

SERVICE-LEARNING IN ASIA

CURRICULAR MODELS AND PRACTICES

EDITED BY
JUN XING AND
CAROL HOK KA MA



香港大學出版社

HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

Hong Kong University Press

14/F Hing Wai Centre

7 Tin Wan Praya Road

Aberdeen

Hong Kong

© Hong Kong University Press 2010

Hardback ISBN 978-988-8028-46-7

Paperback ISBN 978-988-8028-47-4

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue copy for this book is available from the British Library

Secure On-line Ordering

<http://www.hkupress.org>

Printed and bound by Goodrich International Printing Co. Ltd., Hong Kong, China

Contents

Foreword by Edward K. Y. Chen	vii
List of Contributors	ix
Introduction: Service-learning in Asia <i>Jun Xing and Carol Hok Ka Ma</i>	1
Part I: Variations in Meaning and Forms	15
1. Bridging Classrooms to Communities in Service-learning Programs <i>Charn Mayot</i>	17
2. An Appreciation of Cross-cultural Differences through International Service-learning at International Christian University, Japan <i>Yutaka Sato, Florence McCarthy, Mutsuko Murakami, Takashi Nishio, and Kano Yamamoto</i>	31
3. Building Students' Total Learning Experience through Integrating Service-learning into the Teacher Education Curriculum <i>Kwok Hung Lai</i>	47
4. Service-learning Models in the Asia-Pacific Region and Lady Doak College <i>J. Chithra and Helen Mary Jacqueline</i>	63

Part II: Case Studies	71
5. The Community-based Instruction Program at Hong Kong Baptist University <i>John H. Powers</i>	73
6. How Actions Can Become Learning: The Cross-cultural Effectiveness of Service-learning in Asia <i>Jens Mueller and Dennis Lee</i>	85
7. Intercultural Service-learning and Multicultural Symbiosis <i>Enrique G. Oracion</i>	91
8. Service-learning in University Curricula: A Case Study at Fu Jen Catholic University <i>Jen-Chi Yen and Bai-Chuan Yang</i>	111
9. International Service-learning: A Singapore Experience <i>Dennis Lee</i>	127
10. A Cross-cultural Service-learning Program Model: W.T. Chan Fellowships Program <i>Jane Szutu Permaul</i>	143
Notes	157
References	161
Index	171

Contributors

J. CHITHRA has been a senior professor of mathematics at Lady Doak College, Madurai, India since 1987. She obtained her master of arts in mathematics and philosophy from Madras Christian College, affiliated to Madras University, with a specialization in cryptography. She is currently a coordinator of the Centre for Outreach and Service-Learning Program at the college. She has been a program officer of the National Service Scheme in the college for 6 years and has been coordinating all the extension programs of the college for the past 8 years. She has attended conferences and workshops and presented papers on service-learning at national and international levels. She has also attended the Inter-Cultural Course on Women and Society at Manila in the Philippines and is actively involved in women's studies at the college.

Helen Mary JACQUELINE is a senior lecturer in economics at Lady Doak College, Madurai, India. She is currently a coordinator for the Centre for Outreach and Service-Learning Program at the college. She obtained five postgraduate degrees: an MA in economics from Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai; an MA in population studies from Annamalai University, Chidambaram; a master of philosophy (MPhil) in applied economics from Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi; a master of human resource management (MHRM) from Annamalai University, Chidambaram; and a master of business administration (MBA) from Annamali University, Chidambaram. She was the program officer of the National Service Scheme for 5 years and is actively involved in service-learning program and human rights activities. She has published more than 10 articles and presented papers in about 18 seminars and conferences at state, regional, national and international levels.

Kwok Hung LAI, PhD, is a senior student affairs officer at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. He is currently the director of the Institute of Student Affairs of the Asia-Pacific Student Services Association, after serving as treasurer since 2002. He is also the vice-chairman of the Hong Kong Student Services Association. Dr Lai is a registered social worker with over 26 years of professional experiences in working with youths in the fields of social work and education. He has published more than 50 articles in local newspapers and international journals. His research interests are in youth work, crime and delinquency, civic education, campus culture, student learning, and career aspirations.

Dennis LEE is regional vice president and managing director, Asia, for Students in Free Enterprise (SIFE), a global non-profit organization represented in 48 countries. Previously, he was deputy executive director at Singapore International Foundation (SIF). Academically, Mr Lee holds three postgraduate degrees: an MBA from the University of Hull, United Kingdom; a master of divinity (MDiv); and a master of theological studies (MTS) from Regent College, Vancouver, Canada. He also obtained a postgraduate diploma in business administration from the Society of Business Practitioners, United Kingdom. His professional and tertiary education in marketing and civil engineering led to diplomas in these disciplines from the Chartered Institute of Marketing, United Kingdom, and the Singapore Polytechnic respectively.

Carol Hok Ka MA, PhD, is assistant director of the Office of Service-Learning and an adjunct assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Social Policy at Lingnan University. She was awarded a W. T. Chan Fellowship to study and practice service-learning (elderly-related programs) at the University of California, Los Angeles. She was also awarded a Lingnan Foundation Scholarship to do a service-learning research internship on the topic of “doctor-older patient relationship through negotiation” at the National Primary Health Care Centre, the University of Manchester. Currently, she serves on several important government committees in Hong Kong, including the Hong Kong Awards for Young People; Commission on Youth; Working Group on Active Ageing, Elderly Commission; Tuen Mun District Coordinating Committee on Promotion of Volunteer Service, Social Welfare Department; Fight Crime Committee (Tuen Mun District), Home Affairs Department; and as school governor for Lingnan Dr Chung Wing Kwong Memorial Secondary School. Her rich experiences in service-learning inspire her to explore different teaching/learning models/pedagogies in the Asia-Pacific Region.

Charn MAYOT is director of St. Martin Center for Professional Ethics and Service Learning, Student Affairs, Assumption University, Thailand. He has been in charge of teaching business and professional ethics seminar and supervising a service-learning program for undergraduate students at Assumption University since 1998. He is also an ethics trainer for administrators of some corporations in his country. He has written a number of articles in the areas of applied ethics, moral education, moral development, and service-learning. He was formerly a lecturer of applied ethics at the Graduate School of Philosophy and Religions at Assumption University. He used to collaborate with UNESCO to organize projects and promote peace and harmony in six countries in the Mekhong River Basin region between 2001 and 2005.

Florence MCCARTHY is vice president for Asian affairs at International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership (IPSL). She received her PhD in sociology and MA in sociology/anthropology from Michigan State University; and BA in history/political science from the University of California, Berkeley. She is a visiting professor at International Christian University (ICU), Tokyo, Japan. Past positions include: associate professor and director of International Education Development, Teachers College, Columbia University; senior lecturer, College of Human Ecology, Cornell University; advisor, Head Women's Section, Ministry of Agriculture, Bangladesh; and Policy and Program Development, Norwegian Overseas Research and Development, Oslo, Norway. She has been awarded grants from Fulbright, the National Institute of Health, and the Norwegian government.

