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ABSTRACT

In this chapter we discuss how service-learning provides a good foundation and understanding for all students and lays the groundwork for them to move into service-learning projects that specifically focus on social justice issues or justice-learning. As there are scant resources for how to integrate social justice issues into preservice teachers’ service-learning experiences, we propose two models. The first model, Cascading Service-Learning to Justice-Learning, provides the sequence teacher educators might take when beginning to implement service-learning and/or justice-learning with preservice teachers. The second model, Service-Learning + Social Justice = Justice-Learning, examines at what grade level the changes from pure service-learning to justice-learning would occur, and what they would look like at each level.

INTRODUCTION

As the school population expands to include people with diverse cultures, religions, values, and worldviews, teacher education programs must address social justice (SJ) concerns. It is critical to educate preservice teachers (PSTs) with respect to social issues in general, and to address such issues within a context of justice and oppression faced by their students and families (Goodman, 1995).

Several years ago in our early childhood teacher education program, we were working on ways to integrate more SJ issues into our PSTs’ service-learning (SL) experiences. There were scant resources for how to do this with young children. The one article we found by
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Wade (2007), stated that for younger students, specifically elementary age, SJ issues needed to be relevant to their lives and must start with their lived experiences, which in turn would form the foundation that propagated social change. Wade’s (2007) SJ criteria were the same as our operating definition of SL (Lake and Jones, 2012). Therefore, we argued that if children were engaged in direct or indirect SL experiences relevant to their lives, it would foster a sense of social responsibility, a precursor to justice-learning (JL) (Winterbottom, Lake, Ethridge, Kelly and Stubblefield, 2013).

In our research, we also found that connections between SL and SJ education had been previously explored in public administration, nursing, and education. Harkavy and Hartley (2010) found that SL increased students’ racial understanding, sense of social responsibility, commitment to service, and increased community involvement after graduation. Astin and Sax (1998) discussed the relationship between civic engagement and SL, and Baldwin, Buchanan, and Rudisill (2007) revealed that SL could raise awareness of SJ issues. However, in these examples, SJ issues were an underlying, though not explicit, element of the SL experience. Waldner, Roberts, and Widener (2011) asserted that the “key is to emphasize the equity component and purposefully shine the spotlight upon it” (p. 213).

The first formal connection of SL and SJ came from Rhoades (1997) who introduced critical community service. Rosenberger (2000) and Rice and Pollack (2000) tailored this concept specifically for academic experiences and called it critical service learning, which described a SJ orientation to SL. The difference between “service learning and critical service-learning can be summarized in its attention to social change, its questioning of the distribution of power in society, and its focus on developing authentic relationships between higher education institutions and the community served” (Mitchell, 2007, p. 101). Additionally, Butin (2007) used the term justice-learning to describe the intersection of SL and SJ education that promoted a justice-oriented framework “that makes possible the questioning and disruption of unexamined and all too often oppressive binaries of how we view the struggle toward equity in education” (p. 177).

Examining how the works mentioned above undergird the connections between SL and SJ, which is the theoretical framework of the two models, is the focus of this chapter. We discuss how SL provides a good foundation and understanding for all students and lays the groundwork for them to move into SL projects that specifically focus on SJ issues or JL. The chapter shares two models. The first model, Cascading Service-Learning to Justice-Learning, provides the sequence teacher educators might take when beginning to implement SL and/or JL with PSTs. The second model, Service-Learning + Social Justice = Justice-Learning, examines at what grade level the changes from pure SL to JL would occur, and what they would look like at each level.

**SERVICE-LEARNING**

Praxeological learning or SL is both a philosophy and a methodology. As a methodology, SL is experiential education that occurs over a period of time and requires interaction between the student and the community (National Youth Leadership Council, n.d.). Experiential learning necessitates that knowledge is applied to specific situations and includes aspects of reflective thinking and inquiry (Giles and Eyler, 1994). Additionally, experiential learning is
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The philosophical nature of SL asks higher education to renew its historic commitment to SL by accepting a leadership role in addressing society’s increasing problems and by meeting growing human needs (Jacoby, 1996; Jacoby and Mutascio, 2010). Universities have a role and a responsibility to advance issues of social progress by contributing to their local, regional, national, and international communities and striving for more multicultural community engagement (Philpott and Dagenais, 2011). Additionally, higher education must prepare students to address and solve social problems on local and global levels, and teacher educators must prepare PSTs to meet the needs of an even-increasing diverse population of students.

Understanding exactly what SL can be difficult due to the lack of a common definition of the term (Furco, 2003; Lake and Jones, 2008). We use the definition of SL outlined by the Serve American Act (2009) which says that it is an experiential pedagogy that (a) includes students in service that meets community needs, (b) is coordinated mutually by a school and the community, (c) fosters civic responsibility, (d) is integrated into the students’ curriculum, and (e) provides evidence for reflection.

Service-learning can be divided into four different approaches (Kaye 2004; Lake and Jones, 2008; 2012). Direct Service means the interaction is person-to-person or face-to-face. Examples include working with a community group to collect used eye glasses to put new lenses in them to give to others in need while studying units focused on the sense of sight and/or health. Indirect Service provides service to the community but not to an individual. Projects might include planting a garden when studying ecological issues or writing letters/drawing cards for the troops as an integrated effort to global awareness or current events. Creating awareness of public interest issues is the focus of Advocacy Service. Students might be involved in making and posting do not litter signs for their playground. The last type of SL, Research Service, focuses on finding, gathering, and reporting information. When students produce a book after researching and interviewing people who performed heroic acts after a local disaster, they are involved in research service.

