was fairly representative of the U.S. female prison population as a whole: approximately half were African American, two were Latina, and the rest were white, ranging from nineteen to sixty years of age.

After much discussion, we decided that fully embracing the Inside-Out model for this first iteration of our course was not a viable option, given various practical concerns. We had already ordered books and outlined the basic reading and topic schedule, based on standard expectations for Bucknell capstone courses, and on the assumption the course was to be held on campus. Further, we felt that the level of reading and writing required of a capstone course at Bucknell would be too adversely challenging for many of the incarcerated students. (Although they represented a mix of educational backgrounds, only one had taken college-level classes.) Ultimately, our course ended up being two courses wrapped into one for the Bucknell students. All participants met once a week at the prison, but the professors and Bucknell students also gathered once a week for about two hours at the university (which goes against Inside-Out's philosophy and practice). Our hybrid model was in our estimation successful, yet we were also aware that this approach maintained problematic distinctions between Bucknell and incarcerated participants as groups of students. (In later incarnations of the course taught by Davis, a pre-requisite of GED was put in place for the inside students, and inside and outside students were assigned the exact same reading and writing assignments.)

The outside students had a standard number of reading assignments, comprised

of texts that focused topically (and historically) on women and the penal system, and such themes as “invention of the prisoner,” “the prison industrial complex,” and “gender and institutional programming.” The inside students were assigned very little reading in preparation for the class sessions at the prison. (This was a result of our assessment, in consultation with prison staff, of the incarcerated participants’ reading and writing skill levels.) Our class sessions at the prison focused on the second half of the title of the course, “Knowing Ourselves, Our Communities, and Our Institutions,” and often involved a series of exercises and discussions that helped students theorize, analyze and interpret their lives and identities (“selves”) as relational beings. Toward this end, all students completed weekly homework assignments and journal entries, which covered such topics as “visibility and invisibility,” “knowledge of self and other,” “creative expression and the integrity of agency,” and “restorative justice and community.” The outside students also wrote a series of short analytical papers addressing the separate readings they were assigned.

Throughout the semester, we used some of the curricular materials from the Inside-Out course program to explore such themes as the ethics of victimization, the creative intersection of justice and care, and community benefits of restorative justice, for which we also engaged in role-playing. We also supplemented these Inside-Out materials with creative pieces, such as the poetry of Sonia Sanchez and June Jordan, and short stories by Minnie Lou Pratt, which were accessible to all students (Jordan 1995; Pratt 1989, 1999; Sanchez 1985, 1999). A final class project involved pairing students (one inside with one outside student) and giving them time and resources to design a performance piece on what they saw as a main theme or learning point from the semester’s course. Our last class meeting, attended by

prison administrators and counselors, included these performances.

### *Students’ Responses to the Course*

Both inside and outside students greatly valued their classroom exchanges with one another. As one outside student put it in her course evaluation, “Going to [the prison] and learning with the [incarcerated] students is the best environment that I’ve ever had for a class.” At our final debriefing exclusively with the inside students, all expressed the desire for a follow-up class, longer class periods, and more time to become acquainted with the outside students. These latter responses are probably indicative of the fact that a) incarcerated women often lack intellectual engagement with texts and ideas as a result of being deprived of crucial connections with the outside world; b) our inside students were placed in a “college” setting that opened crucial space for creative explorations and critical inquiry; and c) they responded to their peers, instructors, and textual and visual tools with the utmost seriousness, flourishing, in the process, as creative, intellectual human beings.

All of the students expressed their amazement at how effectively the course helped to break down stereotypes that each set of classmates had originally brought to the first class meeting. For example, the inside students relinquished the notion that all outside students were snotty, privileged kids insensitive to the wider set of social injustices that affect women who are likely to face incarceration, many of which have been enumerated by feminist scholars (Davis and Shaylor 2001; Girshick 1999; Merlo and Pollock 1995; Miller 1998; Pollock 2002; Sommers 1995). The Bucknell students were equally liberated from viewing the inside students as lazy, immoral and violent women, as popular images often suggest; rather, they encountered and began to reconceptualize their incarcerated peers as cre-

ative, intelligent women for whom imprisonment compounded already shattered lives.

The breaking down of stereotypes began on the very first day of class, when we engaged in an "ice-breaking" exercise in which inside and outside students moved through repeated pairings and were asked to complete sentences designed to reveal personality traits, interests and experiences (e.g., "One of my favorite movies is...", "If I were an animal I would be...", and "I think the most important thing in life is..."). When we debriefed the exercise, inside and outside students alike exclaimed their surprise at the many things they had in common, noting that the exercise served to alleviate some of their fears of objectification by the other set of students. This process of breaking down stereotypes was a successful feature of the course. As a testament to this result, one outside student wrote on her evaluation form,

We have officially broken down a barrier, defied a whole mess of stereotypes and seen each other as the true people we are --nothing less. The perspectives and opinions I have heard were altering.

An inside student articulated the problematic nature of such limited public portrayals:

I always felt that people from the outside would look down on me because I am an inmate. These feelings have now been broken down as invalid. Society can...condition us to perceive things that simply are not. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to prove that.

Another outside student shared this reflection:

It was only one action that put me at Bucknell and the inmates here at [the

prison]. Besides that one wrong turn, we are all very similar.