Jens MUELLER is an associate professor for entrepreneurship and strategy at Waikato Management School, New Zealand. He also serves as editor for the *Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability* and *International Journal of Indigenous Entrepreneurship, Strategy, Advancement and Education*. He is the foundation chairman of the International Quality Education Foundation (IQEF). Previously, he served as regional vice president and managing director, Asia, Students in Free Enterprise (SIFE).

Mutsuko MURAKAMI is a service-learning program instructor at the International Christian University. She obtained her BA from Tokyo's Sophia University and master of science in journalism (MSJ) from the Graduate School of Journalism of Columbia University, New York City. She worked in journalism for many years, primarily as staff correspondent for *Asiaweek* magazine (a subsidiary of Time Inc.). She started teaching journalism and communication at Sophia in 1993 and later service-learning courses while

acting as the program coordinator at ICU. She is currently teaching service-learning related courses at ICU.

Takashi NISHIO is a professor of public policy and administration, and dean of the College of Liberal Arts (since April 2009), International Christian University. He served as director of the Service Learning Center of ICU from 2005 to 2007.

Enrique G. ORACION holds BA and MA degrees in sociology from Silliman University, Dumaguete City, Philippines and a PhD in anthropology from the University of San Carlos, Cebu City, the Philippines. He is a full professor at Silliman University and teaches in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences; School of Public Affairs and Governance; and College of Education. He is also the current director of the Research and Development Center of Silliman University. His particular research interests include the human dimensions of natural resources management and governance, children and gender issues, the anthropology of tourism, and service-learning.

Jane Szutu PERMAUL, EdD, a lifetime student of higher education focused on student and organizational development, introduced service-learning to the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and nationally worked with other service-learning pioneers in exploring the challenges of integrating community service with academic learning as part of higher education, beginning in the late 1960s to today. Emigrating from China to the United States, Dr Perumal received her BA in economics from Oberlin College in Ohio, master of science (MS) in student affairs administration from Southern Illinois University, and EdD in higher education from UCLA. Her interests in service-learning and cross-cultural learning continue through her capacity as assistant vice chancellor of student affairs, emeritus and adjunct professor of education at UCLA, and as a trustee of the Lingnan Foundation.

John H. POWERS is a professor of communication studies at Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU). He served as director of the Service-Learning Program there for nearly 5 years. His research interests include communication in Chinese communities, communication theory, and public communication. Before coming to HKBU in 1993, he taught at Texas A&M University in the United States for 16 years. His books include *Public Speaking: The Lively Art* (1994), *Civic Discourse, Civil Society, and Chinese Communities* (1999), and *The Social Construction of SARS* (2008).

Yutaka SATO is a professor of Japanese linguistics and director of the Japanese Language Programs at the International Christian University (ICU), Tokyo, Japan. He received his PhD in linguistics from the University of Hawaii at Manoa. He served as director of the Service Learning Center at ICU from 2007 to 2009.

Jun XING is a professor and chair of ethnic studies at Oregon State University. He is the author/editor of six other books, including *Baptized in the Fire of Revolution, The American Social Gospel and the YMCA in China: 1919–1937* (1996), *Asian America through the Lens: History, Representations and Identity* (1998), *Reversing the Lens: Ethnicity, Race, Gender and Sexuality through Film* (2003), *Teaching for Change: The Difference, Power and Discrimination Model* (2006), and *Seeing Color: Indigenous Peoples and Racialized Ethnic Minorities in Oregon* (2007).

Kano YAMAMOTO is managing trustee of International Christian University, Tokyo, Japan. He served as an economist at the Bank of Japan, International Monetary Fund, comptroller of UNICEF, and professor at International Christian University. He was the first director of ICU Service Learning Center and currently serves as its advisor.

Bai-Chuan YANG is an associate professor, dean of the Office of Student Affairs at Fu Jen Catholic University, and deputy chief executive secretary of the Academic Association of Chinese Student Affairs. He received his MBA degree from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (1989) and PhD in business administration from Fu Jen Catholic University (2006). His current research mainly focuses on core competence, service-learning, and business ethics. He also served as a business consultant for Mon-Ya Management Consulting Firm.

Jen-Chi YEN is director of the Service-Learning Center and the Jesuit Mission Office at Fu Jen Catholic University. Father David received his MA in mass communication from Loyola Marymount University. He served as chairman of the Kuangchi Program Service, and on the evaluation committee of the Golden Horse and Golden Bell Awards. He is also the producer of various TV programs and writes movie reviews.

Introduction: Service-learning in Asia

Jun Xing and Carol Hok Ka Ma

Four years ago in 2006, when Jun was working for the United Board of Christian Higher Education in Asia (United Board), he visited International Christian University (ICU) in Tokyo, where he learned about the inspiring story of an ICU-NJU (Nanjing University) service-learning project. In January of 2005, a group of ICU students went to Nanjing University and participated in a service-learning program, sponsored by the Amity Foundation, where ICU and NJU students jointly produced a new play called *Zouba!* (Let's Go). The play portrays a group of students from Japan and China, trying courageously to move beyond history and start a painful, but meaningful journey of reconciliation. Despite its high political risks and initial tension, the joint performance in both Tokyo and Nanjing in the following year turned out to be a resounding success and made a huge splash in the news media. Here is a quote from a Japanese student participant reported on NPR's "Morning Edition," on January 27, 2007:

"That first night we all went to dinner," she (Michiyo Oi, who wrote much of the script) recalls. "We sat around talking, and I figured they must be wondering what we were thinking. Each of us introduced ourselves, and when my turn came, I started to talk about the war, about what a shame it was that we did such terrible things. The air froze. Until then we were all laughing. The moment I mentioned the war, everyone went pale. The Chinese students looked at me as if they couldn't believe the way I'd brought this up."

As we all know, because of historical reasons, Chinese and Japanese are very much divided about that particular period of history. The Nanjing massacre, or what the late historian Iris Chang called the "Rape of Nanjing," has been a focal point of contention between these two countries. It has become a taboo topic for politicians and diplomats from both sides. It was

the service-learning project that brought students together and the joint theatrical production became the ice-breaker that allowed students to openly share their emotions and exchange ideas. It was such a powerful and profound learning experience for both the Chinese and Japanese students that the ICU Foundation in New York is planning to make a documentary about the student experience.

Having invested his life in cross-cultural and international studies for over two decades, Jun was greatly inspired by the story and just witnessed the tremendous potential of international service-learning at its best. Indeed, connecting academic study with community service through structured reflection, service-learning is now widely recognized in the world as a movement that is transforming education. As an instructional philosophy and pedagogy, service-learning has become a major force in Asia. Between 2006 and 2007, on behalf of the United Board Jun traveled to over a dozen university campuses in several countries and witnessed how service-learning was recognized and celebrated for its pedagogical values across the region.