The type of SL should always complement and extend the academic content, as well as match the developmental needs of the students involved (Lake and Jones, 2012). For example, preschool and primary students should be involved in direct SL. As preoperational thinkers, these students benefit from concrete experiences that focus on only one dimension of an event. Direct SL has a greater impact on students if they have face-to-face contact, thus receiving immediate feedback. However, if young students participate in an indirect or advocacy SL project, the teacher needs to facilitate as many concrete experiences as she can in order for the students to obtain that direct feedback. As students become concrete and abstract thinkers they can be involved in planning and implementing all four types of SL. Older students have the ability to think abstractly; they also have more life experiences to draw on when identifying community needs.

Whichever type of SL is implemented, it should strive to meet most, if not all, of the SL standards. The National Youth Leadership Council finalized these standards and released them in 2008. The standards include:
- **Meaningful Service**: SL actively engages participants in meaningful and personally relevant service activities.
- **Link to Curriculum**: SL is intentionally used as an instructional strategy to meet learning goals and/or content standards.
- **Reflection**: SL incorporates multiple challenging reflection activities that are ongoing and that prompt deep thinking and analysis about oneself and one’s relationship to society.
- **Diversity**: SL promotes understanding of diversity and mutual respect among all participants.
- **Youth Voice**: SL provides youth with a strong voice in planning, implementing, and evaluating SL experiences with guidance from adults.
- **Partnerships**: SL partnerships are collaborative, mutually beneficial, and address community needs.
- **Progress Monitoring**: SL engages participants in an ongoing process to assess the quality of implementation and progress toward meeting specified goals, and uses results for improvement and sustainability.
- **Duration and Intensity**: SL has sufficient duration and intensity to address community needs and meet specified outcomes.

Benefits of participating in SL include increased moral development or improved personal efficacy and leadership skills (Wang, Odell and Schwille, 2008), and an increased understanding of racial issues, sense of social responsibility, commitment to service, and community involvement after graduation (Harkavy and Hartley, 2010). Additionally, SL has a positive impact on academic learning, ability to apply knowledge in practical settings, enhancement of critical analysis, and other academic skills (Eyler and Giles, 1999). Students participating in SL have reduced apprehension levels towards community involvement and have shown an increase in their lifelong commitments to community service. Integrating the academic curriculum with community needs benefits PSTs and their students by providing them with practice in both content and social curriculum through the use of active learning, exploration of interests, civic responsibility, character building, and recognizing and helping the community.

**SERVICE-LEARNING IN TEACHER EDUCATION**

Service-learning has emerged as a praxeology that holds considerable potential to support and improve teacher education programs in the United States. It is also an effective approach to use in facilitating active citizenship in teacher education (Elbridge, 2006), as well as an instructional strategy that helps teachers and teacher educators reach students with a wide variety of needs, while at the same time meeting academic expectations (Jacoby, 1996). Additionally, as a response to the 21st Century Teaching Standards and enhanced field experiences, PST throughout the US have become highly engaged in academic SL projects, which offer the opportunity to increase content mastery and reinforce pedagogical skills through authentic community experiences. In recent decades, SL has gained recognition as an effective pedagogy for involving students of all ages in their communities and strengthening
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links between the classroom and real-world settings (e.g., Freeman and Swick, 2003; Lake and Winterbottom, 2009; Winterbottom et al., 2013).

Teacher educators have long been aware of the importance of building relationships and making connections with students, peers, families, and the local community. As an approach to erudition, SL allows teacher education programs to emphasize both content and social skills in ways that increase the learning potential of all PSTs. Through SL, PSTs are challenged to grow as learners and citizens, which prepares them to be stronger professionals in their academic field. Service-learning also encourages and models action-learning, an approach that is established in community-university collaborations in which PSTs provide services that simultaneously address community identified concerns and academic learning objectives (Seifer, 1998).

As a result of studies that have highlighted the benefits of SL as a pedagogy with PSTs (Lake and Jones, 2008; 2012; Vogel and Seifer, 2011), many institutions have begun to fully integrate SL as an essential component of their teacher education programs. However, the task of transferring the epistemology from learned coursework to the praxis of teaching presents a universal challenge for all PSTs. After minimal time in the field, PSTs often fall back on more traditional teaching methods or even "folkways" learned from their own educational experiences (Faircloth and He, 2011). Moreover, teacher educators have the difficult task of trying to provide PSTs with experiences designed to develop the necessary skill sets and demands of meeting the current Common Core or State Standards. Thus, it is vital for universities to integrate SL in teacher education programs so that PSTs will enter the teaching profession with SL as a pedagogical foundation that will continue influencing their way of teaching.

Given that constructivist, experiential, and integrated instructional practices strive to make learning meaningful for the individual student, we argue that SL projects and activities should be integrated into the curriculum from prekindergarten through college. The development of the learner and knowledge taught through SL methodology encourages the use of investigations and minds-on/hands-on activities (Lake and Jones, 2008). Additionally, SL has shown to increase PSTs racial understanding and a sense of social responsibility (Baldwin et al., 2007; Harkavy and Hartley, 2010).

SOCIAL JUSTICE EDUCATION

Adams, Bell, and Griffin (2007) define a socially just society as "one in which all members have their basic needs met" (p. 3). Individuals in a just society need to be physically and psychologically safe in order to develop to their full capability and have the ability to interact equally with others in society in reciprocal relationships. These relationships need to be based on equality, mutual respect, and trust in order for reciprocity to take place (Wray-Lake and Syvertsen, 2011). Implementing the idea of a just society leads to SJ education.

