Service Learning and the Preparation of English Teachers

Heidi L. Hallman and Melanie N. Burdick

In this article, service learning is explored as a pedagogical third space from which preservice teachers learn to teach the New English education. We argue that such a space has the potential to foster preservice English teachers' understanding of their role and identity as future teachers and how this identity is always relative to the students they teach. Drawing from a study of 19 preservice English teachers' experiences with service learning, we discuss three themes relevant to service learning and the preparation of English teachers: (1) service learning as a pedagogical third space for English teachers, (2) service learning as fostering the disruption of a teaching mythology, and (3) service learning as promoting a recognition of the New English education. Further, we propose that service learning can encourage prospective English teachers to complicate notions of teacher/student, official/unofficial language, singular authority/pluralistic power, and server/served.

In English education, the changing student demographics in U.S. schools have prompted some (Boyd et al., 2006; Kirkland, 2008, 2010) to call for a "new" English education, one that, in part, acknowledges the multiple languages and literacies that students bring to the classroom. Swenson, Young, McGrail, Rozema, and Whitin (2006) also reference how the field has been altered by the prevalence of new technologies, therefore urging a reconsideration of everything from what a text is to how mainstream discourses collide with students' home languages. These vast changes suggest, to us, a need to also examine how teachers approach learning to teach in a field that has so quickly evolved. Because many beginning teachers will work in new century spaces where they will encounter the vernacular Englishes (Kirkland, 2008), online social affinities (Black, 2009), and multiethnic communities (Paris, 2010) that our field has helped make visible, we seek to understand how a

future teaching force will approach this changing landscape and how we might effectively prepare them to do so. We suggest, through our study, that service learning, as a component of teacher education programs, can assist beginning teachers in exploring their role and identity as future teachers and helping them to see that their identity is always in relation to the students they teach. Furthermore, we situate service learning as a pedagogical third space (Bhabha, 1994; Kirkland, 2008) for teaching the New English education.

We conceptualize service learning as having the potential to disrupt deficit theorizing on the part of teachers (Sleeter, 2008), thus encouraging teacher candidates to critically question schooling and patterns of inequity. Because we know that many preservice teachers learn to teach by teaching their university peers in mock-teaching environments (Shrofel, 1991), many beginning teachers have few direct, field-based experiences working with youth in schools before student teaching. Therefore, the attitudes that beginning teachers express early in their careers may influence how they will develop as teachers.

Service learning also offers a way to re-envision the relationship between teacher and students. English education has traditionally focused on how to prepare preservice teachers to teach literature, writing, speaking, and, more recently, multimodal literacies, and we know that teacher candidates are still socialized into a traditional, teacher-centered model of instruction (Cuban, 1993; Portes & Smagorinsky, 2010), comprised, in part, of "a conception in which a teacher stands before students who face forward in seats and who are supposedly poised to listen and learn" (Portes & Smagorinsky, 2010, p. 236). Service learning works against this model, thereby becoming both a counter-narrative and conduit for preservice teachers to reconsider the relationship between teacher and students in the New English education. In exploring preservice teachers' understandings and experiences of service learning, we frame our inquiry through the following questions:

1. How do preservice teachers of English conceptualize their present and future roles as English teachers through the context of a service-learning experience? How does this, in turn, suggest the relationship they will have with their students?

2. What do preservice teachers' responses to service learning reveal about the ways in which the role of teacher must shift within the New English education?

Reframing the Roles of Teacher and Students through Service Learning

Teachers of secondary school English are situated within a loosely defined nexus of what constitutes teachers' "professional" knowledge. DiPardo (2003) traces the development of teachers as professionals, linking the term *professional* to an acquired body of specialized knowledge. She also writes that, "while the nature of professionals' 'specialized knowledge' remains the subject of analysis and debate, its importance in terms of authority and prestige endures" (p. 144). In teacher education, specialized knowledge has been viewed as increasingly paired with classroom application (Darling-Hammond, 1997), thereby underscoring a melding of disciplinary, pedagogic, and interpersonal understandings within the act of teaching (DiPardo, 2003). Despite interpersonal understandings comprising part of the teaching act, Portes and Smagorinsky (2010) assert that the paradigm of "teacher as authority" is still the dominant model of classroom teaching into which beginning teachers are socialized. This model, one that "presents" knowledge to students in a way that encourages a passive consumption of knowledge, has been confirmed also as a dominant teaching method in studies of classroom discourse (e.g., Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur, & Prendergast, 1997), linking it to a culture of schooling resistant to change. At the same time that we acknowledge the entrenched nature of this paradigm, we seek to find other models through which to socialize beginning English teachers, thereby urging them to question the taken-for-granted relationships between teacher and students.

Service learning, a component of the educational system in the United States since the 1800s, is, as Eyler and Giles (1999) state, concerned with the "links between personal and interpersonal development and cognitive, academic development" (p. 9). Community service, Flower (2008) notes, brings "idealism and social consciousness into the academy. It brings a human face and complex lives into discussion of ideas and issues. But it can also plunge teachers and students into its own set of contradictory and sometimes profoundly conflicted social and literate practices" (p. 153). As service learning situates itself with both the notions of "service" and "inquiry," scholars (e.g., Flower, 2002, 2008; Schutz & Gere, 1998) have debated the balance the act of service learning must strike between the two; as Kaufman (2004) observes, "English education students often arrive in Methods classes eager to learn the ins and outs of lesson plans, but, through service-learning, they also discover that they need to understand something more about themselves; the question of what they need to be effective about is a crucial one" (p. 178).

343

Being effective in the act of service learning means being open to in-
quiry and reflection. Short stints of "service" in the community, such as forays
into soup kitchens and homes for the elderly, are referred to by Joe Mertz as

Being effective in the act of service learning means being open to inquiry and reflection.

"guerilla service" (Mertz & Schroerlucke, 1998,
as cited in Flower, 2002, p. 181), and such acts
have been criticized for being superficial acts of
service lacking opportunities for critical reflec-
tion about the experiences. Further, these short
service acts reinforce the distance between the "giver" and the "receiver"
in the service act, thereby reinscribing the server-served dichotomy.

Flower's (2002, 2008) exploration of service learning problematizes
the server-served dichotomy that service learning often creates and articu-
lates a more complex picture of the potential role reversals present in the
act of service learning. Her work features *reciprocity*—a concept that refers
to both the interchange in roles between teacher and student as well as the
interchange between university and community partnerships—as central
to service learning's definition, thus seeking to reverse the longstanding
practice of the academy using the community for the academy's own ends
(Zlotkowski, 1996). As Flower (1997) notes, some people in service learning
have been continually cast as "the knowledgeable servers, while [others are
cast] as the clients, patients, or the educationally deficient—the served" (p.
96), and a server-served dichotomy is often perpetuated in service learning's
connotation. Flower's (2008) recent work, however, theorizes service learn-
ing as having the capacity to break this dichotomy through an exploration
of the relationship between "self" and "other."