Each set of students also spoke glowingly about the ability to learn with -- and from -- one another, as they addressed cognitively and emotionally the intersections of gender, race, class and sexuality in the politics of daily living enforced by social institutions and communities. Indeed, the success of the course overall points to the value of combining intellectual, emotional and experiential (even bodily) learning within this unique type of community educational setting.

## II. Reflecting on the Course: Important Lessons and Insights

In a recent study of the service-learning language exchange program called Intercambio, Lucia D'Arlach and her colleagues concluded that critical consciousness is most likely to develop in service-learning class formats where

community recipients can have expert roles....knowledge is assumed to be co-created and multi-directional, and ample time is devoted to dialogue about current social issues (2009:1).

Our findings from our own course reinforce this conclusion. In the course evaluations, both inside and outside students asserted that the course provided them with a broader sense of community and enhanced their capacity to reflect on ethical forms of engagement across differences. One of the reasons this occurred, we suggest, is that throughout the semester, students worked collaboratively on distinct projects, generating many creative and critical forms of self-expression. The cumulative effects of these exercises became evident in the final class; this session exemplified, in ways we explore below, a complicated answer to one of the

provocative questions we raise in this article: “How porous are the walls that separate us?”

Across identity markers of race, gender, class, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, and institutional placement, the students (in pairs and as a collective) demonstrated through their final performances, and in their planning of and preparation for them, the capacity to bridge -- both intellectually and emotionally -- apparently separate worlds. The performances included song, poetry, theatre, and visual arts and engaged with themes including “hidden similarities” (across apparent difference), body politics, self-knowledge and self-love. As they engaged such course themes as “understanding justice” and “choosing heroines” from a broad array of experiential arcs, the students worked toward deeper individual and collective understandings. Here we experienced service-learning in one of its most critical, transformative forms, i.e., as a

strategy of disturbance...provoking us to more carefully examine, rethink, and reenact the visions, policies, and practices of our classrooms and educational [and other] institutions” (Butin 2010:19).

We also like to think that, in part, the tears shed by participants and attendees at the final event were a response to a remarkable “porousness” that enabled such transformative work, as evinced by the following comment made by an inside student:

To converse, exchange thoughts, and experience the energy flowing through all of us when involved in a project was phenomenal.

As professors, we were pleasantly surprised that a set of very privileged (on the one hand) and problematically stigmatized (on the other) participants could engage in

this process together, thereby altering students’ (and our own) sense of selfhood. We believe, as various studies have suggested, that such transformation is not as readily available in traditional service-learning courses, in which the perceived division between those who serve (students and professors) and those who are served (others outside the academy) are distinct -- indeed often reified. It is a demonstration of the fact, we believe, that human selves are not separate entities with fixed identities; rather, we are porous beings that are relational (even communal) in nature. This important theoretical point we will explore more explicitly in the final section.

### *Institutional Constraints and Boundaries*

While this final event enabled us to experience an illuminating moment of porosity between inside and outside (between individuals, groups, and institutions), it also demonstrated that some walls remain impermeable and solid. In retrospect, we were naïve to imagine that the gates of the prison would open as wide as we envisioned, even though students and professors would experience profound intersubjective openings with one another. Prison walls are constructed to keep some people out as much as to keep others in, of course. As Foucault reminds us, according to its own internal logic, the penal system necessarily operates as a surveillance system (Foucault 1995). Indeed, prisons devote an incredible amount of energy and resources making sure that, despite the aspirations of academics and citizens who try to enter and connect with incarcerated women and men, their gates operate as a firm boundary between those inside and those outside its walls. Our understanding of this insight was acutely felt in our experience of the top administrative personnel’s resistance to our plans for a final celebration. The guest list included a wide array of individuals, including prison and univer-



sity administrators who literally held the keys to the future life of the course. After discussing with our prison programmatic counterparts the possibility of inviting specific dignitaries, we were initially hopeful that the proposed set of plans for the program would be implemented. However, in the process of drafting the invitations, we were informed of an administrative injunction forbidding both potential guests and food to be present for the closing ceremony.

This particular experience is an excellent reminder for professors who teach incarcerated students that we may often have to accept the boundaries set up by prison administration interested in maintaining institutional integrity, even when we may disagree with many of their terms and stipulations, or may not even know the rationale behind certain decisions. Given that the penal system depends on discursive power formations (only partially of their own creation) that deindividuate, isolate, and classify those within -- and such proscription and concomitant penal technologies would be deemed unnecessarily harsh in other settings -- from the perspective of those controlling the prison it seems the fewer of those outsiders present, the better. In other words, while surveillance is a critical strategy of the modern penal system, surveillance of the system itself by outsiders must also be contained or restricted. The last thing corrections administrators want, from a security point of view, is a blurring of subject positions -- it is clear that outsiders must remain outsiders. Thus, while we were successful in transgressing those boundaries with a small group of students once a week for a semester -- and in a manner perceived as productive by prison administrators and program coordinators -- we failed, at least in the expansive public manner we sought, to crack the institutional wall further.