Originating in the civil rights era and associated with multicultural education, feminist pedagogy, and anti-oppressive education (Adams et al., 2007; Banks, 1996; hooks, 1994; Kumashiro, 2004), SJ education posits education as essential in understanding and overturning oppressive conditions and practices in schools and society (Butin, 2007). Bell (1997) argues that SJ education is both a process and goal in that “it begins with people’s
lived experience and works to foster a critical perspective and action directed toward social change” (p. 14).

Social justice education is a broad approach that gives students the skills and knowledge that they need in order to address issues such as poverty, discrimination, and other inequalities in our society (Villegas, 2007; Wade, 2001; 2007). Teacher educators can assist PSTs by stressing personal safety in relationships, being sensitive to group dynamics, using their viewpoints to begin discussions, and helping them develop social awareness (Cuban and Anderson, 2007). However, before teacher educators can assist PSTs, they must be knowledgeable about social issues beyond the classroom if they intend on providing meaningful and more equitable educational experiences for their PSTs (Bigelow, Christensen, Karp, Miner and Peterson, 1994).

Education considered as SJ is “student-centered, collaborative, experiential, intellectual, analytical, multi-cultural, value based, and activist” (Bigelow et al., 1994, p. 4). In this environment, students learn skills and knowledge they need in order to challenge, question, make decisions, and to solve problems as a group. Social justice education prepares students to fully participate in society not only to change the world, but also to navigate in the world that they live in (Bigelow et al., 1994; Wade, 2001; 2007).

When beginning SJ education, it should be grounded in the lives of the students who need to see how they are connected to the broader society (Bigelow et al. 1994). However, for younger students, such as those in early childhood, SJ education has to begin with their lived experiences. After the connections are made to their lives and experiences, then a move toward examining different perspectives and action that is directed toward social change can be addressed (Adams et al., 2007; Bigelow et al., 1994).

**SOCIAL JUSTICE TEACHER EDUCATION**

It is critical to note that while PSTs may have an increase in civic responsibility in college, their inclination to enact societal change does not increase once they graduate (Sax, 2000). Sax (2004) states that PSTs are not very politically active students, which is a concern, since they are the ones who will be educating others regarding civic responsibility. Baldwin et al. (2007) state schools teach students that good citizenship means complying with and accepting authority instead of questioning current practices. Moreover, teachers are often excellent models of what good citizenship looks like by conforming to the published and hidden curriculums. Cross (2005) asserts that teachers can unconsciously support racism by failing to recognize their own privilege. Thus, teachers and schools reinforce and perpetuate hegemony through their continued attention to traditional practices that privilege some students and marginalize others.

Therefore, it is essential for PSTs to understand that, in order to provide skills and knowledge for students to address the inequalities in society, they need to use approaches that go beyond meeting individual needs and look at the needs of society (Wade, 2001; 2007). These approaches include teaching students how to ask questions, to challenge, to make decisions, and to solve problems as a collective (Bigelow et al., 1994). Using these strategies allows students, not only to achieve high levels of learning, but also prepares them to actively participate in a democracy (Villegas, 2007). PSTs who teach through the lens of SJ need to
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However, teacher education programs need to do more than just introduce SJ theory to PSTs. In an analysis of programs that had a stated emphasis on SJ in their conceptual frameworks, Kapustka, Howell, Clayton, and Thomas (2009) and McInerney (2007) found that there was a disconnect between the term SJ and the actual application of SJ strategies in programs. In order for PSTs to apply social justice theory into practice it can be integrated with SL which, as stated earlier, is considered JL. PSTs should be engaged in JL at the college level and be required to implement it in their field placement classrooms.

JUSTICE-LEARNING IN TEACHER EDUCATION

As teacher education programs have begun to place greater emphasis on standards and accountability, there has been less focus on working with the community on important SJ issues (Kroll, 2013). While there are “seeming compatibilities of service learning and SJ education—both flowering within the Civil Rights Movement, both committed to engaged empowerment, both cognizant of unequal distributions of power, privilege, and knowledge—the actual overlapping has been minimal” (Butin, 2007, p. 178). While SL has gained recognition as an effective pedagogy for involving PSTs in their communities and strengthening links between the classroom and real-world settings (e.g., Freeman and Swick, 2003; Lake and Winterbottom, 2009; Winterbottom et al., 2013), the reality is that most practicing teachers continually reinforce and perpetuate hegemony through traditional practices that privilege some students and marginalize others (Cross, 2005). Given that most teachers are female, white, monolingual (Zumwalt and Craig, 2005), and members of the dominant culture (Cross, 2005), it is not surprising that JL is not a predominant strategy PSTs implement once they graduate.

Through JL, PSTs begin to understand and recognize the challenges faced by families and their communities (Baldwin, et al., 2007). They also begin to engage in discussions regarding societal issues that they would often prefer not to discuss (Sleeter, Torres and Laughlin, 2004), question existing practices and compare these practices to their own beliefs, and challenge and change their own theories about teaching and learning (Gomez, 1993). Therefore, developing PSTs’ abilities to question their assumptions, societal inequities, and existing curriculum through JL experiences provides them with practice and understanding that is essential to culturally responsive teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1994).