We subscribe to Flower's conclusion that the primary goals of service
learning are twofold. First, service learning must have a goal of viewing
"self" and "other" as ultimately intertwined. A breaking of the self-other
dichotomy through the act of service learning is essential for participants'
reflection on "self" as well as for participants' recognition of their prior, and
perhaps limited, understandings. Second, the act of service learning must
be pursued alongside a process of inquiry. Flower (2008) notes that inquiry
must begin by "confronting the conflicts within the everyday practice of
outreach" (p. 154). Service learning, then, as inquiry, becomes not a series
of interventions or programs but instead is treated as a situated sociocultural
activity—an activity that is always socially, culturally, and historically located.

Finally, we also situate service learning firmly within what Kirkland
(2008, 2010) refers to as the "New" English education. Kirkland describes
the New English education as an approach that values student voice along-
side the canon and that acknowledges the promise of fluctuating literacies

alongside standardized literacies. The New English education is committed to diversity, technology, and hybridity and is both a reaction to and an interaction with the current state of language in our world. In urban areas especially, a changing student demographic affects schooling because of linguistic and cultural pluralism and the predominance of technology in communication and literacy practices. Kirkland describes the need for a "pedagogical third space" (Bhabha, 1994) in English education that synthesizes traditional school literacies with students' lived literacies. This, then, becomes the foundation of the New English education. Echoing Bhabha (1994), whose discussion of third space theory refers to third spaces as sites "for elaborating strategies of selfhood . . . that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself" (pp. 1–2), both Kirkland (2008) and Moje et al. (2004) position "pedagogical third spaces" as those spaces that challenge and expand what types of literacy practices are valued in school and in the world at large. Through an invitation to youth to bring their everyday literacy practices into the classroom, both Kirkland (2008) and Moje et al. (2004) assert that such a third space can be fostered.

The manifestation of third space in classrooms and after-school programs has been cited as a possibility by Moje et al. (2004) in that "third space" is a merging of students' "first space" (their home language) and the "second spaces" they encounter in the world (such as the space of school). Resonant with research conducted on students' in- and out-of-school literacies (e.g., Hull & Schultz, 2002), "third space" as both a theoretical construct and real-world space is particularly attuned to articulating the "mismatches" between students' home and school literacies.

The foundation of the New English education, as Kirkland (2008) describes it, is built upon "third space" and Bhabha's (1994) work, and it contrasts the opposing literacies of "official spaces" (as schools and classrooms) and "unofficial spaces" (as students' homes and communities). In the unofficial spaces, Kirkland notes that students make aesthetic and communicative choices daily regarding the literacies around them, often in direct response to the official literacy expressions that confine and judge them in school. The unofficial literacy spaces, then, showcase both acts of resistance and judgments of beauty. Within the confines of the official spaces, judgment of beauty is most often dictated to students through the white, standardized eye, and students become voiced through, or over, rather than allowed the power of uncertainty and variation through their "unofficial," dissenting voices. Bhabha's (1994) assertion that minority groups can reclaim their identity by creating a third space—a separate space that is *neither the One*

. . . nor the Other . . . but something else besides, which contests the terms and territories of both (p. 28), emphasizes how actors within third spaces can be both participants and critics of official and unofficial spaces.

Consequently, training preservice teachers to embrace and understand the New English education becomes a process of encouraging beginning teachers to undergo a metaphorical passage from an alignment with the standardized, white, schooled literacy to a pluralistic understanding and acceptance of what literacy is and can be. Within our postmodern educational setting, we must train teachers to grapple with unsettling ideas, as described by Kirkland (2010), "in which authority is de-centered, notions of truth are questioned and questionable, grand narratives are deconstructed, knowledge is functional, and Englishes are plural" (p. 232). Preservice teachers must become, as Kirkland (2008) invites, brave enough to follow the seemingly radical literacy expressions of their trailblazing students. But, in complicating how preservice teachers see literacy, we believe the relational spaces of teacher-student, official-unofficial language, singular authority–pluralistic power, server-served must also be complicated. These hierarchical relationships are the "grand narratives" that must be deconstructed. We propose this passage could begin through service-learning experiences that also inherently complicate such roles. Service learning, we propose, is the "pedagogical third space" in which to learn to teach English in the twenty-first century.

Research Methods

Context(s) of the Study

This study took place in the context of the secondary English education methods course at our university. During and after this course, we studied how 19 preservice English teachers responded to the act of service learning in relationship to their identity as future English teachers. Throughout our analysis of participants' written reflections and interviews, we present a more complex understanding of preservice teachers' understanding of their present and future role as teachers. We suggest how teacher educators, such as ourselves, might frame service-learning experiences in teacher education programs in ways that urge preservice teachers to contemplate the roles that all participants play in the service-learning experience. While we take into consideration the concerns that Flower (2002, 2008) posits about service learning and reciprocity, we articulate what service learning can contribute to the field of English education.

As part of the course, Teaching English in Middle/Secondary Schools, we envisioned that a service-learning experience, as a component of the course, would present beginning teachers with opportunities to tutor youth in reading and writing, better understand youth's in-school and out-of-school literacies, and provide a context for preservice teachers' ongoing identity formation. At the time of the study, all 19 of the preservice teachers involved in the study were in the process of becoming licensed teachers in the area of secondary English language arts education at Green State University (all names of people and places are pseudonyms) and all were in their junior or senior year of college. Green State University is a large, Midwestern university located in a community of 90,000 people. Because the university is also situated 45 miles from Marshall City, a large metropolitan area of just over 2 million, the relative proximity of Marshall City to Green State University offers teacher education students the ability to attend the state's flagship institution, yet complete their student teaching experience in schools located in the state's largest metropolitan center. Green State University, also surrounded by rural communities and towns, gives teacher education students the option to complete early-field experiences and student teaching in any or all of urban, suburban, and rural contexts.

The school year 2009–10, in which this study took place, also marked the 100th anniversary of Green State University's School of Education. This anniversary brought the change of Green State's teacher education program from a five-year licensure program to a four-year program. The university's five-year program had been in existence since 1984; however, the program had been under increasing pressure by state officials, university administration, parents, and community members to revise its fifth-year component, thus revising its current program. Green State will move to a four-year teacher certification program in 2011.