Indeed, many leading universities and colleges across Asia had established service-learning centers or programs, supporting a dedicated core of faculty and serving an increasingly larger student population. Lingnan University, for example, was the first to set up the Office of Service-Learning (OSL) on campus. Clearly echoing Lingnan's long-standing motto "Education for Service," OSL is devoted to fostering student-centered learning and whole-person development model.¹ Between 2006 and 2009, over 1,000 Lingnan students from various disciplines, such as social sciences, business and arts have participated in the three core programs in service-learning, including the Lingnan Healthcare Program (LHCP), the Lingnan Community Care Program (LCCP), and the Lingnan Service-Learning Evaluation Program (LS-LEP). These participants were required to fulfill a service-learning practicum with at least 30 hours of service and complete a subject-related project in a semester. So far Lingnan students have served over 100 organizations (government, non-profit, schools, and corporate firms) and registered 70,000 service hours for the needy, elderly, youth, patients, and single-parent families. In addition, over 80 students have joined international service-learning programs, sponsored by OSL and engaged in service-learning activities in Yunnan, Beijing, Taipei, Guangzhou and several cities in the United States.

For another example, under the auspices of the Singapore International Foundation, over a five-year period (2000–05), the Youth Expedition Project sent over 12,000 students on service-learning assignments across Southeast Asia, China and India.² In the meantime, the CBI (community-based instruction) program at Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU)

partnered with 100 local service agencies and conducted several hundred service-learning projects in Hong Kong and elsewhere.³ What is more, in Taiwan, over half (86 out of 146) of its universities and colleges have incorporated service-learning into their core curriculum.⁴ The Ministry of Education in Taipei plans to add service-learning into its annual regular accreditation process. In a sense, service-learning has come of age in Asia and its place in the Asian academy has been secured.

However, despite these accomplishments, there are few scholarly publications on Asian-based practices and contexts of service-learning. Most of the written works on service-learning so far are monographs, teaching anthologies or guidebooks published in the United States, including series and booklets coming from the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), International Partnership for Service-Learning (IPSL) and Campus Compact. The 21-volume set 'Service-Learning in the Disciplines', published by AAHE, is a good example of this increasing body of literature. Although these are seminal works that have made significant contributions to the development of service-learning in Asia, we see the urgent need of a book that explores specifically local or indigenous practices of service-learning in Asian societies. This anthology is a modest attempt to help fill that gap by focusing on service-learning in the Asian contexts, both reflective of international trends but also distinctive in its own local and regional characteristics, given the tremendous diversity within Asian societies.

As disparate as they may seem in length, cultures (a true mosaic), disciplines (from social work to business) and institutions (public, private or Christian by nature), the essays in the collection coalesce around three major thematic foci and contribute to the overall objectives of the publication together.

Service-learning and Indigenous Cultural Traditions

Service-learning is not intended to be used in every course, but it is possible to incorporate it into any discipline. It is not possible to design a single model that effectively integrates service-learning into academic study for all disciplines or institutions. Service-learning must be contextualized and relevant to meet unique and evolving needs . . . Thus, service-learning takes different forms in different contexts.⁵

This quote from the authors of Chapter 4 in the volume captures the first reigning theme and objective of the book, that is, promotion of the concept of indigenous or local and culturally specific knowledge or systems of knowledge. Indeed, service-learning, like any learning, is not culture-neutral

but deeply imbedded in the historical and social contexts of each educational system. Although service-learning is primarily a Western term, the meaning, understanding and practices vary from society to society. In the Philippines, for example, service-learning is often practiced at colleges and universities that have a Christian tradition, while in India it grows out of a vision of national self-reliance in the post-colonial era. For Hong Kong the development of service-learning has benefited from the government's emphasis on whole-person education. In contemporary China, as some scholars argue, service-learning represents a way of countering the growing individualism and materialism in a rapidly transforming society.

As indicated in the title, cultural diversity and local themes are the defining characteristics of the book. For example, it is refreshing to read Chapter 1, where Charn Mayot provides the national contexts of service-learning in Thailand. He explains that although the very term "service-learning" was not coined until 1967 in the United States and it was not used in Thailand as late as in the early 1990s, social concern has been a part of higher education in the country for a very long time through the concepts of community service and social exposure.⁶ Similarly, in Chapter 7, Enrique Oracion helps the readers to distinguish service-learning as a "pro-social behavior, but short of altruism," a time-honored Filipino cultural tradition, "because the latter means helping others without any expectation of return," while service-learning "maybe less or not at all altruistic because of the learning or the grade the students expect to earn in exchange."⁷

Recently, there has been a growing debate over indigenous knowledge and cultural traditions in the academy. The World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC), for example, was established in 2002 by indigenous peoples' representatives from Australia, the United States, Canada, and Norway. WINHEC's goals were to advance indigenous peoples' endeavors in and through higher education and establish an accreditation body for their own higher education institutions and initiatives. In the meantime, international attention has turned to intellectual property laws to preserve, protect, and promote traditional knowledge. In 2005, the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) sponsored a conference in Delhi, India, and announced the initiative to create a digital library system for classifying the region's traditional knowledge and linking it to the international patent classification system.

The papers collected in the volume demonstrate how students engaged in service-learning can benefit from, and contribute to, the development and promotion of indigenous knowledge and traditions. A good case in point was the Students in Free Enterprise (SIFE) program discussed in Chapter 6, which provided ample evidences of how service-learning students from Singapore

worked with the tribal communities in Australia and the indigenous Maori population near Whakatane, New Zealand.⁸ Equally telling was the ecotourism project taken on by Assumption University students in collaboration with several local organizations at Mooban Khanim in Phang Nga Province, Thailand. Mooban Khanim is in the area hit by the tsunami in 2004. Forty faculty and students learned that the village was not destroyed because it was protected by a vast mangrove forest around the village. Community members realized that the mangrove forest was both a source of food and a natural wall that protected the community from strong wind and giant waves. That knowledge from the villagers helped Assumption University faculty and students launch a multi-year service-learning project for the mangrove forest preservation in a sustainable manner.⁹

It is also heartening to learn that in Chiang Mai, Northern Thailand, students of Payap University executed their service-learning projects in the library by digitalizing artifacts, rare books, and audio-video materials on northern Thai culture. They had aptly named the project the “local wisdom initiative,” which attempted to preserve and document northern Thai dialects, folk songs, recipes, architectural designs and other cultural relicts. Altogether, they have identified 1,000 photos, 2,000 slides, 60 CDs, 123 video tapes, 244 audio tapes and 50 rare books. Those prized collections will soon be made available for researchers worldwide.¹⁰

Over recent years, a growing rank of scholars has called for a paradigm shift in liberal arts education. Specifically, they ask for a shift of emphasis upon the transformative rather than only the utilitarian value of knowledge. Indigenous knowledge, the philosophical, literary, scientific knowledge, as part of the cultural heritage and history of the local communities is an important part of that transformative knowledge. Unlike the “objective” or “scientifically based” intellectual paradigms, indigenous knowledge can be experientially learned in the field. Readers will pick up ample examples from this book that service-learning, as a powerful experiential pedagogy, is one of the best pedagogical tools we have to acquire that knowledge.