Preservice teachers enter teacher education programs steeped in and by their culture(s). Throughout their lifetime, what Lortie (1975) calls the apprenticeship of observation, they have been studying teaching, schooling, and education and learning how schools are organized, what counts as knowledge, and the various roles and responsibilities of students and teachers (Oyler, 2011). Because PSTs’ beliefs tend to be stable across time and are considered a better predictor of behavior than knowledge (Nespor, 1987; Rimm-Kaufman and Sawyer, 2004), their beliefs have the possibility to be harmful to their students as they can reinforce and perpetuate hegemonic practices (Baldwin et al., 2000). Given that PSTs’ experiences have not adequately prepared them to meet the enormous challenges inherent in a
SJ approach to education, teacher education programs must do more than prepare teachers to meet the needs of their children, families, and communities, they must prepare them to critically examine curriculum and instruction for issues of equity and equality (Oyler, 2011).

Many PSTs believe that marginalized students are deficient (Bartolome, 1994), and hold stereotypical beliefs that children of color are more difficult, unmotivated, and have poor attitudes toward school (Baldwin et al., 2007). They must move away from the deficit model of education and begin to view students, families, and communities from a capacity viewpoint. The capacity viewpoint requires PSTs to carefully assess individual children’s learning needs (Oyler, 2001) and plan appropriate and challenging content attainable through differentiated instruction. Capacity orientation also requires PSTs to examine and challenge the terms at-risk and underprivileged as they do not allow them to fully explore and embrace the cultural richness these students bring to the classroom (Oyler, 2011).

Justice-learning experiences that expose PSTs to the conditions in their students’ neighborhoods can cause them to question their assumptions regarding the existing stereotypes they hold about their students and the inequities they face (Baldwin et al., 2007). They also disrupt the silent dichotomies that guide much of PSTs day-to-day thinking and acting, and force them to rethink their known worlds (Butin, 2002). Baldwin et al. (2007) believe that JL in diverse settings positively affects PSTs because it requires them to reexamine their assumptions and their desire to teach in marginalized communities. They found that their PSTs became more tolerant and accepting of all learners and that they were prepared to empower their students to reach their full potential.

Teachers educators who work from a JL perspective start with a few working assumptions. They believe that classrooms are places of cultural and social reproduction and that cultural and social hierarchies must be carefully scrutinized for the ways inequality and injustice are produced and perpetuated within the curriculum, the classroom, and the school (Oyler, 2011). They must help PSTs to develop the skills needed in order to recognize how these forms of oppression are generally communicated in the curriculum and in day-to-day school practices and have the necessary tools to teach differently. Oyler (2011) provides three strategies that are essential for implementing JL in teacher education programs: inquiry, curriculum designers, and placements in diverse settings.

Inquiry

Inquiry or reflective practices are a hallmark of most teacher education programs and are essential strategies for JL. Cochran-Smith (1991, p. 111) states that PSTs must “learn to think like teachers and reformers” and that inquiry practices help them “transform from novice thinking to expert understanding” (Pultorak and Stone, 1999, p. 5). In the past few decades, teacher education programs have moved away from providing PSTs with lists of best practices, to requiring them to carefully examine, then deconstruct instructional decisions about their children and families, the curriculum, and society (Oyler, 2011).

Inquiry starts when PSTs are asked to examine their own lives through the lenses of family and cultural messages, privilege, social class, and parental involvement (Oyler 2011). They are asked to critically analyze, problem pose, and engage in dialogue about how their upbringing might influence how they teach. As they examine their beliefs, they confront hidden biases and discover social injustices related to their, or others’, education experiences.
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(Boyle-Baise and Sleeter, 1998; Freire, 1990; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter et al., 2004). Most PSTs need a lot of support when beginning to explore their lives through these lenses and teacher educators must be sensitive to their feelings and knowledge (Winterbottom and Lake, 2009). Personal inquiry should continue throughout the entire teacher education program in order to promote transformations in thought and action (Nieto, 2000).

Preservice teachers also need to examine, reflect, and make connections between practices and concepts related to the meaning of SJ. Oyler (2011, p. 148) outlines that SJ encompasses the following areas:

building classroom communities of dialogue across and with difference (Sapon-Shevin, 1999); critical multicultural and anti-bias education (Derman-Sparks and Ramsey, 2006; Schniedewind and Davidson, 2006; Sleeter, 2005); culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994); culturally responsive and competent teachers (Irvine, 2003; Irvine and Armento, 2001); anti-racist teaching (Berlak and Moyenda, 2001); equity pedagogy (Banks and Banks, 1995); anti-oppressive teacher education (Kumashiro, 2004); critical literacy practices (Comber, 2001; Dozier, Johnston and Rogers., 2005; Vasquez, 2004); disability rights (Charlton, 1998; Linton, 1998), ableism (Hehir, 2002; Oliver, 1996), and access to academics for students with disabilities (Kluth, Straut and Blicken, 2003).

Oyler (2011) highlights the importance for PSTs to develop knowledge of oppression, be able to recognize inequity as it functions in schools, and acquire a commitment to equity pedagogy (Oyler, 2011). In order to do this, she suggests that, rather than stand-alone courses in diversity, multi-cultural, anti-bias, or SJ education, teacher education programs strive to integrate issues of oppression and inequity in their foundations, methods, and field-based courses. Preservice teachers need a lot of time and support in order to change their beliefs. Therefore, education programs must find ways to continually address SJ themes through inquiry practices in multiple classes, every semester, throughout their program.