At the time of our study, participants were involved in a 2-year sequence of courses prior to their student teaching year (5th year of the program), which was designed to prompt preservice teachers to understand the context of schooling in the United States; the relationships between schools, society, and families; knowledge about curriculum and pedagogy within the field of English language arts; and knowledge about oneself as a teacher. The course, Teaching English in Middle/Secondary Schools, the site of our study, was part of this coursework. During the Fall 2009 semester, Heidi and Melanie co-taught this course and implemented the service-learning component. Three service-learning sites in the local community were identified the summer before we initiated the change in the course, and we worked in

collaboration with the Center for Service Learning to find sites that sought preservice teachers to work with adolescents, specifically in the areas of reading and writing. These sites included an after-school program at a local junior high school, a tutoring program for English Language Learners at a local high school, and a class at a local high school entitled Writing for the College Bound.

We focus, in this article, on two of the three service-learning sites: Cloverleaf Junior High's after-school program and Walnut Grove High School's ESL tutoring program. We focus on these sites for specific reasons: (1) the majority of our students (14 of the 19 preservice teachers) were placed in these two sites, (2) the service-learning experiences at these sites took place outside of the school day (either before or after school), and (3) Cloverleaf Junior High[1] and Walnut Grove High[2] were, respectively, the community's most diverse junior high and high school. We feel that the portrait that this diversity of context creates mirrors a reality as documented in research literature (e.g., Haddix, 2008)—a reality that a majority white teaching force (such as is the group of preservice teachers featured in our study[3]) will work in increasingly diverse school contexts. In Table 1 found in Appendix A, we feature the demographics of participants involved in service-learning at Cloverleaf Junior High and Walnut Grove High.

Preservice teachers taking part in the study entered their service-learning sites approximately three weeks into the academic semester. Before entering their service-learning sites, Heidi and Melanie presented the concept of service learning to the preservice teachers through a discussion of service learning based on the work of Linda Flower (2008). In our discussion of Flower's (2008) work, we emphasized the importance of pairing observation with inquiry as well as grappling with the roles of "server" and "served." Heidi and Melanie also invited a representative from Green State University's Center for Service Learning to speak with the students enrolled in the course. Green State University is one of the few institutions of higher education in the country that has an established Center for Service Learning (since 2005), and the center was a pivotal force in identifying organizations in the community that expressed a clear need and/or desire for a relationship with the university. This, in turn, allowed for us to select the three sites that were seeking partnership with the university with a goal of sustaining a service-learning relationship. Throughout one academic semester, all preservice teachers completed 20 hours of service learning at one of the sites described above. Although the Center for Service Learning assisted us in initiating our contacts with the three field sites, Heidi and Melanie

facilitated all placements and were involved in discussions throughout the semester in contact with the teacher(s) at each site.

The service-learning work that the preservice teachers undertook at the two sites, Cloverleaf Junior High and Walnut Grove High, was structured primarily through one-on-one tutoring between preservice teacher and adolescent. Preservice teachers involved in Cloverleaf's after-school program assisted students with completing homework or led students in book clubs and other language arts–related activities. For example, screenplay writing had proved to be of high interest to many students who attended Cloverleaf's after-school program in past years, and one preservice teacher continued this group, sharing scripts that other adolescents had written in past years. Walnut Grove High School's ESL tutoring program took the form of one-on-one tutoring before the school day started. One frustration that several preservice English teachers expressed over the course of the semester was their lack of desire to assist ESL students with homework outside the domain of language arts.

Data Collection and Analysis

We explore preservice teachers' experiences of service learning through their stories of "self," as we view these stories as important windows into understanding beginning teachers' relationships with students. Mishler (1999) notes that the stories we, as people, tell about our lives are the ways we "express, display, [and] make claims for who we are—in the stories we tell and how we tell them" (pp. 19–20). Therefore, the stories that preservice teachers told us were identity claims about who they were in the service-learning act. In discussing the concept of identity, we adhere to a view of identity that is fluid and complex, as well as inherently "social." Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, and Cain (1998) discuss the premise that "identities, the imaginings of self in worlds of action, [are] . . . lived in and through activity and so must be conceptualized as they develop in social practice" (p. 5). Identities, then, are always formed in relationship to others and are always historically and culturally situated (Harding, 2004).

We feature preservice teachers' stories of self, as told to us within reflective journals and focus group interviews, within our exploration of service learning. We purposefully prompted students to focus on the self as a way to situate teacher identity as a gradual formation of "becoming" (Gomez, Black, & Allen, 2007). In our study, we feature stories of preservice teachers' service-learning experiences in an attempt to understand the "becoming" of participants' teacher identities.

The study used a number of data collection methods to attend to preservice teachers' stories of self as related to their service-learning experience. The first of these methods involved conducting focus group interviews with four small groups of preservice teachers after they had completed the service-learning experience. The focus group interviews, conducted by Heidi and Melanie, asked participants to comment on (1) their service-learning experience over the course of one semester; (2) the triumphs and challenges experienced; (3) how they, as future teachers, thought about their role within the service-learning context; and (4) a particular experience working with one adolescent over the course of the semester. The prompts framing the focus group interviews specifically asked preservice teachers to view stories of self as a method for thinking about their experiences of service learning. All focus groups were between 45 minutes and one hour long and each included no fewer than four and no more than six participants. Our rationale for using focus groups in the interviewing process was based on our intention to elicit dialogue between multiple students that would more authentically reveal their feelings and perceptions about service learning. We also thought that participants may be able to synthesize their experience in deeper ways by being privy to other's narratives of their experiences. The prompts used in the focus group interviews can be found in Appendix B.

A second source of data for the study was the participants' reflective journals. Through reading the participants' journals, collected three times throughout the semester-long study, we were reminded that these journals were individuals' identity performances, or "imaginings of the self in worlds of action" (Holland et al., 1998, p. 5). Preservice teachers were given a series of prompts to guide their journal writing (see Appendix C). They were encouraged to respond to any of the prompts in multiple journal entries throughout the semester. Although the series of prompts featured in Appendix C spanned a range of topic areas, our research focused on those journal entries that responded to how participants envisioned their role in the service-learning site.

The reflective tools that preservice teachers were given (e.g., prompts featured in Appendix C) were presented to the preservice teachers in the context of the Methods class. In the Methods class, Heidi specifically introduced the concept of the New English education to preservice teachers, especially engaging them in discussion of students' out-of-school literacies (Hull & Schultz, 2002). Though preservice teachers were enthusiastic about contemplating adolescents' out-of-school reading and writing practices, at

times they resisted these practices as relevant to the "official" English classroom. The presentation of such ideas in the Methods class was an important framing for the service-learning experience in which the preservice teachers would soon be engaging.