### *Pedagogical Challenges:*

#### *Resistance from Students*

When juxtaposed to the very clear institutional constraints, the myriad forms of resistance we encountered from our students appear more subtle and nuanced; yet, they also challenged us as feminist teachers. As we noted earlier, one general aim of our course was to encourage each student to reflect critically and honestly on whether one could ascertain and enact authentic selfhood amid the realities of being shaped and influenced by institutional constraints and prescriptive values. A second goal was to have all students develop fuller comprehension of gender realities that have both shaped and challenged their awareness and sense of themselves. A third was to challenge denigrating stereotypes while also acknowledging and appreciating the differences among us. In attempting to achieve these objectives, we incorporated assignments entailing both experiential and academic modes of grasping the intersections of gender, race, class, and sexuality, which are crucial markers constructed by the myriad social institutions and communities that frame our daily choices and values.

While daunting, these goals proved to be both challenging and illuminating for our pedagogy, as attested by entries in students' academic journals. We designed journal assignments to help students record reflections on the class readings and group exercises, and to grasp cognitively their emotional responses to both. We also wanted students to make crucial connections between theoretical issues related to women's incarceration and what they experienced throughout the semester -- either in their daily lives or while engaging each other at the correctional facility. The journal entries from the Bucknell students ranged in description from experiencing a heightened sense of fragmentation of self through sheer initial discomfort and fear in entering the prison

for the first couple of times, to a fuller critical consciousness of the (often unjust) societal mechanisms (e.g., entrenched poverty, gendered violence, deficient educational systems) that were often operative in the lives of many imprisoned women.

While the majority of Bucknell students embraced these assignments with genuine enthusiasm, a few of them did not, revealing, we suggest, subtle forms of resistance. A small number of students, for instance, consistently submitted journal entries that had very clichéd responses, showing very little progression of thought toward authentic expression or self-exploration. They seemed unable, or perhaps unwilling, to offer anything more than facile responses to all that they were encountering at the prison, in the readings, and with their expanded set of peers. This type of student response has helped us to become acutely aware of the fact that we all set up safe boundaries that can reinforce or establish an intact or integrative sense of self (Griffin and Ouellett 2007). Hence, we think that some of the usual resistance professors encounter in assignments requiring more in-depth self-reflection in regular classroom settings may become fraught with more anxiety within the context of prison settings.

The more illuminating aspect of our experiences with journal assignments is found in the responses of the inside students. They all embraced this writing exercise with eagerness, often offering well-articulated, poignant journal entries that frequently corroborated the data found in scholarly studies of incarcerated women in the United States. For example, both instructors received entries from the inside students that detailed their emotional responses (ranging from shame through fear to ongoing anxiety) regarding separation from their children, their family members, and their cultural communities. Other entries from our incarcerated students contained harrowing descriptions of

gendered abuse (e.g., experiences of incest as a young girl from a male family member or physical abuse from a boyfriend or husband), as well as reflections on harm to others they themselves had caused. We also encountered very nuanced accounts of inside students' critical acknowledgment that within misogynist familial structures and cultural practices in the United States they have often not been treated as the valuable persons they actually are.

These more poignant reflections were often tempered with soulfully amusing critiques of United States' frenetic culture, or enthusiastic bouts of self-affirmation -- marvelous sentiments focusing on self-improvement within the various programs offered at the prison. Ironically, unlike their Bucknell peers, many of the inside students did not enjoy the freedom of movement in their physical environments that often help individuals create or reinforce interior safe spaces or reassuring boundaries. Yet, the incarcerated students wrote, explored, and engaged us with enthusiasm and sincerity. In this context, their journal entries seemed to function as linguistic portals of empowerment, displaying the rhetorical power of incarcerated women's voices that are silenced by a range of institutions, distorted by societal stereotypes, or inadequately represented in scholarly materials (Adams 2007). Another form of student resistance was evinced in those class activities where we tried to address the social variables involved in establishing and reifying prescribed gender constructions. This type of challenge arose in connection with our screening of the documentary film *War Zone*, in which the filmmaker takes on the issue of sexual harassment in city streets (Hadleigh-West 1998). We chose this film specifically to help generate students' reflections on whether, and the extent to which, they tried to resist the pressures of fitting into dominant cultural norms of gender identification, or

how women might resist being objectified by a dominant conception of femininity.

One heated discussion of the film revolved around a scene in which the white producer confronted several African-American men who were making catcalls and whistles at women passing by on the street. Most of the outside students, and a few inside students, were critical of the men's behavior, viewing their comments as objectifications of women in the public arena; however, several of the incarcerated students of color (Latina and African American) refused to accept the premises of such standard feminist observations, staunchly declaring that they appreciated the attention they received from men in their respective neighborhoods and cultural settings. The discussion was very emotionally charged, made even more complicated by the fact that some of the women of color from both institutions interpreted the behaviors of the men as a viable social mechanism in specific cultural settings. In such contexts, different constructions of beauty are affirmed for those who are not traditionally included in the dominant Euro-American model perpetuated in the United States. Despite being able to contain the potentially explosive discussion, we were left with an acute sense of the complexity of teaching gender analysis among diverse cultural landscapes where ethnic, racial, and class variables are intermingled. Moreover, the exchange taught us as instructors about the need for a more nuanced intersectional feminist approach to issues of objectification in order to generate student growth. At the end of the semester, an inside student who had initially resisted viewing the cat calls as problematic, commented,

the class has helped me to understand more about why as a woman I've been conditioned to live and think the way I was taught....I truly appreciate the

knowledge of knowing who I am, my strengths and weaknesses as a woman.