Curriculum-Designers

Faced with increasing pressures from district and state administrations, and the need to improve test scores and provide more intensive early intervention for students, schools are being forced to use scripted lesson plans and didactic curriculum materials and pedagogical approaches, often referred to as teacher-proof curriculums (Lake and Winterbottom, 2009). Oyler (2011, p. 156) argues that teachers should be considered “curriculum designers, who are responsive to external mandates, but who add to and challenge traditional curriculum that is often devoid of critical multicultural content.” Preservice teachers need knowledge and practice in examining curriculum through the lens of power. They need to ask whose knowledge is being privileged? Whose knowledge or voice is being left out? What biases, stereotypes, or predominant beliefs the authors might represent? Noddings (1984) wrote that if children are going to grow up being caring adults, the adults who care for and teach them must model those behaviors. The same is true for SJ; teachers educators must model and practice SJ education if they want their PSTs to practice them.
Placements in Diverse Settings

All PSTs are required to have field placements and/or student teaching before they graduate. In order to prepare them for the variety of students they will teach and environments they may find themselves in, PSTs should have experiences in diverse settings that differ from their own in order to experience or witness issues of inequity and inequality (Baldwin et al., 2007). We advocate that teacher educators teach JL pedagogy to PSTs AND have them actively involved in JL with a local community partner (e.g., homeless coalition, food banks, children's rights or high stakes testing).

Baldwin et al. (2007) and others have found that SL experiences positively impact PSTs attitudes about students and teaching in diverse settings. By scaffolding and supporting PSTs as they increased their knowledge and experiences about diversity and started to question societal inequities that they encountered, teacher educators empowered them to confront difficult societal issues and “to begin the deconstruction of lifelong attitudes and the construction of socially just teachers” (Baldwin et al., 2007, p. 326).

CASCADING SERVICE-LEARNING TO JUSTICE-LEARNING MODEL

The previous sections of this chapter discussed the progression from SL to JL. The following model illustrates a sequence that teacher educators might take when beginning to implement SL and/or JL.

Cascading SL to JL Model

\[\text{LEVEL 1: TE and PSTs learn service-learning pedagogy} \]
\[\text{And implement service-learning as a class} \]
\[\text{with a community partner} \]

\[\text{LEVEL 2: TE scaffold PSTs as they implement SL in their} \]
\[\text{Field placements. TE continue to include SJ} \]
\[\text{issues throughout the curriculum.} \]

\[\text{Level 3: Conduct JL as a class project; TE & PSTs apply} \]
\[\text{social justice theory-to-practice via SL methodology.} \]

\[\text{Level 4: TE scaffold PSTs as they implement JL in} \]
\[\text{their field placement (if appropriate for student age).} \]

Adapted from Lake and Jones, 2009.

Figure 1. The sequence teacher educators might take when beginning to implement SL and/or JL.
If teacher educators are not currently using SL as a methodology, we suggest they begin at Level 1. In this level, teacher educators and PSTs must learn the pedagogy of SL and implement SL as a class project. At the same time, teacher educators discuss SJ issues and theory in their curriculum. In Level 2, the biggest change is that PSTs are teaching the pedagogy and implementing SL in their field classrooms. Teacher educators continue to discuss SJ theory throughout the rest of the curriculum. In Levels 1 and 2, the focus is on the pedagogy and implementation of SL; SL is the foundation upon which JL is built.

In Level 3, teacher educators and PSTs work together as a group or in several small JL groups to address a SJ issue in their community. During this time, PSTs need a lot of support as they begin to directly face SJ issues. Teacher educators must provide a safe environment and guidance as they challenge the PSTs’ beliefs by having them reflect and critically examine their own biographies (Baldwin et al., 2007) and compare them to what they are currently seeing and experiencing by participating in JL (Lake and Jones, 2012). Preservice teachers may not come to any resolutions about the SJ issues they addressed, but the experience provides them with a new SJ lens that will be used throughout their program. Therefore, they cannot ignore or discard it.

After PSTs have engaged in JL as a group (Level 3), they should begin to teach and implement JL to students in their field placement classrooms (Level 4) (Butlin, 2007; Lake and Jones, 2012). Throughout the JL projects, the PSTs scaffold their students as they address the SJ issue, as well as provide support as students engage in the process of SL. In Levels 3 and 4, JL should have a cognitive transformative effect on the PSTs as it continues to challenge their existing beliefs.

In Levels 2 and 4, the PSTs’ students begin to teach others about community needs or SJ issues through their projects (Lake and Jones, 2012). SL and JL approaches offer PSTs and their students an opportunity to learn in a way that is most natural to them, as opposed to a segmented method stressing isolated skills and concepts (Verducci and Pope, 2001). These approaches align themselves with the national reform efforts that emphasize curriculum restructuring and establish even closer connections between curriculum, instruction, assessment, and community needs/SJ issues.

One possible reason for the lack of JL is that teacher educators are not comfortable requiring its actual implementation. It is rare that PSTs participate in real social change. According to a survey of almost 600 college SL programs, less than 1% of SL fell into the category of JL (Robinson, 2000). Therefore, we advocate that teacher educators begin with pure SL projects. Once they become familiar with using SL as a methodology, they can begin to implement JL experiences with their PSTs.

FROM SERVICE-LEARNING TO JUSTICE-LEARNING

The second model, Service-Learning + Social Justice = Justice-Learning, examines at what grade level would the changes from pure SL to JL occur, and what they would look like at each level. This model provides a developmental overview of students from prekindergarten to college. Therefore, teacher educators in Levels 2 and 4 can use the model to help their PSTs understand and implement appropriate SL and JL experiences for students in their care.
Child and Adolescent Development Theories

Service-Learning + Social Justice = Justice-Learning model utilizes child and adolescent development theories (e.g., Dewey, Erikson, Kohlberg, Piaget and Vygotsky), as well as SL and SJ literature to determine the four grade-level bands and the types of SL or JL experiences appropriate in each. It is assumed that teacher educators utilizing this model are familiar with SL and, like us, are looking for ways to integrate more SJ issues in their SL experiences.