The focus group interviews and journals produced a number of participant stories that we considered to be data. These stories were, in the case of the interviews, transcribed. When reading through participants' stories, a qualitative process of data analysis was initiated through the use of inductive and deductive coding constructs (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Our analysis of the data was inductive in the way it first sought to find recurring themes in preservice teachers' stories of self in both the focus group conversations and reflective journals. We were attentive to the ways that preservice teachers described the service-learning site in which they worked, the youth with whom they worked, and their perceived role in the service-learning site. For example, a theme that was recurrent in several preservice teachers' stories was the transitional state of identity preservice teachers expressed as part of working within service-learning sites. Some preservice teachers described this state of identity as one "between" teacher and tutor, while others found they needed to reposition their identity each time they worked within their service-learning site, depending on students' needs. The theme of "transitional state of identity," then, became an inductive code through which we read preservice teachers' stories.

Next, our analysis process used deductive coding constructs as a way of triangulating the findings that we gleaned through our inductive approach. In taking a deductive approach to coding our data, we searched for themes that we expected may be present in the preservice teachers' stories, based on our knowledge of the literature on service learning, teaching diverse students, the New English education, and third space theory. For example, several preservice teachers expressed that the after-school site in which they worked was a space different from the classroom because it validated students' out-of-school literacies. Yet, this space was simultaneously influenced by the "official" space of the school. Preservice teachers reflected on how the pedagogy they used in the after-school space was unique and responsive to students' literacies. This, in our coding, resonated with "third space theory," and therefore "third space" was a code that we applied in a deductive manner to our data. After inductive and deductive analyses were completed, we located narratives that exemplified an identified theme or themes in the preservice teachers' stories of service learning.

Findings

It was through an interplay of undertaking both an inductive and deductive coding process that three central themes were illuminated in regard to service learning and the preparation of English teachers: (1) a pedagogical third space for English teachers, (2) disruption of a teaching mythology, and (3) recognition of the New English education. These three themes captured the themes within preservice teachers' stories and are explored in depth in the remainder of the article. Preservice teachers' stories of self are featured as the windows through which these three themes are illustrated.

A Pedagogical Third Space for English Teachers

When describing the New English education and the need for a "pedagogical third space," Kirkland refers to Bhabha's (1994) ideas on cultural difference and transformation. Most applicable is Bhabha's contention that while popular, multiculturalism actually reinforces the dominant culture by relegating the non-dominant cultures to mere entertainments or assumed responses within the grid of dominance (Bhabha, 1994). Bhabha's third space is a place of hybridity, "which enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom" (qtd. in Rutherford, 1990, p. 211). Kirkland's envisioning of a pedagogical third space, then, is one that moves beyond basic multiculturalism. This can seem unsettling for many teachers, and beginning teachers especially. After all, it is asking them to encourage these emerging "other positions" and "new structures of authority" from their students while they are simultaneously attempting to find their own positions and structures of authority as classroom teachers. Finding a space of hybridity, then, asks beginning teachers to look anew at who students are in the classroom: What identities do they inhabit and what identities exist as possibilities?

These positions and structures of authority are described by DiPardo (2003) when she discusses the process that teachers engage in when acquiring a body of specialized knowledge as related to the "authority and prestige" (p. 144) it holds. For a beginning teacher, the creation of a pedagogical third space requires both the acquisition of specialized knowledge and the willingness to circumvent that knowledge and authority when students bring new Englishes into the classroom. Scholars such as Lisa Delpit (2002) have noted that learning to pedagogically negotiate this collision between the "official"

and "unofficial" takes practice and reflection. Therefore, we believe it also involves close personal experiences that pursue such collisions.

Betty Gering, a preservice teacher who worked at Cloverleaf Junior High, consistently questioned the position she was asked to assume in the after-school program and struggled to articulate the value of such a position to her view of herself as a future teacher, despite seeing a value in such a position for the students with whom she worked. In a focus group interview, Betty told us that a consistent challenge for her was

> understanding what role they [Cloverleaf Junior High after-school program coordinators] wanted us to take with the students. I didn't understand if I was a teacher, a role model, a friend, or all of this. On some days, I didn't have the option to really be the "teacher" and this affected my view of who I was. I don't like feeling that uncertainty but I know that this is probably part of teaching. It was just a reality check for me and an awkward role to have.

Clearly, Betty struggled to define her role in the after-school site. Kirkland (2010) reminds us that it is not an option to abandon the official English as this is the "current code of power . . . [which can] protect diverse students from cultural domination, absorption, and social marginalization" (pp. 301–302). So, we are asking preservice and beginning teachers to not only learn how to articulate the current code of power to their students but, while doing so, also begin to critique their own dominance and authority to make space for the languages students carry into the classroom. This is a complicated task to say the least, and one that might be eased into and practiced. Kaufman (2004) describes service learning as a natural place for students to engage in this inquiry, as it requires reflection and continually complicates the boundaries of performance and relationship in teaching.

In her final journal entry, Betty continued to elaborate on the space she occupied in the after-school program at Cloverleaf. Though she said that it consistently made her nervous to redefine her role every time she worked in the program, she began to notice that students were responsive to her even during times when she felt she wasn't clearly "a teacher." Betty wrote:

> I actually ended up spending a lot of time just talking with the students about their interests . . . like why they loved the *Twilight* series so much, for example. At first I wasn't sure if I really should be talking to them about the things they do outside of school, but they were really eager to tell me about it. I actually was able to use some references to *Twilight* in the book discussions we had about other books and I could tell the students really responded to me after I became more comfortable getting to know them. But I was doing this in the after-school space, not the formal classroom.

Several of our study's preservice teachers described an occupation of their "transitional state" of identity while engaged in service learning. Through their experience, they reflected on their positions of authority as these contrasted with the needs of their students. Because the service-learning environment required close relationships through one-on-one tutoring, preservice teachers were not positioned in a traditional teacher role, standing in front of a (passive) class and extolling information. This different positioning with students placed the preservice teachers closer to students and further from curriculum, loosening up the authoritarian, traditional role. They were not creating curriculum but rather working through another teacher's curriculum with the students as they tutored. One preservice teacher, Maria Collins, illustrates this change in position when she writes:

Because the service-learning environment required close relationships through one-on-one tutoring, preservice teachers were not positioned in a traditional teacher role, standing in front of a (passive) class and extolling information.

> The experience I am having tutoring is teaching me more than I had anticipated. I expected to gain knowledge of students' skills and how to help the students. I am gaining that, but I am also gaining more. When tutoring at Cloverleaf school, I am learning that students are individual people and they need individual attention. Each student I work with at Cloverleaf needs something different from me. Some need help with homework, others want to play a game, and some even seem as if they simply want a friend. Since I am not their teacher, I can be all three to them.