Service-learning and Social Justice Education

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly.¹¹

This quote from the late US civil rights activist and leader the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. brings to the fore the second theme of the volume: service-

learning and the concept of social justice education. Although service-learning has been adopted widely among faculty, administrators and educators, the misconception of service-learning as charity work is still well around and alive. Some faculty and students have expressed their skepticism about service-learning simply because they feel that such endeavors amount to little more than “charity” work or, even worse, “distractions” from core disciplinary competencies.

Indeed, we may have to admit that this “charity” type of service-learning is still employed by some nonprofit organizations, including universities and colleges, and some service-learning projects lack a political awareness component and the service students perform treats social symptoms, without addressing the root causes of the social disparities, poverty conditions and medical maladies. As Kwok Hung Lai writes in Chapter 3, “Learning from serving others is not automatic. Students serving meals to the homeless, mentoring at-risk youth, and visiting chronically ill patients enjoyed the work and felt satisfied from such altruistic experiences, but did not necessarily engage in critical thinking about the existence of poverty, youth policy, and health-care reform. These experiences may even promote a power imbalance of the privileged ‘haves’ providing for the ‘have-nots’.”¹²

To help debunk this misperception and realize the full potential of service-learning, service-learning scholars and practitioners are pushing the advocacy and social change agenda. The stories told by faculty and students in this collection provide ample examples about how faculty and students get involved in policy-related learning and community engagement. A good place to start is to teach students about the social construction of human differences and their own unearned privileges. Chapter 7 illustrates vividly how doing service-learning in Filipino rural communities challenged non-Filipino students in the most personal way, “the comfort of air-conditioned bedrooms, the soothing baths with running hot and cold water in clean bathrooms, the savor of favored food at home or in restaurants, and many other privileges in the urban world are temporarily denied to them . . .”¹³ While completing their “social exposure” project, a group of Assumption University students, for another example, witnessed the dire situation of street children in Pattaya and reflected on their own unearned privileges. They were “strongly struck by the fact that these children live on 12 baht a day” and that these children had never tasted fruit before. In comparison, a majority of the students themselves go and see a movie several times a week and spent more than 100 baht for each movie.¹⁴ They learned that sacrificing one movie each week could potentially help one child to be fed for seven days. Similarly, a Singaporean student performing service-learning in Lijiang, China, wrote, “We saw ourselves as

fortunate and felt the need to contribute to a less privileged society in our own capacity and capability.”¹⁵

For social justice education, some service-learning have introduced Paulo Freire’s concept of transformative processes for service-learning operations, which calls for changing public policy as well as creating change agents. As discussed by John H. Powers in Chapter 5, the CBI program at HKBU promotes the concept of problem-based learning, which “was defined as a teaching method that builds the instructional process around one or more complex problems that the course content may be used to solve.”¹⁶ The expected learning outcome of the CBI program, according to Powers, is to encourage students to identify real-life problems from the community and apply knowledge they have learned in seeking their solutions.

Doing service-learning in the Philippines taught the International Service-Learning Model Program (ISLMP) students the enormous disparities between the rich and the poor in the country. One ready example, given in Chapter 7, was the student experience of attending a lavish birthday party of a local politician. Despite the festive mood of the party, a female non-Filipino student was saddened by the lavishness, which presented such a powerful contrast to the poverty they saw being experienced by so many in the community day in and day out.¹⁷ These examples clearly demonstrate how direct community engagement helps ISLMP students develop a transformative perspective on the critical issues of social inequality.

Working for peace and reconciliation was another example cited by several authors in service-learning for social justice education. As discussed earlier, after its successful experience for the joint-production of “*Zouba*,” ICU’s service-learning office is planning a follow-up reconciliation program in Nanjing in the near future, where ICU students will acknowledge history and take ownership of Japan’s war policies. “This may be a rather unusual agenda for service-learning,” as the authors write in Chapter 2, “but as nationals of a country that invaded Asian countries and committed atrocities during modern times, creating this understanding is something very important for all Japanese as global citizens.”¹⁸

Nowadays, social justice ideals are broadly embraced by faculty and students, but oftentimes students are exposed to issues of injustice or inequity only as an abstraction. Service-learning offers a proven pedagogy for moving the discussion of human rights and social justice from the classroom to the streets, where it takes on human meaning and the very concept of social justice can be, therefore, translated into passion and commitment for the students.

Service-learning and the Concept of Multicultural Symbiosis¹⁹

If you give people fish, they can eat for a day.

If you teach them how to fish they can eat for a lifetime.

If you teach them to learn, they don't have to eat fish all their life.²⁰

This pithy quote from Chapter 9 captures the spirit of service-learning in promoting cross-cultural and world literacy. Chapters 2 and 7, for example, describe in detail how in 2006 the six cooperative member schools of the Service-Learning Asia Network (SLAN) first introduced the concept of “multicultural symbiosis” or *kyosei* (meaning “living together” in Japanese) as the key learning objective for the International Service-Learning (ISLMP) program.²¹

In ecology, symbiosis, according to Enrique G. Oracion, refers to a mutually beneficial relationship among organisms. “When applied to human interaction amidst cultural diversity,” he writes, “the concept of multicultural symbiosis implies how the coming together of people with diverse cultural backgrounds offers relative benefits to all involved.”²² In both Chapters 2 and 7, readers will find very successful cases of ISLMP participants broke down their long-time held stereotypes against local cultures and residents. Living closer to the Filipino communities, for example, they observed that school children came to school late, not because they were lazy, but “because they must walk three to four hours before reaching school” and “some pupils had to cross rivers several times, which made it difficult to go to school during bad weather.”²³

However, to reach this lofty goal of multicultural symbiosis, it takes vision, care and high ethical standards with regard to power, capacity, equity and sustainability. Several chapters in the book shed light on the sticky side of service, the all-important ethical conduct of service-learning in a cross-cultural or international context. Indeed, there are risks or pitfalls of all kinds in conducting service-learning, especially international service-learning. For example, some of us are familiar with the phenomenon of “academic tourism,” referring to those short and superficial stunts overseas without clearly defined learning objectives. Occasionally, students have talked about their service-learning class as a glorified vacation or a visit, a sign of the so-called academic tourism.

Furthermore, we may have heard about those “island programs,” where students often stick together among themselves with little or no interaction with the local communities. The entire service project could become exploitive of the stakeholders and communities. Worse still, our faculty and students might try to make other people in our own image, or use service as a way of exercising their sense of generosity or beneficence (read paternalism, patronization or “colonial mentality”). Those “benevolent programs” reinforce personal bias and cultural

prejudice against other people. The programs immediately become counter-productive and destructive.

In view of all these potential problems, as service-learning faculty and scholars, how do we set up some useful parameters or criteria for the ethical conduct of service-learning? Reading through the volume, readers will find four broadly defined themes emerge from the pages, namely power-related issues, capacity-related issues, equity-related issues and sustainability-related issues.