This example elucidates our sense that at crucial challenging moments, the course transported its various participants beyond the server/student – served/other dichotomy, and opened up spaces where all participants are considered students and teachers, enabling new kinds of knowledge.

A third, perhaps more intriguing, form of student resistance we experienced was reflected in students' reluctance to discuss the class readings that focused on the erotic-affective forms of intimate connections among incarcerated women. Several otherwise highly engaged outside students remained silent when we read about the various forms of sexual intimacy and erotic bonding occurring among incarcerated women that were described in class texts (Pollock 2002), or when some inside students of color brought it up during specific group discussions. This issue becomes even more intriguingly complicated when juxtaposed with the fact that one of the white outside students was an "out" lesbian who would talk openly about her relationship with her girlfriend during our Bucknell class sessions. Given the charged emotional atmosphere created by the structure of the course, we did not feel comfortable forcing the outside students to disclose their feelings and thoughts on this issue. The silence was conspicuous, but we allowed it. However, we now think that perhaps the overall reluctance by our outside students to discuss lesbianism and the myriad forms of same-sex erotic and affective bonding within the prison context may have been due to a confluence of factors. Perhaps the outside students were not cognitively or emotionally ready to address the very complex issues endemic to what some refer to as performative lesbianism among incarcerated women vis-à-vis the fact that we were engaging classmates who

named themselves as lesbians. Within the context of prison, lesbian identities are cast as taboo in the popular imagination and are susceptible to punishment by the penal system, so perhaps our outside students did not want to confront their own stereotypes or to put their incarcerated peers at risk.

Another more disturbing thought we bring to our reflection on this issue is that specific racial markers are not so fluid or easily dissolved when students attempt to address sexuality, which is an emotionally charged issue. Whereas our white female student's sexual-affective marker as lesbian might be viewed as relatively harmless, even benignly chic, in popular culture, we suspect that the same-sex erotic, romantic bonds of incarcerated black lesbians may be tied to pejorative ethnosexual myths and stereotypes about African-American women and men reinforced by the popular imagination - chief among these is the enduring cultural myth of blacks' hypersexuality (Freedman 2006). As Sander Gilman has argued, stereotypes help us to see and examine ideologies that structure our universe, as well as to understand the unstated assumptions our worldviews entail (Gilman 1985). In light of these assumptions, the same-sex erotic, romantic bonds of incarcerated black lesbians may have been loosely associated with a racialized homophobia that associates black bodies with violence. Perhaps, on some level, the students were paralyzed by societal myths that reinscribed black incarcerated lesbians as symbolic markers of black (male) violence. Another possibility here is that our outside students (most of whom were whites) were simply less inclined to view the women of color as engaging in same-sex sexuality and did not know what to say.

In reflecting further on this situation, we observed that depending on their positions, students deployed silence and speech as specific forms of resistance: on the one hand, to

the challenges the course provided to their previously integrative selves and, on the other, to dominant and disempowering discourses about "people like them." These various forms of student resistance helped us to see how difficult and yet worthwhile it is to bring students from two different institutions together to reflect on their lives as relational beings whose contextually salient identities (sexual, racial, gendered, and erotic) are constantly being formed and shaped by institutions and communities.

Fortunately, these stubborn forms of resistance did not dominate in class sessions or instantiate themselves to affect the overall positive quality of the class. Rather, they receded into the background that semester as our apparent and obvious differences became increasingly permeable. As students embraced the complex humanity of otherness, so did most of their resistances dissolve, convincing us of the porous nature of our subjectivities -- a startling revelation within the context of teaching behind the walls of prison. With these insights, we evoke Jean-Paul Sartre's innovative notion of intersubjectivity, where one's subjectivity is confronted, in the most immediate way, with another's, both limiting and enabling what one could possibly choose in any given context (Sartre 1985). In the next section, we further explore this theme of decentering subjectivity within the context of postmodern theory.

### **III. Alterity, Postmodern Subjectivity, and Porous Walls: Theoretical Reflections**

Our praxis of teaching this course has impressed upon us that the type of genuine communication across multiple differences to which we aspired, and that we often experienced, may best be comprehended with expanded views of the self, which have been part of compelling feminist critiques of the dominant model of the solitary self, whose

self-consciousness assumes the form of an individual "I" defined in opposition to, and in transcendence of, other isolated subjects (Minh-ha 1989; Moya 2002; Perez 1999; Spelman 1991). Challenges to this modernist view of the self have come to us in many forms, but here we focus on specific post-Enlightenment conceptions of subjectivity itself as fractured, contradictory, and produced within social practices. Alternative models in critical theory range from the psychoanalytic understanding of subjectivity split between the unconscious and the conscious self (or the ego, id, superego) to the Nietzschean critique that the sense of self-unity is a fiction we create to get along in the world. All of these lead to a view of subjectivity as a site of conflicting ways of being and feeling, dissolving essentialist tendencies.