The story Maria tells reflects her negotiation with her teaching role while working with individual students, and how this, to her, is not an entirely academic role. However, she reports that she is able to assume this role because she is "not their teacher"—because a teacher, in her mind, must fulfill the traditional, authoritarian stance of curriculum creator and dispenser. Interacting with students as individuals and valuing their individual needs was not congruent with Maria's idea of a teacher's role. Stepping outside the traditional role of teacher allowed Maria to interact with students in ways that valued their individual perspectives and needs. Further, it was not a part of the traditional teacher identity in which a teacher creates and shares curriculum with a homogenous group of students. Understanding that students have different needs and are bringing these needs to the classroom can become a step toward a willingness to negotiate students' experiences and Englishes with the traditional teacher's identity. Additionally, it can lead to the eventual creation of a pedagogical third space.

On reading other preservice teachers' journal entries, though, we found that some students processed their identity as teacher within the tutoring situation in different ways. While Maria and Betty believed that they could make certain moves with their students because they were "not their teacher," preservice teacher Jim Fraser equalized the roles of *teacher* and *tutor* in his written reflections. Though Jim's view of his role in the service-learning site was distinctly different from many others' views, his perspective, nonetheless, affirmed the idea that preservice teachers' identity-building process resided on a continuum that was affected by certain experiences with students.

Jim was a student who was employed as a para-educator at Walnut Grove High while he was completing his service-learning experience. Jim had worked as a para-educator for more than two years prior to the time of the study. His extensive experience in schools before entering his service-learning experience likely contributed to the way he was able to articulate how his current experience in the service-learning context connected to his future position as *teacher*, as he came to the study having spent much more time in schools in comparison to his fellow preservice teachers. Jim described his students as "unmotivated" or "unreceptive" to working with a tutor, and his service-learning experience again presented him with students he generally characterized as "not wanting to do school." Yet, Jim reflected on how these experiences working with youth had, over time, provided him with an experience to grow as an educator. He saw his service-learning experience continuing this growth. In his first journal entry, Jim wrote:

> Both of the students I am working with this semester are highly unmotivated English language learners so I have come to learn about maximizing motivation in multiple ways. Sometimes extrinsic motivators work if students are not built with a lot of intrinsic motivation. Either way, it is important to learn what a student cares about and familiarize yourself with this in order to maximize the productivity of tutoring sessions.

Jim expressed much more comfort than the majority of preservice teachers in viewing his tutoring methods as valuable to his future role as *teacher*. Jim described this in his final journal reflection by stating:

> Really, developing a strong rapport and knowing your students goes a long way with struggling learners so they know you are on their side. I have enjoyed making the goals of my own students pivotal to my own goals as a tutor, para-educator or teacher.

Being one of only two preservice teachers involved in the study who had been previously or was currently employed in the local school district ap-

peared to have provided Jim with an alternate view of the service-learning experience with regard to the views that many other preservice teachers held. Jim's statement, featured above, challenges the server-served dichotomy in a meaningful way by claiming that the goals of students might also be viewed as the goals of the teacher or tutor. His understanding that his students' goals are "pivotal" and learning from them is a process to be "enjoyed" shows that his understanding of his identity as a teacher is more complex than Maria's or Betty's fairly traditional one, and that he is becoming more open to the idea of a pedagogical third space where official and unofficial Englishes can coexist.

Through the service-learning experience, preservice teachers described their negotiation of the role of teacher and how they were beginning to make space for and value the experiences their students brought to school spaces.

Through the service-learning experience, preservice teachers described their negotiation of the role of teacher and how they were beginning to make space for and value the experiences their students brought to school spaces. Calling to mind Flower's (2008) ideas of reciprocity in service learning, we witnessed that a reconfiguration of the server-served dichotomy and teacher-student relationship began to unfold for Betty, Jim, and Maria. As these negotiations and reconfigurations occurred, the teacher's role changed into one who held official knowledge yet still worked to meet students and puzzle through their individual motivations and Englishes. This puzzling meeting place represents a progression toward inhabiting a pedagogical third space for teaching English.

Disruption of a Teaching Mythology

Portes and Smagorinsky (2010) remind us that the dominant model of classroom teaching into which English teachers are socialized is one that adheres to a role of "teacher as authority." Thonus (2001), similarly, reflects that the dominant model for socializing writing tutors is one that differentiates *tutor* and *teacher*, with a tutor's role being distinct and different from a teacher's. Yet, she notes that this is, indeed, a *tutoring mythology*—a mythology that constrains the tutor's role, limiting it to "issues of personality and strategies of interpersonal interaction" (p. 61). We feel, similarly, that the role of "teacher as authority" bolsters a *teaching mythology* that constrains beginning teachers' views of an appropriate teacher's role.

Several preservice teachers in our study seemed bound to the teaching mythology, as they focused on the stymied position they felt in the service-learning context. Both at Cloverleaf and at Walnut Grove, beginning teachers

perceived they were in a clearly defined hierarchy consisting of *teacher* and *tutor* while working within their service-learning sites, with teachers possessing the specialized knowledge that allowed them authority and autonomy in the classroom. The expressed teacher-tutor juxtaposition was a focal point in their narratives. Through the following narratives, we explore both participants' confirmation of and disruption of a teaching mythology.

One preservice teacher, Erin Stiller, described the relationship between *teacher* and *tutor* by saying, "I see myself as a tutor and a tutor is more like a friend but still has some authority. The teacher is mainly an authority figure and the person who ultimately makes the choices." Erin referenced her role at her service-learning site when she told us that "teachers set the framework of assignments while a tutor must work within that framework." Erin's comments were based, in part, on her perception that a tutor resides in a lower-status role than that of a teacher. Interestingly, despite acknowledging a tutor's so-called lower status, several preservice teachers still processed the job of a tutor as more complex than the job of a teacher. Because of the lack of autonomy to make decisions in the classroom, many preservice teachers embraced the idea that a tutor needed more patience when working with students. Sam Archer, a preservice teacher participating in Cloverleaf's after-school program, expressed the difficulties of possessing patience with the seventh-grade students he worked with when he said,

> When I was at the school I wished that I could slow down the class and allow the student I was mainly working with to get the help he needed. But, that is how it is. Teachers are moving forward and tutors are slowing down.

Several preservice teachers told us that they only possessed "so much" agency in changing those conditions. When listening to the comments such as those made by Erin and Sam, we detected an uneasiness in preservice teachers' observations, and this uneasiness stemmed from their perception that they were en route to becoming a *teacher*, and therefore, were ready to shed the role of *tutor*. This location of being a "not-yet" teacher placed them at an identity point difficult for them to define. Not only were they asking, "Who are the students I am working with at my service-learning site?" but they were also asking, "Who am I at my service-learning site?"