For power-related issues, service-learning faculty and students are often confronted with four interrelated issues: (1) How do we guarantee voluntary participation and informed consent? In other words, how do we make sure that there is no coercion for service-learning, especially among vulnerable segment of the population with diminished autonomy or capacity? (2) Is the principle of shared governance being practiced? Is there a strong buy-in by the local communities? Are the host communities equal partners in the education of student participants? Reflecting over the experience with ISLMP students in Chapter 7, for example, the author emphasized that projects “must be appropriate to the needs of the communities and should be identified together with the locals during the planning stage in forging a partnership for service-learning.”²⁴

A number of capacity-related questions can be asked about each of the major players or partners in service-learning. First, for community capacity, do our students understand the difference between help on the one hand and social development on the other? Or, are we relatively certain that the local communities we serve will improve their capacity by our genuine, active, and sustained engagement? Secondly, for student capacity, do our students have the maturity, skill, and knowledge, to perform the tasks or duties assigned by the agencies? And, finally, for agency capacity, does the placement agency have the capacity to provide monitoring or supervision for students at the service site? Are the agencies’ staff properly trained or have the right credentials? Is it faculty responsibility to scrutinize their qualifications or do we simply rely on administration assurances about these oversight issues? Oversight responsibility is a very touchy issue for the agency and faculty.

The case studies in the volume have addressed those questions in varying degrees. On student capacity, for example, Kwok Hung Lai’s point is very well taken when he writes about student placement in Chapter 3, “service-learning placements should be tailored to students’ needs and their level of self-efficacy. A community service placement that is perceived as too far beyond the student’s capabilities will be threatening, and will decrease rather than increase their sense of self-efficacy.”²⁵

In addition, the concepts of reciprocity, equity and respect have been cited by the authors as the absolute key for a successful service-learning program. Dennis Lee in Chapter 9, while discussing the Singaporean situation in service-learning, cites reciprocity as the key factor in differentiating service-learning from community service.²⁶ He advises his readers to avoid “the ever-present pitfall of paternalism disguised under the name of service.” “Service-learning,” he writes, “avoids the traditionally paternalistic, one-way approach to service in which one person or group has the resources, which they share charitably or voluntarily with the person or group that lacks resources.”²⁷ Likewise, in Chapter 10, Jane Szutu Permaul, in assessing the cross-cultural learning outcomes of the W. T. Chan Fellowships Program, raises similar questions: “Is cross-cultural learning a one-way or two-way learning experience? Do the American hosts learn anything along with the fellows?” It is interesting to note how Assumption University students quickly find out that many communities will only allow a stranger to be involved in the community’s life through someone they trust. “In our social exposure to hill-tribe communities,” Charn Mayot writes in Chapter 1, “we work together with the Mirror Foundation, a local NGO that engages in community development.”²⁸

Some writers in the book are strong advocates for the principle of equity, making sure that it is the communities, instead of selected individuals, who benefit from the service. Charn Mayot, for example, advises his readers in Chapter 1, “Any service-learning produces a good outcome for only one or two stakeholder group risks exploitation of the rest, and service-learning programs that intentionally or consciously ignore the benefits to other groups reflect an attempt to harvest other stakeholders’ labor.”²⁹ It is also interesting to note that the quote has pointed our attention to exploitation issues for the community as well as students. In fact, specific suggestions have been made by several authors about how to honor and recognize community contributions at the end of our projects. Perhaps, similar questions can also be asked about student exploitation, making sure partner agencies do not use free student labor to perform duties that should have been done by salaried employees with no proper supervision, especially duties outside service-learning agreement. With regard to respect, these writers strongly endorse the idea of diversity/sensitivity training for students by faculty or staff in student affairs, as recommended by John Powers in Chapter 5, where students are expected to be prompt, reliable, respectful, and have the cross-cultural competency in a different society.

In teaching service-learning, we cannot avoid asking whether the project is sustainable given the human, environmental and economic resources available locally. Again, we cite Charn Mayot, as an example, who teaches students the

“sufficiency economy” theory of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej, a long-time intellectual tradition in his homeland. At Baan Amphur Muang in Prachinburi Province, as he writes, Assumption students “learn the principles of a sufficiency economy through exposure to the way community members live, information instruction, and by participating in community activities.”³⁰

Increasingly, in university settings institutional oversight is being established for the ethical conduct of faculty who are engaged in research, especially with regard to human and animal subjects. That oversight is often provided by institutional review boards (IRBs). In addition, various academic disciplines, such as those represented by the American Anthropological Association, the American Psychological Association, the National Association of Social Workers, and the American Sociological Association, have developed discipline-based codes of ethics. Should service-learning programs and centers establish some mechanism or system, such as ethical oversight committees of their own, for oversight of service-learning projects since no formal research is done by service-learning faculty? What is more, because service-learning faculty members come from all disciplines, should each member refer to his or her own discipline’s codes of ethics for guidance in the conduct of service-learning? Contributors to the volume do not give ready answers to the issue, but together they have helped start a worthwhile conversation on the topic.

We want to conclude this introduction with a few words about the structure of the book. The essays have been organized into two parts. The first four chapters, despite their institutional focus, have provided readers with a broad sweep of the history, definitions and methodologies of service-learning in the United States and Asia. In Chapter 1, Charn Mayot gives a brief but accurate overview of the service-learning movement in higher education, which should be quite helpful to those readers who are new to the concept. Chapter 2, by faculty and administrators from ICU, the institution that has taken a leadership role in developing service-learning programs in Asia, furnishes a brief history of service-learning in the region. Kwok Hung Lai, in Chapter 3, offers readers a comparative perspective on the history of service-learning in the North American and Hong Kong contexts. The various examples that he cites, ranging from institutions in the United States to the seven local universities in Hong Kong, show his breadth of knowledge and rich experience in service-learning. In addition, Lai’s detailed account of the different components of service-learning, including institutionalization and assessment, could serve as useful guidelines for faculty training. In Chapter 4, J. Chithra and Helen Mary Jacqueline provide a catalogue for the different service-learning models, including discipline-related, course-related and module-related service-learning.

Each of the six chapters in Part II presents a case study, based on a specific location (country or region), program, or model of service-learning. In the first article in this section, John Powers offers a detailed account of a five-year pilot CBI Program funded by the Hong Kong government's University Grants Committee. As the principle investigator (PI), Powers specifically looks at the program's daily activities with regard to the program's key constituencies, namely, faculty, students, NGOs and government agencies. If Powers' essay is institutional in focus, Jens Mueller and Dennis Lee's work in the following chapter has a disciplinary anchor on business and management education on an international scale. Through a large electronic survey, they analyzed the data collected from 477 service-learning participants in Korea, Singapore, China, Australia, New Zealand, Germany, and the United States. In Chapter 7, Enrique Oracion provides one of the most well-documented case studies in the volume, a 2006 study of the ISLMP program hosted by Silliman University in the Philippines. Chapter 8 by Jen-Chi Yen and Bai-Chuan Yang is a field report from Fu Jen Catholic University, one of the leaders in service-learning in Taiwan. As indicated by the title, Chapter 9, by Dennis Lee, focuses on the Singaporean experience in service-learning, which explores varied curricular designs and ways of learning by doing. Using David Kolb's experiential learning theory as its methodology, Jane Szutu Permaul, in the final chapter of the book, reviews the effectiveness of the W.T. Chan Fellowships Program sponsored by the Lingnan Foundation in the United States. After a careful outcome analysis of this 5-1/2-month-long program among seven cohorts of fellows, she enthusiastically endorses the program as a useful model for other cross-cultural service-learning projects.