As our essay suggests, we are conscious of resisting essentialist and unitary concepts of the subject (namely, an autonomous, stable, individual capable of full consciousness and constituted by a set of static characteristics) that would not effectively challenge unequal power dynamics among all students and between instructors and students. However, as feminist teachers of incarcerated women who encounter historical forces and realities symbolized by the materiality of walls and cells, our critical sensibilities are wary of those forms of postmodernism that celebrate the purported dissolution of subjectivity where historical agents are "erased" by linguistic forces over which they can have little or no control. One crucial insight we thus have is in approaching poststructuralism as a tool, and not a comprehensive theory (Fraser & Nicholson 1990; Kipnis 1988; Phelan 1990; Scott 1988; White 2002).

Within the context of our course, these postmodern conceptions of subjectivity often took on fascinating material force, as evinced in our account of the outside black

students' classroom behaviors vis-à-vis their fluid identities in distinct class settings: first, in relation to Bucknell white students' perception of them, and, second, in relation to the general perception of them by inside students. During the Bucknell class sessions, the African-American students intentionally segregated themselves from their white peers by sitting together at one end of the seminar table, often chatting and joking with each other in a festive communal manner. Critics who often target such self-imposed isolation as antithetical to the overall mission of university life fail to see, that, among other things, this cultural space created by students of color at majority white institutions effectively helps them to solidify their racial identity against a hegemonic cultural whiteness, which permeates higher education (Tatum 2003).

#### *Postmodern Selves*

##### *and the Situational (In)Salience of Race*

This strategic move by our black students took on a level of added complexity when they entered the prison facility, our other campus. While there, the Bucknell African-American students' perceived separateness from their white outside peers seemed to dissolve on two accounts. First, they were not so cliquish, or segregated in their interactions with the inside students – as noted before, approximately half were African American, two were Latina, and the rest were white, ranging from nineteen to sixty years of age. Rather, the Bucknell African-American students dispersed themselves individually among their incarcerated peers, forging new connections based on mutual values and not primarily on certain arbitrary markers, such as race. Second, the majority of the inside students (women of diverse ages, ethnic/racial, and class backgrounds) did not isolate the black Bucknell students and treat them as others -- as outsiders to higher education. Rather, the inside

students did not appear to distinguish between their white and black Bucknell peers. To them, all of the outside students were smart, educated, and privileged individuals, belonging to an educational system to which they had no access. (Yet, stereotypes associated with such institutional positionality were broken down.) In this unique penal context for education, the form of racial essentialism practiced effectively and out of necessity by the outside students of color was dispelled.

What we are suggesting in sharing this classroom experience is that the de-centered self may lead to genuine cross-difference communication, or, better yet, to reflective understandings or immediate grasps of intersubjectivity. In other words, we emphasize a postmodern relational self that can resist solipsistic tendencies and egoistic impulses. Accordingly, there is no isolated self who stands over against the field of interaction. Put another way, there is no private self or final line between interiority and exteriority -- we always include the other (even if by acting to exclude it). Hence, our basic conviction is that the self is constitutionally relational and inevitably entangled in temporal becoming. Within a service-learning context, this theoretical insight is translatable as the pedagogical aim of possibly blurring boundaries between those who serve/ those served, which is often built on a psychology of differences presupposing superiority/ inferiority (Henry 2005; Henry and Breyfogle 2006).

*Alterity, Power/Knowledge,  
and Critical Pedagogy*

In suggesting the idea of a fractured, radically relational postmodern subjectivity in this teaching context, we are led us to another major theoretical point, namely, that humans are primarily constituted and enhanced by our efforts to interpret, make sense of, symbolize, and assess our relations with oth-

erness (or alterity). In short, we envision our feminist pedagogy at the prison as grounded in the experience of the other. Our myriad encounters with otherness presuppose our radical historicity, which becomes one precondition for conceiving of and living in community. Furthermore, through an awareness of our material, concrete embodiment and perceived relatedness, we may begin to envision what might lie beyond our self-perceptions and thoughts. As we encounter others and ourselves in a host of ways, we are guided by an interpretive mandate, which compels us to derive meaning, purpose and value amid our efforts to recognize and honor otherness. As some scholars suggest, this becomes an awareness of how to enact intercultural interactions that do not bolster pre-existing stereotypes of those perceived as different (Adams 2007:28-29; Boyle-Baise 2006).

This theoretical insight is, perhaps, most poignantly revealed in our encounter with a certain form of otherness that challenged our unreflective assumptions of privilege as outsiders when we entered the prison facility via the gatehouse. Our experiences of being held at the gate (firmly grounded by the authorial presence of the guards) and subjected to search and surveillance became for us moments of vulnerability where, we became the other, in a very particular, limited sense. We did not shed our special status as volunteer visitors and the privileges of movement, resources, and symbolic capital that came with such status. Nonetheless, within the context of our course, and in other multiple ways, the gatehouse at the prison symbolically functioned as a solid portal that both separated us (students and instructors) from the wider societal assumptions of who and what incarcerated women are (and could be), ushering us into a new space where our evolving (porous) subjectivities were challenged and transformed. Passing through the gate and moving through our classroom ses-

sions, we encountered the myriad subject positions of inside students (e.g., as authors, lovers, and community elders). Their degrees of integrity, views of life, and range of perspectives forced Bucknell students and instructors to reconsider our purported subjectivity as autonomous, free agents who came to engage them inside prison walls. As suggested in some critical models of service-learning, our purported positions as servers dissolved as we found ourselves engaged in mutual reciprocity.