Bakhtin's (1990) understanding of the relationship between self and other helps us understand the impetus for teachers' questioning of self through a relationship with other. Bakhtin (1990) believed that the self always resides in two spaces at once: the space that is I and the space that is other. These two spaces are always in relation to each other and are continually referenced in the creation of self. Bakhtin referenced this when he said:

to see ourselves, we must appropriate the vision of others. . . . I see myself
as others might see it. In order to forge a self, I must do so from outside.
In other words, I author myself. (qtd. in Holquist, 1990, p. 28)

In a Bakhtinian sense, then, teachers involved in the service-learning act
authored themselves as future teachers, in part, through authoring the re-
lationship they had with the other—the students with whom they worked.
They created reciprocity within their relationships with students that allowed
them to continually negotiate who they were in the moment and who they
were in response to a teaching mythology. We illustrate this Bakhtinian
understanding of the relationship between self and other through Dierdre
Turner's narratives.

Dierdre was placed at Cloverleaf Junior High for her service-learning
experience and spent most of her time working with students who came to
the homework lab, a part of Cloverleaf's after-school program. Throughout
her weekly journal entries, she often began with the sentence, "Same as last
week—not much to report as most students told me, 'no help needed' when I
asked them if they needed help." Dierdre often expressed her disappointment
with this, as well as expressed her own need to feel useful and purposeful as
a teacher. In one journal entry, she wrote:

> I guess that the way I feel about my service-learning experience could be
> viewed as a lesson learned and something that I now understand. This
> lesson being that some kids will take no time at all to become comfortable
> around me as a teacher and others will take a little while longer to get used
> to me. As I discussed in a previous journal entry, I don't like feeling like
> kids don't like me and that I'm not a good teacher. However, I am seeing
> that this is not the way to view things. The reality might be that not all
> students will see me as essential to their learning. I will have to realize
> this before I start teaching. But now I think I will realize this before I start
> student teaching!

Throughout her service-learning experience, Dierdre was in the process
of questioning how students related to her as a teacher. Her focus on the
relationship between self and other became a focal point for her semester
spent at Cloverleaf, and in another entry later in the semester she reflected,
in a more critical fashion, on her perceptions:

> Again, this week there is not too much to report. One thing that I've found
> myself bothered by this semester is that some students don't come to the
> homework lab to get homework help. They come to hang out. At the begin-
> ning of the semester, I found myself responding to this very negatively,
> thinking, "Why don't you just go home?" But then I found myself feel-
> ing guilty and disappointed in my judgments. Yes, some kids do come to

> Cloverleaf's homework lab because maybe this place is more comforting than home for them. I have realized that the bias I had at the beginning of the semester could potentially affect my teaching and the way I relate to students. It hurts me to realize that I have passed these judgments because I was seeing how I viewed my life as the "right" kind of life.

The questioning of the relationship between teacher and students found throughout Dierdre's experience encourages teacher educators to see that service learning can be, with guidance and reflection, a conduit by which individuals understand who they are and how they perceive others. Bakhtin (1990) believed that humans are always in the process of negotiating with others—how they "address" each other as well as how they "answer" each other. Because we use the contexts in which we live to do this negotiation, it is important that these contexts be selected to provide such opportunities. The service-learning sites, such as Cloverleaf's after-school program, opened a window to preservice teachers' understanding of the "relational" aspect of teaching, in part because teachers were taken outside of the "official" school space of the English classroom. Students, such as Dierdre, started to become, as Kirkland (2008) encourages, brave enough to question the mythologies and investigate the relational spaces of teacher-student, unofficial-official, and singular authority–pluralistic power that undergird the New English education.

Recognition of the New English Education

Through service learning, preservice teachers also started to recognize that teaching is constituted by more than a series of teaching techniques (see Harste, Leland, Schmidt, Vasquez, & Ociepka, 2004). Instead, observing the manifestations of teaching English in "unofficial" school spaces assisted preservice teachers with viewing teaching as a complex negotiation of multiple systems at play in the classroom (Lave & Wegner, 1991). These multiple systems included the new literacies in which adolescents were proficient.

At times, though, this realization illuminated the multiple challenges that lie ahead in their future teaching careers. Preservice teacher Elise Norton's journal entry aptly describes the feelings of dismay that accompanied her view of an English classroom. Elise completed some observations of English classrooms at Cloverleaf in addition to working in the after-school program. After observing some of these "official" school spaces, Elise wrote:

> One of the things I observed that I think is the most thought-provoking and will be something I will continue to deal with as a student teacher and hired teacher is the students' engagement with the material. I am not sure

if I ever saw a student fully engaged in the classroom that I was in. The teacher was excellent, the curriculum was interesting, the activities were creative, the directions were clear, but the students either didn't care at all or only cared about completing the assignment correctly. Their goals were centered around getting A's and doing the assignment the right way, not on what they were learning. It makes me wonder how, as a teacher, I can get my students to redirect their focus to their learning. I want my students to assess what they are learning and what they want to learn, and how it is beneficial to them, but seeing a good teacher like Mrs. Monroe not even be able to do this is discouraging.

It is interesting to note that Elise describes what is happening in this class-room as a one-way movement, with students on one side and the material and teacher on the other. Students weren't "engaged" despite seemingly interesting and clear curriculum, materials, teaching, and directions. There is little description or acknowledgment of what the students might be bring-ing to the classroom to engage with the curriculum. Again, this seems to be the traditional paradigm of teacher as authority, dispensing curriculum to students who are poised to listen and learn and who are, instead, passive and unengaged. What is important to these students is "completing the assign-ment correctly . . . getting A's . . . doing the assignment the right way," or, in other words, mimicking the official language passed down by the teacher, without bringing any of their own lives or interests to the process.

Elise sees this as a problem. She wants students "to assess what they are learning." More than that, she wants students to have some say in, or at least consider, "what they want to learn." It is clear to her that these acts of self-assessment and metacognition are not natural or common elements of the traditional English classroom where official knowledge comes from the teacher and students' unofficial languages are disengaged.

Elise noted that the classroom she observed was a contrast to what she observed in the after-school program. In the after-school program, she noted that some of the same students that she observed in the classroom were now engaged in ways that she had not seen:

> It was amazing seeing Mercedes in both the classroom and in the after-school program. She was part of Kylie's [another preservice teacher] book club and was pretty vocal in the book discussion. I did not see her act like this in the classroom.

As Elise notes, students like Mercedes were participating in literacy learning in ways unseen in the classroom. This evidence may reaffirm the in-school/out-of-school literacy divide that teachers must come to understand to re-

cruit students' out-of-school literacies—those literacies fostered in homes, after-school programs, and community-based organizations where "literacy flourishes" (Hull & Schultz, 2002, p. 2). Elise's recognition that this is, indeed, the New English education in action bodes well for her ability to grow as an English teacher. The contrast of the two experiences may allow Elise to question and reflect on what happened in the after-school program that did not occur in the English classroom in which she observed. With continued reflection, her observations could lead to a reconsideration of the "official" English classroom and teacher.