Inherent in SL and SJ literature is Dewey’s (1925) notions of democratic and experiential learning. He believed that students would take knowledge gained from one situation and be able to apply their understanding to future experiences. The teacher’s role in learning was to help students make connections between the different experiences and reflect on the learning and the meaning of each of them. Guided by the belief that schools should be a democratic endeavor, Dewey (1925) believed that school experiences would foster both learning and social interactions. Additionally, his democracy and education connection encouraged all domains of learning, including moral development (Dimitriadis and Kamberelis, 2006). A critical aspect of Dewey’s (1916; 1925) theory was his belief that knowledge was a tool for solving societal problems. As such, he proposed that students be engaged in authentic learning experiences, in the classroom as well as the community, that were focused on real-life problems.

Vygotsky’s (1978) theory was also a catalyst for the overall development of the model. He believed that students construct their own understanding and knowledge through active participation in tasks that are scaffolded by more capable others. These social aspects of learning develop through interactions with peers, adults, and the environment. Vygotsky stated that people evolve through negotiations with others as ideas are exchanged, thus improving students’ ability to organize and communicate their thinking and internalize learning. His construct, the zone of proximal development (ZPD), is widely used in education. The ZPD is the difference between the student’s actual level of development and potential development through scaffolding with a more capable peer or adult. Skills and tasks that fall into a student’s zone of proximal development are tasks too difficult for him to complete alone, but they can be accomplished with guidance. As adults, or more capable others, scaffold students, they provide them with both cognitive and affective strategies by building on their knowledge and experiences (Goldstein, 1999).

Vygotsky (1978) also discussed the developmental changes in student’s thinking in terms of the cultural tools they use to make sense of their world. He described two different kinds of tools, technical tools are used to change objects or gain mastery over the environment, and psychological tools organize behavior or thought. Society, and more capable others, play a major role in shaping the child’s mind by teaching the tools that are appropriate in that culture. Thus, cognitive development must be understood by examining both the culture and the student’s experiences. Vygotsky also believed that internalization refers to the process of constructing an internal or cognitive representation of physical actions or mental operations that first occur through social interactions. As students internalize characteristics of social interactions, they acquire ways of regulating their own behavior and thinking. Service-learning and SJ SL foster opportunities for cognitive growth as students are engaged in meaningful experiences in their communities while being scaffolded by more capable others, usually their teachers.
What the Service-Learning + Social Justice = Justice-Learning Model Is and Is Not

Before describing each level of the model and its developmental characteristics, it is important that we are clear about what the model is and is not.

1. It is a starting point for planning and implementing SL and JL experiences. PSTs new to SJ literature gain information on what types of activities would be appropriate for their students. Since we know that students develop at varying rates, the model has overlapping grade levels; it is not set in stone. It is always the PST’s decision about where to start and what type of SL experiences she wants to implement with her students, therefore, the overlapping grade levels provide room to accommodate students and PSTs’ knowledge and prior experience with SL or JL.

2. It is a type of SJ scope and sequence. The model demonstrates the progression of when SL experiences should shift to JL and what types of activities would be appropriate.

3. It is a quick reference for types of SL or JL experiences that are appropriate for the developmental domains of students in the grade level bands.

4. It is ONLY a model for implementing SL and JL. It is not representative of the whole curriculum, only SL. There has been pushback from some early childhood teachers because we do not advocate JL experiences with young children. In fact, we strongly encourage early childhood teachers to plan and implement activities that focus on SJ issues. However, we do not suggest using SL as the methodology to teach those activities. The SL and SJ literature both agree that, for young children, the focus should be on direct (and some indirect) SL experiences. Concentrating on SL with young children becomes the foundation for JL later on.

As the model implies, focusing on SJ issues in the classroom is both a process and a goal (Bell, 1997). For teacher educators who teach PSTs how to implement SL or JL, they need to understand that this is not a simple task and that it is an ongoing process. Even PSTs who are already engaged in SJ issues, it still takes several semesters for them to realize and understand the limitations and possibilities of their actions and ideas (Mitchell, 2007). Additionally, teacher educators must be very intentional about keeping the focus on the community need as the reason why the projects are being implemented. Students at all ages can easily get lost in the doing or the activity, and fail to make the connection to the underlying social issue.

GRADE LEVEL BANDS

PK-K-1

The model, Service-Learning + Social Justice = Justice-Learning, begins with students in preschool, kindergarten, and first grade where the focus is on SL and helping children decent, or think about others. One of the characteristics of this age group is egocentrism (Piaget, 1952). Since this age group is very much centered on themselves and what affects
them, they tend to make decisions based on what is best for themselves and do not consider other people’s feelings or needs (Kohlberg, 1984). In addition, this is a time of exploration for these students where they are learning about their own role and the roles of others, as well as the standards of society.

Erikson (1959) believes that students in this age group are beginning to assert control over their environment; they are beginning to take initiative. Initiative is seen as the state in which students take risks, reach out to their peers, attempt creativity, and assert themselves. Guilt happens when students are led to believe that their actions are wrong. Success in this area can give a student a sense of purpose. However, if the student’s use of control or initiative is extreme and met with disapproval, it can lead to a sense of guilt. Teacher educators must help PSTs understand that using SL provides students opportunities to use their initiative in such a way that they are able to achieve the feeling of success. It also allows them to move away from egocentrism and begin focusing on others and their needs.