As feminist instructors, we consider this new consciousness of being fluid selves encountering otherness as one foundation for the construction of radical knowledge for both students and professors engaged in service-learning. Our experiences with otherness reconstituted our places in an expanded world, including new forms of relationality with the inside students -- with crucial limitations, of course. If empirical, historicist analysis has taught us anything, it is that thinking, reflective subjects are also material and partisan, situated in cultural formations that are themselves contested sites of power/knowledge struggle between different social groups and classes, which can change in one particular direction or another. We then embrace the insight that Swords and Kiely have offered:

Critical reflection shifts the focus of reflection from self-discovery, student learning, and practical dimensions of service to examine how relations of power, ideology, institutional arrangements, and social structures influence stakeholder participation in service-learning program planning, the original and solution to community problems, and the development of sustainable campus-community partnerships (2010:149).

Wherever there are different interests in play, individuals and social groups will de-

velop strategies to realize or protect those interests with which they identify. In this moment, then, teaching at a prison has significantly shaped our convictions that our systems of thought are contingent, strategic, in constant flux, and marked by undecidability. Teaching in a prison helped us to see that we were embodying a novel type of spatiality in the postmodern landscape where alternative values, social practices, and theorizations necessarily intermingled. We were challenged to identify and promote a set of assumptions, positions, critiques, etc., that are grounded in political and ethical commitments, and are inspired by persuasive models of mutually enhancing relations.

We also think that as long as asymmetrical social and power relations exist, feminist instructors who teach in prisons may need to create alternative cultural values and ethical mandates, including localized counter-hegemonic practices of relationality. In more practical terms, the institutions and procedures that we employ to actualize hierarchies of value -- schools, universities, prisons, local and national government, religious institutions and traditions, political organizations of all kinds -- are always likely to become fixated by the desire to conserve and reproduce those value structures. Yet, as we encountered many formulations of gender, racial, class, and erotic construction within the walls of prison, for example, we quickly learned that forms of valuing must themselves be pluralized; and that instructors need to institute practices that allow for such pluralization. Working within our various institutions, feminist teachers are wise to be strategic, even politically savvy, in our efforts to implement instances of alternative valuing, which may lead to new and expanded forms of community.

*Porous Walls, Feminist Pedagogy, and Service-learning = Critical Cultural Work*

As instructors of incarcerated women, we view our pedagogy as critical cultural work, as inspired by some of the insights of Edward Said regarding the status of the contextualized critic. Said proposes a view of the critic as one who is inside the culture and who opposes its hegemony with power derived from the experience of having been outside. For Said, "criticism belongs in that potential space inside civil society, acting on behalf of those alternative acts and alternative intentions whose advancement is a fundamental human and intellectual obligation" (1983:29-30). Said posits the conception of the mature critic who is no longer a naïve child, but a social player of a part, a wearer of a mask. Pushed further, this reading alludes to the power of one's positionality. One interesting implication is that feminist teachers engaging incarcerated students often assume the role of seducers, persuading the gatekeepers of our institutions that those who are outsiders in our society (or inside walls) belong as insiders to our educational systems. It is incumbent upon such cultural workers to help create contexts in which marginalized groups, such as those in prison, can both theorize and confront their worlds. Here, we are suggesting that such cultural work expands on the notion that service-learning is a rich form of civic engagement that resists passive/active dichotomies, and opens up participants to richer forms of relationality in community (Rosenberger 2000).

While it is crucial that feminist teachers recognize how everyday cultural discourses (such as institutional, administrative, and educational policies regarding incarceration) produce and sustain hegemonic power, it is equally important to identify counter challenges contained within marginalized discourses. We understand that our critical interpretations as professors and theorists are

often from strength -- we can do what others (the "illegitimate" others or, in this teaching setting, incarcerated women students) cannot do. As critical cultural workers, then, we reject the view of "the inheritor of the voice of the transcendental ego," that wishes to hold onto the Enlightenment privilege of the universal intellectual who serves as the voice and representative of a general consciousness, or the one who escapes (or is outside of) the contingencies and power relations of our time (Hartsock 1987: 201). In contrast, such cultural workers

self-consciously situate themselves at vulnerable conjunctural modes of ongoing disciplinary discourses where each of them posits nothing less than new objects of knowledge, new praxes of humanist (in the broadest sense of the word) activity, new theoretical models that upset or at the least radically alter the prevailing paradigmatic norms (Said 1985:104).

Teaching with the aim of achieving genuine cross-difference communication and knowledge- and capacity-building has prompted us to continue viewing systems of meaning (and value claims) as social products, enmeshed in webs of power. This suggests that feminist scholars and instructors teaching in prison settings, in particular, must continue to do our thinking and our investigating in and through various forms of resistance and struggle. Accordingly, we are led to ask: Which cultural values are esteemed, and under which conditions? Which institutional props or mechanisms aid in reproducing or contesting influential cultural artifacts? To what extent, and how, do our institutionalized values aid in the myriad struggles to acquire, maintain, or resist power in its myriad forms (Brookfield 2010)?