The service-learning experience resituated the concept of the New English education in real ways for several preservice teachers. In the following focus group interview, preservice teachers working with English language learners at Walnut Grove High begin to see the interplay between "traditional" English curriculum and students' literacies.

> **LAUREL:** One day I worked with a student, Antonio.

> **JIM:** Yeah, I know Antonio.

> **LAUREL:** Well, you know Antonio has attended Walnut Grove High since last year sometime and he isn't entirely fluent in English. . . . I think he tested at, like, a 3 . . . and so he is in the pull-out ESL classes. But, he is also in some of the mainstream classes, like Junior English. One day I worked with him on understanding rhyme scheme in Shakespeare's sonnets. And I felt so incompetent. I mean, I didn't know how to even explain why we were doing what we were doing. Because, before this, I had assumed that, as an English teacher, I would be doing this kind of thing with my students and they would love it. But, working with Antonio was like an eye-opening experience because it made me question why I was teaching what I was teaching. Why was this relevant to the kinds of literacy instruction that could be really meaningful for him? Or, was it?

> **VINCE:** That is crazy.

> **LAUREL:** Yeah, I know. It actually made me feel really useless. Like I could have been doing things that were more meaningful. But, maybe I could have made this meaningful.

> **JIM:** I've felt that way. But you have to see it as just one experience for Antonio.

> **LAUREL:** Yeah, I get that. But what if all his experiences are like this—doing things that really don't mean much?

JIM: You don't think it meant much?

LAUREL: No, not really.

Before her service-learning experience, Laurel espoused a firm belief in teaching the literary canon in U.S. high schools. However, her service-learning experience working with Antonio caused her to question how official and unofficial literacies could work together in English classrooms, especially for students like Antonio, for whom English is not his first language. Laurel reached some thoughts about this in her final journal entry:

> I am understanding more and more why students' lives and outside [of school] literacies are relevant to me as a teacher. I know that being effective as a teacher means knowing your students. Before this semester, I thought knowing your students just referred to knowing their interests, etc., but I think it really means more than that. It means knowing their literacy backgrounds as well. Before this semester, I didn't have any experience working with students whose first language was not English. Working with Antonio opened my eyes to this but I know I still will need other opportunities in classrooms to really understand how to bring students' outside literacies into the classroom.

Viewing how unofficial literacies can function within the classroom still puzzles beginning teachers. Because it is not an option to abandon the official English, as this is the current code of power that can protect diverse students from cultural domination, absorption, and social marginalization (Delpit, 2002), beginning teachers like Elise and Laurel struggle to articulate the pedagogical third space within the classroom that can become the New English education. Elise calls Mrs. Monroe, the teacher she observed, a good teacher, yet wonders why the space of her classroom cannot move into a space where students are engaged in their learning. Laurel enjoys working with Antonio but struggles to envision how a mandated junior English curriculum can become relevant to him. Listening to students such as Elise and Laurel encouraged us that preservice teachers were asking these questions and, in the process, discerning how movement to a new paradigm of teaching English might be reached.

Conclusion: Service Learning and Learning to Teach English

As the stories of participants involved in our study illustrate, service learning has the potential to prompt preservice English teachers to not only understand students as literacy learners but to also understand themselves as future teachers of New English education. Learning to teach is a complex process

that is historically framed through debates concerning both content and method. As a student in our Methods class remarked to us with some disappointment, "I thought that when I got into the teacher education program everyone would just agree about what is the best way to teach." As teacher educators, we know that this is far from the truth.

Service learning has the potential to be a pivotal experience for preservice teachers early in their teaching careers. The critical consciousness that the act of service learning can promote is, to us, the best way to learn to teach the New English education. It is the pedagogical third space where beginning teachers are encouraged to complicate the notions of teacher-student, official-unofficial language, singular authority– pluralistic power, and server-served. Before entering the "official" spaces and roles of English classroom and student teacher, we feel that beginning English teachers must be presented, through service learning, opportunities to reconsider prior assumptions about not only the teaching act but also understandings they hold about the relationship between teacher and learner.

> **Service learning has the potential to be a pivotal experience for preservice teachers early in their teaching careers.**

While teacher educators may not be at a point where we can or even want to agree on the one "best way to teach," we can identify thinking and experiences that may move beginning teachers into better ways of looking at their relationships with students and curriculum. Using service learning in teacher education programs can provide these new experiences and open up thinking that deconstructs the traditional dichotomies present in language and classroom positioning. Only here can preservice teachers personally reconstruct these dichotomies in ways that are more applicable and beneficial to the contemporary literacy practices of our students and our world.

Appendix A: Demographics

Table 1

Demographics[*] of Preservice Teachers Placed at Cloverleaf Junior High School

Name (pseudonym)	Gender	Race	Age	Year in College
Sam Archer	Male	White	22	Senior
Maria Collins	Female	Latina	21	Junior
Betty Gering	Female	White	23	Senior
Talia Martin	Female	White	22	Senior

Elise Norton	Female	White	21	Senior
Erin Stiller	Female	White	21	Junior
Max Stylis	Male	White	22	Senior
Dierdre Turner	Female	White	21	Senior
Sean Weston	Male	White	21	Junior
Kylie Williams	Female	White	22	Junior

Demographics of Preservice Teachers Placed at Walnut Grove High School

Name (pseudonym)	Gender	Race	Age	Year in College
Jim Fraser	Male	White	23	Senior
Laurel Day	Female	White	21	Senior
Vince Sutter	Male	White	21	Senior
Cody Taylor	Male	White	21	Junior

*Students self-identified according to the above categories on a brief demographic survey given at the beginning of the study.

Appendix B: Guiding Prompts for Focus Group Interviews

Each participant began the focus group interview by describing his or her service-learning experience this semester (the service-learning site, how often he or she visited the site, the students with whom he or she worked). Next, participants were asked to contribute to the discussion about the following topics.

First topic:
Triumphs and challenges of the tutoring experience

Second topic:
How do you think about the role of a "tutor"? Has your thinking about the role of tutor changed since being involved in this experience? If so, in what ways?

Third topic:
Do you see the roles of "tutor" and "teacher" differently? In what ways?

Final topic:
Tell me about a particular experience working with one adolescent this semester.

Appendix C: Prompts That Guided Preservice Teachers' Writing about Service Learning

Describe two or three literacy practices in the classroom
Describe each practice in terms of what the teacher does, what the students do, what materials are used, and how the students are organized. Also describe your role in participating in the practice. Describe each practice in terms of its goals and its implications for learning and student achievement.

Select "focal" students
Describe these students in terms of how they are achieving in the classroom and how they interact with the teacher, the other students, and the practices in the classroom. Also describe the ways you interact with these focal students.
Questions you might respond to include the following:
- How does the teacher view each of these students in terms of achievements, needs, and goals she or he has for them?
- How would you characterize each student's strengths and weaknesses? What's your evidence for this?
- What do these students think of reading and writing?