In closing, our intent in this introduction is to provide some general information about the thematic focus and organization of the book. We also want to acknowledge the Office of Service-Learning (OSL) at Lingnan University for bringing these international service-learning scholars together at the 1st and 2nd international service-learning conferences co-sponsored by Lingnan University and the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia. We reserve our final comments for the authors. The contributors selected are a distinguished group of international scholars from Thailand, Japan, Hong Kong, India, Singapore, New Zealand, the Philippines, Taiwan and the United States. In addition, some of our contributors have also served in the roles of community leaders and social workers. Because of its multinational, cross-disciplinary and comparative nature, this book should make a unique contribution to the field of service-learning. On the surface, you may find the collections of essays vary widely in style and substance, ranging from

short data report to well-documented critical analysis. But, together, they combine to present a multifaceted field report of service-learning in Asia that allows its service-learning scholars and practitioners to appreciate their past accomplishments and plan for an even broader movement of “Serving to Learn and Learning to Serve” in Asia.

Notes

Introduction

1. For more details about Lingnan's OSL, please refer to the document "Service-Learning and Research Scheme: The Lingnan Model," published by OSL, Lingnan University. The manual is first of its kind in describing how service-learning can be implemented in the Hong Kong context.
2. Dennis Lee, Chapter 9, p. 129.
3. John H. Powers, Chapter 5, p. 81.
4. Jen-Chi Yen and Bai-Chuan Yang, Chapter 8, p. 111.
5. J. Chithra and Helen Mary Jacqueline, Chapter 4, p. 63.
6. Charn Mayot, Chapter 1, p. 20.
7. Enrique G. Orcion, Chapter 7, p. 96.
8. Jens Mueller and Dennis Lee, Chapter 6, p. 88.
9. Charn Mayot, Chapter 1, pp. 24–25.
10. Site visit and interview by the author on January 23, 2007.
11. Martin Luther King, Jr., "Letter from Birmingham Jail," April 16, 1963.
12. Kwok Hung Lai, Chapter 3, p. 58.
13. Enrique G. Oracion, Chapter 7, p. 108.
14. Charn Mayot, Chapter 1, p. 23.
15. Dennis Lee, Chapter 9, p. 137.
16. John H. Powers, Chapter 5, p. 49.
17. Enrique G. Oracion, Chapter 7, p. 99.
18. Yutaka Sato et al., Chapter 2, p. 37.
19. We borrowed the term from Enrique G. Orcion, Chapter 7, p. 92.
20. Tom Smith, as quoted by Dennis Lee in Chapter 9, p. 141.
21. Established in 2004, SLAN currently has six member schools: ICU in Japan, Silliman University in the Philippines, Lady Doak College in India, Chung Chi College at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Seoul Women's University in South Korea, and Soochow University in Taiwan.
22. Enrique G. Oracion, Chapter 7, p. 92.

23. Enrique G. Oracion, Chapter 7, p. 99.
24. Enrique G. Oracion, Chapter 7, p. 107.
25. Kwok Hung Lai, Chapter 3, p. 57.
26. Dennis Lee, Chapter 9, p. 128.
27. *Ibid.*
28. Charn Mayot, Chapter 1, pp. 26–27.
29. Charn Mayot, Chapter 1, p. 24.
30. Charn Mayot, Chapter 1, p. 26.

Chapter 1

1. BG 1403 has been a requirement in undergraduate programs since the inception of the university in 1969.

Chapter 2

1. See for example: McCarthy, F., M. Murakami, T. Nishio, and K. Yamamoto (2005), “Crossing borders at home and abroad: Transformative service-learning for Japanese students,” a paper presented at the 6th Annual Research in Service-Learning Conference, Portland, Oregon. See also Y. Sato, F. McCarthy, M. Murakami, and K. Yamamoto (2008), “The impact of service-learning: Reflections from ICU service-learning alumni,” a paper prepared for the Service-Learning Asia Network Workshop, International Christian University, Tokyo, Japan.

Chapter 3

1. This chapter is based in part on “Integrating service education into the teachers’ training curriculum,” a paper presented at the 1st Asia-Pacific Regional Conference on Service Learning held in Hong Kong in May 2007. The author wants to express his sincere thanks to Professor C. C. Lam, dean of students and director of General Education of the Hong Kong Institute of Education, for his valuable comments on the original manuscript.
2. Established in 1994 upon the foundation of 65 years of teacher training by the former Colleges of Education, the Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIEd) is the only University Grants Committee funded institution dedicated solely to the upgrading and professional development of teacher education in Hong Kong. After 10 years of intensive upgrading and continuous developments, the Institute was granted “self-accrediting” status in 2004. Currently, the Institute provides doctoral, master, and undergraduate degrees, postgraduate diplomas, certificates, and a range of in-service programs to more than 7,000 pre-service students and serving teachers. The Development Blueprint looks at how the HKIEd’s unique role in teacher education can be developed and expanded over the next decade to meet the challenges of the new century through the creation of a Hong Kong University of Education.

3. Lingnan University introduces the Integrated Learning Programme (ILP) to enrich students' learning experiences, enhance their way of thinking and judgment, enable them to interact with others, inspire their creative thinking, and expand their cultural horizons. The ILP, recognized as a graduation requirement, covers the following domains: (1) civic education; (2) intellectual development; (3) physical education; (4) social and emotional development; and (5) aesthetic development. As a part of graduation requirements, all undergraduate students are required to take 75 ILP units during their three-year study.
4. The Hong Kong Baptist University Leadership Qualities Centre of the Office of Student Affairs organizes the University Life subject, which consists of co-curricular learning, a university life workshop, and mentoring. First-year students are required to attend at least eight items of learning, of which four should be a seminar. Students who have not fulfilled that requirement would be required to make up the deficiency by the end of the fourth semester of study. Should they be unable to complete it, they would not be allowed to enroll in subjects in the fifth semester, until their University Life subject deficiency has been made up.
5. As one of the mandatory graduation requirements at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, all full-time undergraduate degree students must participate in at least one non-credit-bearing co-curricular activity. These co-curricular activities aim at rendering additional values, and helping students to broaden their horizons and inspire them to actualize all-round development outside the classroom. They can be any all-encompassing development programs offered by the SAO or support services units; and any other activities in a variety of forms that individual academic departments/schools/faculties consider essential as part of the overall requirement of general education, such as developmental programs, cultural programs, skills enhancement programs, or exchange activity/study tour. Students may opt to participate in activities that have a short duration or that last for a series of sessions, but they must fulfill the minimum attendance requirements, which may vary according to the individual program's nature. Summer attachments, work placement, internships, mentorship programs, volunteer work, community service, and work-integrated education activities forming part of the formal program curriculum are not recognized as co-curricular activities.