In advancing this type of pedagogy as service-learning cultural work, we can expect (and should hope) to encounter the notions of otherness and difference in the fullness of their material and conceptual forms. And we should not be unaware of the power dimension of our value-laden discourses, for such awareness leads us toward strategic practices that may help to advance some of our interests. These epistemological insights suggest that when communication among differentiated and stratified parties occurs, one possible result is not just a view of the other, but also a transformation of self and other. In order to affect a fluidity of selves and to construct alternative forms of knowledge and justice, one must, of course, overcome resistance on many levels -- a critical pedagogical challenge. Finally, while engaged in such cultural work, we discovered a pedagogical model that constantly challenged us to create a truly collaborative learning context in which all can both serve and be served. As our earlier reflections show, this model also instilled within us many important lessons. Key among these is that social justice teaching compels one to think from the margins (hooks 1984), and to engage boldly in forms of knowledge that continually transform self and other (Kreisberg 1992; Lewis 1993). We believe that in such situations revolutionary teaching and learning occur.

---

**Coralynn V. Davis** is Director of the Women's and Gender Studies Program and Associate Professor of Women's and Gender Studies and Anthropology at Bucknell University. She has authored works on women, development, and tourism in Nepal, and on Maithil women's expressive practices.

**Carol Wayne White** is Professor of Philosophy of Religion at Bucknell University. She has authored two books and various articles on the intersections of critical theory and religion, feminist theory and postmodernism, science and religion, and religious naturalism.

## References

- Adams, Maurianne. 2007. "Pedagogical Frameworks for Social Justice Education." Pp 15-34 in *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice*, edited by Maurianne Adams, Lee Anne Bell, and Pat Griffin. New York: Routledge.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria E. 1987. *Borderlands = La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute Press.
- Balliet, Barbara J., Karissa Heffernan, and Edward Zlotkowski. 2000. *The Practice of Change: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Women's Studies*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.
- Bell, Lee Anne. 2007. "Theoretical Foundations for Social Justice Education." Pp 1-14 in *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice*, edited by Maurianne Adams, Lee Anne Bell, and Pat Griffin. New York: Routledge.
- Boyle-Baise, Marilyn, Rondalynn Brown, Hsu Ming-Chu, Denisha Jones, Ambica Prakash, Michelle Rausch, Shelley Vitols, and Zach Wahlquist. 2006. "Learning Service or Service Learning: Enabling the Civic." *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 18(1):17-26.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 1991. *Patterns of Dissonance*. New York: Routledge.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. "Transformative Learning as Ideology Critique." Pp 125-148 in *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress*, edited by Jack Mezirow and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Butin, Dan, W. 2010. *Service-learning in Theory and Practice: The Future of Community*

- Engagement in Higher Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cone, Dick and Susan Harris. 1996. "Service Learning Practice: Developing a Theoretical Framework." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 3:31-43.
- Cornell, Drucilla. 1991. *Beyond Accommodation: Ethical feminism, Deconstruction and the Law*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Crosby, Christina. 1992. "Dealing with Differences." Pp 130-143 in *Feminists Theorize the Political*, edited by Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott. New York: Routledge.
- D'Arlach, Lucia, Bernadette Sánchez, and Rachel Feuer. 2009. "Voices from the Community: Case for Reciprocity in Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 16(1), 5-16.
- Davis, Angela, and Cassandra Shaylor. 2001. "Race, Gender, and Prison Industrial Complex." *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 2(1):1-25.
- Deans, Thomas. 1999. "Service Learning in Two Keys: Paulo Freire's Critical Pedagogy in Relation to John Dewey's Pragmatism." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 6:5-29.
- Enos, Sandra and Keith Morton. 2003. "Developing a Theory and Practice of Campus-Community Partnerships." Pp 20-41 in *Building Partnerships for Service-Learning*, edited by Barbara Jacoby. Indianapolis: Jossey-Bass.
- Foucault, Michel. 1995 [1975]. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- Fraser, Nancy and Linda J. Nicholson. 1990. "Social Criticism Without Philosophy: An Encounter Between Feminism and Postmodernism." Pp 19-38 in *Feminism/Postmodernism*, edited by Linda J. Nicholson, New York: Routledge.
- Freedman, Estelle B. 2006. *Feminism, Sexuality, and Politics: Essays by Estelle B. Freedman* (Gender and American Culture). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilman, Sander. 1985. *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Girshick, Lori. 1999. *No Safe Haven: Stories of Women in Prison*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Griffin, Pat and Mathew L. Ouellett. 2007. "Facilitating Social Justice Education Courses." Pp 89-116 in *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice*, edited by Maurianne Adams, Lee Anne Bell, and Pat Griffin. New York: Routledge.
- Hadleigh-West, Maggie. (Director). 1998. *War zone* [Motion picture]. Northampton, MA: Media Education Foundation.
- Hartsock, Nancy. 1987. "Rethinking Modernism: Minority vs. Majority Theories." *Cultural Critique* 7:187-206.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1962 [1927]. *Being and Time*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Henry, Sue Ellen. 2005. "'I Can Never Turn My Back on That': Liminality and the Impact of Class on Service-Learning Experience." Pp 45-66 in *Service Learning in Higher Education: Critical Issues and Directions*, edited by Dan Butin. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Henry, Sue Ellen and Lynn M. Breyfogle. 2006. "Toward a New Framework of 'Server' and 'Served': De(and re)constructing reciprocity in Service-Learning Pedagogy." *Interna-*