Describe how each of these students interacts with the literacy practices you described above (it's OK if both of your students don't participate in all of the practices you've described). Some questions you might consider about their participation are the following:
- How do the students behave?
- What do the students think of the practice?
- What do the students appear to get out of it?
- Is there evidence that the students are learning anything or otherwise making progress?

Assessment
Questions you might respond to include the following:
- What kinds of assessments are used in the classroom? How do they match the literacy practices?
- What do these assessments tell you about your focal students' strengths and areas of needed improvement?
- Are the measures used to assess the students' reading/writing appropriate? Why or why not?

Your role in your service-learning site
Describe the role you took in the classroom or in working with students.
- What triumphs and challenges did you experience?
- What questions do you have?

If you did take certain initiatives with the students, describe why you made the choices you did. Also, note how long you feel your interventions will be effective, how they were meant to help each student, and what evidence you observed that may indicate that the student made/was making progress.

Notes

1. Cloverleaf Junior High School (grades 7–9) is known in the community as the most diverse of the city's four junior high schools, and using the figures from the 2008–09 school year, the school reported that 54.4% of its students were economically disadvantaged. The school consisted of 62.2% white students, 19.9% labeled as "other-raced" students, 12.8% African American students, and 4.7% Hispanic students. A large portion of the "other-raced" students that the school reported were Native American adolescents, as the community is also home to a federally funded Native American university.

2. Walnut Grove High School's student body of 1,276 students, as reported in 2009, is 72% white, 7% African American, 6% Hispanic, and 13% "other-raced." Thirty-four percent of students at Walnut Grove High are economically disadvantaged, 18% are noted as having disabilities, and 5% are English Language Learners. Walnut Grove High did not make AYP for the 2008–09 school year. Attendance is poorer at Walnut Grove High than in the district as a whole and the dropout rate is higher than the district average.

3. In 2009, Green State University's student body (self-reported) was 3.5% black, 1.2% American Indian, 4.1% Asian, 3.5% Hispanic, 76.8% white, and 4.4% unknown.

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1990). *Art and answerability.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture.* New York: Routledge.

Black, R. W. (2009). Online fanfiction, global identities, and imagination. *Research in the Teaching of English, 43*(4), 397–425.

Boyd, F. B., Ariail, M., Williams, R., Jocson, K., Sachs, G. T., & McNeal, K. (with Fecho, B., Fisher, M., Healy, M. K., Meyer, T., & Morrell, E.). (2006). Real teaching for real diversity: Preparing English language arts teachers for 21st century classrooms. *English Education, 38*(4), 329–350.

Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890–1990.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Delpit, L. (2002). Introduction. In L. Delpit & J. K. Dowdy (Eds.), *The skin that we speak* (pp. xv–xxiv). New York: New Press.

DiPardo, A. (2003). Teacher professionalism and the rise of "multiple literacies": How to describe our specialized knowledge? In J. Flood, D. Lapp, J. Squire, & J. Jensen, (Eds.), *Handbook of research in the teaching of English language arts* (2nd ed., pp. 143–151). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Flower, L. (1997). Partners in inquiry: A logic for community outreach. In L. Adler Kassner, R. Crooks, & A. Watters (Eds.), *Writing the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in composition* (pp. 95–117). Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Flower, L. (2002). Intercultural inquiry and the transformation of service. *College English, 65*(2), 181–201.

Flower, L. (2008). *Community literacy and the rhetoric of public engagement*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

Gomez, M. L., Black, R. W., & Allen, A. (2007). "Becoming" a teacher. *Teachers College Record, 109*(9), 2107–2135.

Haddix, M. (2008). Beyond sociolinguistics: Towards a critical approach to cultural and linguistic diversity in teacher education. *Language and Education, 22*(5), 254–270.

Harding, S. (2004). A socially relevant philosophy of science? Resources from standpoint theory's controversiality. *Hypatia, 19*, 25–47.

Harste, J. C., Leland, C., Schmidt, K., Vasquez, V., & Ociepka, A. (2004). Practice makes practice, or does it? The relationship between theory and practice in teacher education. *Reading Online, 7*(4). Retrieved from http://www.reading online.org/articles/art_index.asp?HREF=/articles/harste/

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Holquist, M. (1990). *Dialogism*. New York: Routledge.

Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (2002). *School's out! Bridging out-of-school literacies with classroom practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kaufman, J. E. (2004). Language, inquiry, and the heart of learning: Reflections in an English methods course. *English Education, 36*(3), 174–191.

Kirkland, D. (2008). "The rose that grew from concrete": Postmodern blackness and new English education. *English Journal, 97*(5), 69–75.

Kirkland, D. (2010). Englishes in urban contexts: Politics, pluralism, and possibilities. *English Education, 42*(3), 293–306.

Lave, J., & Wegner, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mertz, J. S., Jr., & Schroerlucke, K. (1998). Technology Consulting in the Community. Carnegie Mellon Center for University Outreach Reports. http://www.cmu. edu/outreach/csinc.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mishler, E. (1999). *Storylines: Craftartists' narratives of identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K. M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39*(1), 38–70.

Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Prendergast, C. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Paris, D. (2010). Texting identities: Lessons for classrooms from multiethnic youth. *English Education, 42*(3), 278–292.

Portes, P. R., and Smagorinsky, P. (2010). Static structures, changing demographics: Educating teachers for shifting populations in stable schools. *English Education, 42*(3), 236–247.

Rutherford, J. (1990). The third space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 207–221). London: Lawrence and Wisehart.

Schutz, A., & Gere, A. R. (1998). Service learning and English studies: Rethinking "public" service. *College English, 60*(2), 129–149.

Shrofel, S. (1991). Developing writing teachers. *English Education, 23*(3), 160–177.

Sleeter, C. (2008). Equity, democracy, and neoliberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1947–1957.

Swenson, J., Young, C. A., McGrail, E., Rozema, R., & Whitin, P. (2006). Extending the conversation: New technologies, new literacies, and English education. *English Education, 38*(4), 351–369.

Thonus, T. (2001). Triangulation in the writing center: Tutor, tutee, and instructor perceptions of the tutor's role. *Writing Center Journal, 22*(1), 59–82.

Zlotkowski, E. (1996). A new voice at the table? Linking service-learning and the academy. *Change, 28*(1), 21–27.

Heidi L. Hallman is assistant professor of English education at the University of Kansas. Her research and teaching interests include the preparation of prospective English teachers, especially as this preparation relates to teaching in diverse school contexts, and the literacy learning of "at risk" adolescents. **Melanie N. Burdick** teaches in the English department and is coordinator of dual credit English at the University of Missouri–Kansas City. She is a doctoral candidate in English education at the University of Kansas.