Students in this age range need to receive immediate feedback throughout their experience, therefore the focus needs to be on SL since the results of SJ projects may not be seen immediately (Wade, 2001). It is best to use direct or indirect SL for this grade band. In order for a SL project to be direct, it needs to affect individuals; indirect projects provide service to the community. An example of an indirect SL project would be playground safety. Not only would students learn about how to keep their playground safe (e.g., raking sand in fall zones under slides or swings or checking for lose bolts or protrusions), they would also present the importance of playground safety to another classes or the whole school. This SL project helped keep the school community safe and the students received immediate feedback from school personnel, parents, and other students.

Lake and Kelly, 2015.

Figure 2. Service-Learning + Social Justice =Justice-Learning Model.
It is important to note that, although this grade level band of the model is focused solely on SL, SJ issues should be integrated throughout the rest of the curriculum. We are firm believers that SJ education is appropriate for students in prekindergarten, kindergarten, and first grade, however, we do not believe that SL is the appropriate methodology to use when focusing on SJ issues. Social justice education is important for these students because their identity is being formed (Williams and Cooney, 2006). Because students tend to internalize issues regarding power and privilege and allow it to surface in their play, it is important for teachers to address these biases (Ryan and Grieshaber, 2004; Boutte, 2008). Williams and Cooney (2006) suggest five concepts and activities that are appropriate SJ concepts for young students: solving problems; families; work and society; skin color; and cultural and language differences. As students mature and grasp these concepts, they are able to undertake SJ issues using SL methodology.

**Grades 1-3**

At this grade level band, the importance is on exposing students to SJ issues by learning about the inequities in society and how they can make a difference through direct or indirect JL experiences. Beginning to focus on JL is appropriate since students are moving into the concrete operational stage where they have a shift in cognitive skills and begin to reason and think in a logical fashion (Piaget, 1973). Additionally, egocentricism is diminishing as they begin to see other’s points of view and are able to distinguish that there are differences between their thoughts and feelings and those of others. As this transition takes place, the opinions of their peers become more important to them (Kohlberg, 1984). These students are learning how to work together to reach a goal (Eccles, 1999) by planning, evaluating those plans, and then modifying the plans if necessary. They are also able to use new information in order to find solutions for problems that arise.

Students in this band are beginning to see inequities in society as they become more aware of and involved in their community. Therefore, moving into JL projects provides them with opportunities to develop and implement ideas of how they can make a difference regarding the inequities they have been exposed to. It allows them to learn about SJ issues, as well as act upon them (Waldner et al., 2011).

Feeding the hungry is an example of a project appropriate for this band. This project gave students the opportunity to define a problem in their community: people in need of food. Students discussed the problem, developed and implemented a plan, and then evaluated the results. The plan included recruiting help from the community through signs and pictures, meeting with members of the community to explain their plan, and arranging for the collection of canned food. Due to the limited school budget for field trips, they could not deliver the cans to the community center. Therefore, the preservice teacher videotaped the arrival of the cans and then the head of the food bank came to the class and explained how their food would help people in need. These students had the opportunity to work together to see how they could make a difference in their community. It is important for teachers to make sure that the focus is on the SJ aspect or community need and not on the cans collected. In other words, the key for JL projects is to highlight the SJ factor and be intentional in making that connection for students (Waldner et al., 2011).
Grades 3-8

The goal of JL experiences for the grade band 3-8 is to activate social citizenship of marginalized groups. Students in this level are moving from concrete (ages 7-11) into formal operations (ages 11-16) (Piaget, 1973). The concrete operational stage deals with the present or the here and now, whereas students in formal operational thought can think about the future, have developed abstract thinking, and can propose hypothetical situations. During this level, students continue to move away from their home environment into wider social contexts that strongly influence their development (Erikson, 1968). Kohlberg (1984) describes students in this stage as being very concerned about the opinions of their peers. They want to please and help others while developing their own internal idea of what is means to be a good person.

The latter part of this level coincides with students entering middle school, the beginning of adolescence, and marks the start of abstract thought and deductive reasoning. Students now have the ability to think in more flexible, rational, and systematic ways (Piaget, 1973). They can think of many ways to problem solve and can approach a situation from several points of view. Adolescents are developing mental tools for living their lives as they strengthen their inner value system and develop a sense of moral judgment. This change in their thinking allows students to work with marginalized groups in order to enact change. They are able to problem solve the SJ issue and suggest viable solutions. In addition, the knowledge and experience they obtain through the project will provide the mental tools needed for their developing moral judgment.

An example of a project for this grade level band is one in which students worked with the local Department of Human Services to provide necessities for children who have been removed from their homes where methamphetamine was produced. When police raid homes where meth is produced, they remove the children and decontaminated them before they are placed in the custody of social services. Children cannot bring anything with them because meth particles are everywhere in the house; therefore, they come away with nothing: no clothes, no personal items, or favorite toys or stuffed animals. The JL project focused on the plight of these children and their immediate needs. After learning about this issue, the students developed and implemented a plan for accruing items that would be useful for these children. They created Teddy Bear Bags that included a large t-shirt, socks, underwear, toiletries, stuffed animal, book, and a permanent marker so the items could be immediately labeled with the child’s name. Representatives from the social services department and several local police officers came to the school to pick up the bags. They met with the students and discussed how the bags would be helpful for this group of children, where the bags would be stored, and explained that social workers and police officers would carry two bags in their cars at all times.