Chapter 9

1. All participant quotes have been translated.
2. Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin (1987, 39–45) identified three possible kinds of benefits—academic learning, personal development and program improvement to encourage youths to reflect on their service experiences; see “Learning from Service: Experience is the Best Teacher: Or is It?”, *Youth Service: A Guidebook for Developing and Operating Effective Programs*, Independent Sector, 39–45 (Washington, DC).
3. Tom Smith is famously cited for this quote. It is also claimed to be a Chinese proverb. See <http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/quotes.HTM>.

Index

- academic tourism 8
altruism 96
American Association of Community Colleges (AACCC) 19, 161
American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) 3, 19
American College, India 37, 41, 44
Amity Foundation, China 1, 37, 41, 44
Assumption University xi, 5, 6, 10, 17, 18, 21, 22, 28, 161
 Bangkok Metropolitan Authority 27
 Business and Professional Ethics Seminar 21, 162
 Eco-tourism project 24
 “Head” plus “heart” plus “hands 24
 Komolmas, Martin P. 18
 Mirror Foundation 10, 27
 Siam Cement Lampang Co. Ltd. 27
 St. Martin Center for Professional Ethics and Service Learning xi, 21, 22, 24, 25
 22nd International Conference on Service-Learning (Chiang Mai) 21
- “benevolent programs” 8
Berry, Howard A. 17, 86, 127, 129, 161, 165, 168
Brookfield, Stephen 18, 161
Bunda College 38, 44
- Cambodia
 Kompong Cham Province 132
Campus Compact 3, 18–20, 165, 166
- change agents 7, 91
Chen, Edward K. Y. viii
Cheng, Chi-Lang 115
Chithra, J. 11, 63, 157, 165
Chung Chi College at the Chinese, University of Hong Kong 37, 39, 41, 42, 44, 92, 157
collaboration 5, 22, 24–28, 43, 48, 49, 50, 53, 55, 56, 80
Colloquium on National and Community Service 1995 19
Colorado State University Corporation for National Service 19
 Service Integration Project (SIP) 51
concept of *Kyosei* 8, 42, 92, 167
- developing a knowledge-sharing based study group 116
Development Blueprint 47, 54, 158, 163
discipline-based codes of ethics 11
- education
 of, by, and for experience 131
 of the head, heart, and hand 69
experiential learning 12, 17, 18, 22, 48, 49, 51, 56, 91, 127, 129, 141, 144, 146–148, 150–152, 155, 161–165, 168, 169
- Fu Jen Catholic University xiii, 12, 111, 125
 adoption of service-learning 114
 annual teaching excellence project 111

- book swap mechanism 118
- Chinese knowledge-sharing study group
 - worldwide 125
- computer literacy 115, 117, 124, 130
- holistic education 65, 113
- Holistic Education Center 112
- holistic education curriculum 113
- House of the Dying and Destitute, Calcutta, India 114
- integrated service-learning 114
- international outreach program 114
- Jesuit educational philosophy 112
- KMS software 122
- knowledge-based online study groups 119
- Medical and Social Services Corps, Mongolia 114
- Miao-Li County Information Center 122
- multiple-platform and multiple-class model 120
- pioneer in the promotion of service-learning 126
- professional curriculum 114
- Service-Learning Project for Colleges and Universities in Taiwan 111
- single-platform and multiple-class model 120
- Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) xii, 2, 52, 159
 - Centre for Holistic Teaching and Learning 83
 - community-based instruction (CBI) program 2, 7, 73, 74
 - problem-based learning 7, 74
- Hong Kong Institute of Education x, 47, 48, 158, 163
 - Awards and Co-Curricular Activities Transcript (ACAT) 47
 - caring organization logo 50
 - course-based service experience 55, 61
 - generic teacher competencies framework 53
 - Student Affairs Office (SAO) 48–50, 159
- Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education 50
 - “Creativity, Action, and Service” at the Morrison Hill campus 50
 - “Learning through Serving the Community” project 50
- Hong Kong Polytechnic University 52, 159
- Hong Kong University of Science and Technology 52
- Honnet and Poulsen
 - best service-learning practices 129, 130
- Howard, Adam 149, 169
- Indiana Department of Service Learning Education 18, 25, 161
- Institute of International Education (IIE) 145
- Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) 11
- Intercultural Service-Learning 65, 68, 91, 92, 104, 108, 167
- International Christian University (ICU) xi, xii, xiii, 1, 31, 92, 158, 162, 167
 - advising system 36
 - community service-learning (CSL) 32, 33
- ICU Foundation 2
- international service-learning (ISL) 2, 8, 12, 31, 32, 34, 35, 38, 39, 41, 45, 64, 68, 83, 93, 127–138, 140, 141
- International Service-Learning Evaluation Workshop 37, 38
- keep a journal 35, 42
- keep a portfolio 35
- Nanjing-Tokyo Academic Partnership Conference 38
- networking with Asian institutions 31, 37
- Peace Research Institute 32
- Program for the Promotion of Internationalization of University Education 36
- Programs in the Philippines, India, and Malawi 36
- reconciliation-focused service learning program 38
- Service Learning Center 33, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 45
- Service Learning in Asia: Creating Networks and Curricula in Higher Education conference 38
- Thai Work Camp 32