- tional Journal of Teaching and Learning in Education* 18(1):27-35.
- hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory from Margin to Center*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Jacoby, Barbara and Associates. 1996. *Service-Learning in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jordan, June. 1995. *June Jordan's Poetry for the People: A Revolutionary Blueprint*. New York: Routledge.
- Kreisberg, Seth. 1992. *Transforming Power: Domination, Empowerment, and Education*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 1995. "Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal* 32(3): 465-491.
- Lewis, Magda Gere, 1993. *Without a Word: Teaching Beyond Women's Silence*. New York: Routledge.
- Liu, Goodwin. 1995. "Knowledge, Foundations, and Discourse: Philosophical Support for Service Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 2(1):5-18.
- Kipnis, Laura. 1988. "Feminism: The Political Conscience of Postmodernism?" Pp 149-166 in *Universal Abandon: The Politics of Postmodernism*, edited by Andrew Ross. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McFaren, Peter and Colin Lankshear. 1994. *Critical Literacy: Politics, Praxis, and the Postmodern*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Merlo, Alida V. and Joyce M. Pollock. 1995. *Women, Law, and Social Control*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Miller, Susan L. 1998. *Crime, Control and Women: Feminist Implications of Criminal Justice Policy*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publishers.
- Minh-ha, Trinh T. 1989. *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Mitchell, Tania D. 2008. "Traditional vs. Critical Service-Learning: Engaging the Literature to Differentiate Two Models." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 14(2):50-65.
- Moya, Paula M. L. 2002. *Learning From Experience: Minority Identities, Multicultural Struggles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Moya, Paula M. L. and Michael R. Hames-García. 2000. *Reclaiming identity: Realist Theory and the Predicament of Postmodernism*. Berkeley: UC Press.
- Nakano Glenn, E. 1992. "From Servitude to Service-Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor." *Signs* 18(1):1-43.
- Perez, Emma. 1999. *The Decolonial Imaginary: Writing Chicanas into History*. South Bend, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Phelan, Shane. 1990. "Foucault and Feminism." *American Journal of Political Science* 34:421-440.
- Pollock, Joyce. 2002. *Women, Prison, Crime*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Press.
- Pompa, Lori. 2002. "Service-Learning as Crucible: Reflections on Immersion, Context, Power and Transformation." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 9(1):67-76.
- Pratt, Minnie Bruce. 1989. *Crime Against Nature*. Ithaca, New York: Firebrand Books.
- Pratt, Minnie Bruce. 1999. *Walking Back Up Depot Street*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

- Rosenberger, Cynthia. 2000. "Beyond Empathy: Developing Critical Consciousness Through Service Learning." Pp 23-43 in *Integrating Service Learning and Multicultural Education in Colleges and Universities*, edited by Carolyn R. O'Grady. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Said, Edward. 1985. "Orientalism Reconsidered." *Cultural Critique* 1:89-107.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. *The World, the Text and the Critic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sanchez, Sonia. 1999. *Shake Loose My Skin: New and Selected Poems*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *I've Been a Woman: New and Selected Poems*. Chicago: Third World Press.
- Sartre, Jean Paul. 1985 [1946]. *Existentialism and Human Emotions*. New York: Kensington Publishing Corporation.
- Sawicki, Jana. 1991. "Foucault and Feminism: Toward a Politics of Difference." Pp 217-231 in *Feminist Interpretations and Political Theory*, edited by Mary L. Shanley and Carole Pateman. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Schniedewind, Nancy. 1993. "Teaching Feminist Process in the 1990's." *Women's Studies Quarterly*. 3&4:17-30
- Scott, Joan W. 1988. "Deconstructing Equality-Versus-Difference: Or, the Uses of Poststructuralist Theory for Feminism." *Feminist Studies* 14:33-50.
- Schwartzman, Roy. 2010. "Service-Learning Pathologies and Prognoses." *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education* 1 (2):1-17.
- Sommers, Evelyn K. 1995. *Voices from Within: Women Who Have Broken the Law*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Spelman, Elizabeth V. 1991. "Simone de Beauvoir and Women: Just Who Does She Think 'we' Is?" Pp 199-214 in *Feminist Interpretations and Political Theory*, edited by Mary L. Shanley and Carole Pateman. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Swords, Alicia and Richard Kiely. 2010. "Beyond Pedagogy: Service Learning as Movement Building in Higher Education." *Journal of Community Practice* 18(2-3):148-170.
- Tatum, Beverly Daniel. 2003. "Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria"? and Other Conversations About Race. New York: Basic Books
- Walker, Tobi. 2000. "A Feminist Challenge to Community Service: A Call to Politicize Service-Learning." Pp 25-46 in *The Practice of Change: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Women's Studies*, edited by Barbara Baillet and Kerrissa Heffernan. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.
- White, Carol Wayne. 2002. *Poststructuralism, Feminism, and Religion: Triangulating Positions*. Amherst, NY.