This project allowed students to think about others that were outside their own environment and focus on their needs. This example met the criteria of this grade level band by focusing on the needs of children who were being removed from their homes. Students were given the opportunity to think of ways to solve a real community problem, and then do something about it. They were able to provide a solution for a marginalized group by providing Teddy Bear Bags to local social workers and police officers. This project not only helped the children, but it provided the students an opportunity to continue developing their own inner value system.
Grades 8-12 and College

The goal of the last grade level band is to strive for JL projects that have a cognitive transformational experience regarding issues of oppression and power imbalance. From about 8th grade through college, students continue to develop flexible, rational, and systematic thinking strategies (Piaget, 1973). They become adept at holding multiple points of view at the same time, which allows them to examine current problems and make connections to policies and practices in their community or society that deal with oppression and power inequities. Prolonged engagement in the issue is an essential element of JL projects at this level.

As students become more independent, they also seek to fit in and belong to the larger community (Erikson, 1968). In this major stage of development, they re-examine their identity and try to figure out exactly who they are and who they want to become. They tend to struggle with accepting, instead of negatively judging, others who may hold ideological differences. While at the same time, they seek to contribute to their friends’ happiness and they become more sensitive and aware of what matters to other people (Eccles, 1999). Additionally, some students in this level are able to view morality in terms of abstract principles and not by the existing rules that govern society (Kohlberg, 1984).

One example of a JL project for this band was at-risk student mentoring. High school students examined the characteristics of elementary students who were considered academically at-risk and discovered a disproportionate number of black and Hispanics males. Their goal was to mentor these younger students on a regular basis in order to help them succeed academically, as well as increases their social/emotional development (Herrera, DuBois and Grossman, 2013). This year long JL project was a transformative experience for students, the mentor and mentee. Working with an at-risk population provided the high schools students the opportunity to examine a social issue, identify the inequity of the at-risk group, implement a possible solution, and examine the results. While most of the mentored students did improve academically, the high school students came to realize that mentoring one group of students did not provide a solution for this systemic social issue.

A societal issue that many college students are taking a stance against is securing student safety against sexual violence on campus. Several campus and community organizations have organized JL experiences that connect college courses with activist efforts (e.g., Florida State University, Penn State, University of Virginia, Vanderbilt University). Through literature, political science, history, and women’s study courses (to name a few), college students are examining the cultural contexts that undergird the current problem and are developing JL projects that bring attention to the injustices victims face by being violated and when reporting the incident to campus authorities and local police. Their focus is to change policies that will increase student safety, empower the victims, and hold violators responsible for their actions.

CONCLUSION

At a time when student diversity is expanding, it is unfortunate that elementary, secondary, and postsecondary schools are moving further away from addressing SJ issues
such as poverty, demographics of special education or incarcerated population, and affordable health care; these issues call for greater equity and equality across historically marginalized populations (Cross, 2005). If teacher education programs are to adequately prepare PSTs for the complexity of today’s classrooms, they must do more than just discuss SJ theory; they must actually apply it.

While social justice teaching is considered a primary goal of many teacher education programs, it is still not a core value across all programs (Zeichner, 2009). Until there is a body of research that demonstrates the significance of implementing JL in teacher education programs, it will not become a priority. Boyle-Baise, Bridgewaters, Brinson, Hiestand, Johnson and Wilson, (2007) state that it can be risky for teacher educators to involve PSTs and their students in questioning the status quo and advocating for change. However, if teacher educators are unwilling or scared to engage in JL, then there is little hope PSTs will have the knowledge, understanding, and courage to implement JL with their students.

The political climate in schools today focus on the evaluation of teachers on the basis of students’ standardized test scores (Zeichner, 2009). Due to this climate, the focus is on test preparation and skill development, not what is right for students or social justice education. Subsequently, teachers are being criticized for not raising test scores and that they are discouraged from advocating for students and challenging programs and policies that undermine student achievement.

Philpott and Dagenais (2011) discuss that new teachers want to be accepted by established teachers in their building and often feel pressured to abandon their own belief in themselves or their practice and adopt more traditional-skill based practices. If they do not conform “to these dominant voices and authoritative discourses, novice teachers may find themselves further alienated and relegated to the outer margins of the community” (Philpott and Dagenais, 2011, p. 86).

The purpose of this chapter was to advance our understanding and application of the connections between SL and JL. The theoretical framework illustrated these connections and supported the two proposed models that teacher educators can use to move themselves from SL to JL, and to aide PSTs in planning and implementing appropriate SL or JL experiences with their students.

The literature is clear; SL provides a firm foundation for JL. Along with Bell, Horn and Roxas (2007), we believe that SL and JL experiences significantly influence teachers’ understanding of diversity and increase their tolerance of marginalized students, and that they must be developed further and more widely used across teacher education programs. Teacher educators must help PSTs confront their own biases and stereotypes in order to move away from the deficit model of education and view students from a capacity orientation (Oyler, 2001).

We conclude this chapter with several key points for teacher educators to consider.

1. Teacher educators must be willing to confront their own beliefs, stereotypes, and values before asking PSTs to do it.
2. Teacher education programs must change in order to meet the diverse nature of school populations. They must graduate PSTs who are capable of meeting the demands of students from diverse cultures, religions, values, and worldviews.
3. PSTs will need a lot of support as their beliefs, stereotypes, and values are challenged. Because most of them are female, white, monolingual, and members of
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4. PSTs will not be able to properly advocate for their students’ rights if teacher educators do not teach them why it is important and how to do it. However, teaching is not enough, teacher educators must walk the talk by modeling how they advocate for education issues.
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