- International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership (IPSL) xi, 3, 38
- International Service-Learning Model Program (ISLMP) 7–9, 12, 36, 38, 42–44, 92–97, 100, 103–109, 167
- “island programs” 8
- “ISL-Leadership and Character Development” Survey 138
- Jacoby, B. 19, 24, 28, 47, 161, 162, 163
- Jacqueline, Helen Mary 11, 63, 157, 165
- Kayes, Christopher 150–151, 155, 169
- Kendall, Jane C. 48, 127, 161, 162, 163, 168
- King Chulalongkorn (King Rama V, 1868–1910) 20
- Kolb, David A. 12, 17, 56, 129, 135, 141, 146, 147, 148, 150, 161, 163, 168, 169
- Lady Doak College (LDC) ix, 37, 38, 39, 41–44, 63, 65–69, 92, 157, 165
- cohesive curriculum 65, 67
- course-related service-learning 64, 66, 97
- discipline-related service-learning 64, 66
- LAB Serve (a “lab to land project”) 67, 68
- LAMP (learning and application made possible) 67, 68
- module-related service-learning 11, 65, 67
- National Consultation on Institutionalizing Service-Learning 66
- Lai, Kwok Hung 6, 9, 11, 47, 157, 158
- Lawrence, Paul 85
- Lee, Dennis 10, 12, 85, 86, 127, 157, 158
- Lijiang, China 6, 137
- Lingnan University in Hong Kong (LUHK) viii, x, vii, 2, 12, 52, 143, 144, 157, 159, 167
- education for service 2, 143
- Lingnan Community Care Program (LCCP) 2
- Lingnan Foundation 12, 143
- Lingnan Healthcare Program (LHCP) 2
- Lingnan Service-Learning Evaluation Program (LS-LEP) 2
- Office of Service Learning 2, 12, 167
- “Serving to Learn and Learning to Serve” 13
- Ma, Carol Hok Ka 1
- Mayot, Charn 4, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 157, 158
- McCarthy, Florence 31, 158, 165
- Mueller, Jens 12, 85, 157, 166
- multicultural symbiosis 8, 91, 92, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101, 103, 105, 107, 109
- Murakami, Mutsuko 31, 158
- Myanmar
- Hlaing Thayar township, Swi Pytha township 130, 132, 134, 137
- Nanjing University 1, 41, 42, 44
- National and Community Service Trust Act of 1990 19
- National Education Act of 1999 20
- National Junior College 129, 133, 135, 138, 139
- National Society for Experiential Education 19, 163, 169
- New Senior Secondary Curriculum in Hong Kong 53, 54, 61
- Nishio, Takashi 31, 92, 158, 162, 167
- Niyekawa-Howard, Agnes M. 169
- Oracion, Enrique G. 4, 8, 12, 91, 157, 158, 167
- Oregon State University xiii
- parent mentors 131, 133, 134, 137
- partnership 3, 9, 21, 24, 26, 27, 38, 50, 56, 57, 60, 78, 107, 144
- Payap University 5, 21, 37, 41, 42, 44
- Permaul, Jane Szutu 10, 12, 143, 152, 169
- Petra Christian University 37, 39, 41, 42
- pitfall of paternalism 10, 128
- post-expedition debriefing 135
- Powers, John H. 7, 10, 12, 73, 157
- Principles of Good Practice in Combining Service and Learning 19
- Ramburuth, Prem 149, 154, 169
- reciprocal learning 93
- reciprocity 10, 24, 26, 28, 55, 128, 131. *See also* concept of reciprocity

- Record Reflection Log 152
 reflection 2, 22, 23, 34, 35, 36, 40–43, 45,
 50, 55, 56, 58, 60, 63, 70, 94, 95,
 97–100, 102, 104–106, 108, 112,
 129, 31–137, 140, 145, 146, 150,
 152, 153, 155, 158, 165
 Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. 5, 157
 Rhoads, Robert A. 17, 48, 58, 162–165
 rote learning vs. evaluative learning 154
- Sato, Yutaka 31, 157, 158
 Seetoo, Da-Shien 117, 168
 concept of CORPS 117
 Seoul Women's University 37, 39, 41, 42,
 44, 93
 service-learning
 adequate funding viii
 assessment vii, 11, 20, 36, 43–45, 49, 58,
 60, 61, 77, 78, 94, 97, 99, 106, 108,
 109, 166
 Campus Out-Reach Opportunity League
 (COOL) 19
 charity type of 6
 concept of equity 10
 concept of reciprocity 10, 131
 concept of respect 10
 dedicated service-learning office viii
 ethical consideration 108
 indigenous cultural traditions, 3
 misconceptions and misunderstanding vii
 power-related issues 9
 Ramsey, Sigmon and William 18
 social justice education 5–7
 support and commitment of the senior
 management viii
 Service-Learning Asia Network (SLAN) 8,
 35, 37–45, 92, 108, 157
 Sikkema, Mildred 169
 Silliman University, the Philippines xii, 12,
 37, 38, 41–44, 92–94, 96, 97, 99,
 103, 107, 108, 157, 167
 community immersion 106
 cultural differences 31, 43, 68, 69, 87,
 92, 94, 103, 106, 149, 150, 154, 155
 cultural stereotypes 103
 Dumaguete City 38, 42, 94, 104, 167
 Filipino rural communities 6, 108
 Filipino traits 104
 host communities 9, 92–94, 97, 99, 100,
 104–109
 host families 95–99, 101–104, 106, 108,
 109, 145, 146, 154
 language barriers 100, 101
 livelihood projects 107
 local dialect 101
 orientation 28, 36, 41, 42, 59, 69, 78,
 79, 87, 93, 94, 105, 106, 134, 145,
 146, 150, 153–155, 163
 origami 101
 sense of ownership 97, 107
 sign language 101
 social disparity 99
 social inequity 100
 social mobility 100
 social sensitivity 98, 100
 teacher-facilitators 93, 98, 102, 105
 tuba (coconut toddy) 103
 volunteer service program 97
 Singapore International Foundation (SIF)
 x, 2, 129, 130
 Smith, Tom 41, 157, 159
 social exposure and immersion 21, 22
 Soh, Rong'en 140
 Soochow University, Taiwan 37, 41, 44,
 93, 157
 South Asian Association for Regional
 Cooperation (SAARC) 4
 students in Free Enterprise (SIFE) 4,
 85–88, 90, 166
 sufficiency economy 11, 26
 Sun Yat Sen University (SYSU, also known
 as Zhongshan University) 144, 145
 systems theory 92
- Tam Thon Hiep Open House in Vietnam
 130
 Tan, Xin Pei 140
 Total Landcare 38, 44
- United Board for Christian Higher
 Education in Asia (UBCHEA) 12, 31,
 37–40, 106, 167
 University College at Indiana University-
 Purdue University in Indianapolis
 (IUPUI) 51
 University of California, Berkeley (UCB)
 145

- University of California, Los Angeles
(UCLA) xii, 145, 152, 162
- University of Rhode Island 51, 164
- W. T. Chan Fellowship x, 10, 12, 143, 144,
146, 148, 152, 155
- W.T. Chan Fellowships Program Provisions
for Essential Experiential Learning
vii, 155
- language immersion programs 148, 168
- on-site orientation 146
- pre-departure orientation 145
- Waikato Management School xi
- Washington State University 38, 44
- White House Office of National Services
and Points of Light Foundation 19
- Willamette University 52
- Wilson, Woodrow 18, 162
- Wingspread Conference 19
- Wittrock, Merlin C.
generative learning theory 150, 169
- World Indigenous Nations Higher
Education Consortium (WINHEC) 4
- Xing, Jun 1, 2
- Yamamoto, Kano 31, 158, 162
- Yamazaki, Yoshitaka, and D.
abstract conceptualization phase 151
- active experimentation phase 151
- concrete experience phase 151
- Experiential Model of Cross-cultural
Learning Skills 151, 152, 155
- “person-culture congruence” theory of
learning 151
- reflective observation phase 151
- Yang, Bai-Chuan 12, 111, 157
- Yen, Jen-Chi 12, 111, 157
- Youth Expedition Project 2, 129, 133
- Zouba!* (Let’s Go) 1, 7