Confronting Assumptions:
Service Learning as a Medium for Preparing Early Childhood Special Education Preservice Teachers to Work with Families

By Patricia Korzekwa Hampshire, Katie Havercroft, Megan Luy, & Jennifer Call

Teacher education programs are called upon to provide field experiences that promote application of pedagogy, collaboration, and reflective practice. Traditionally, field experiences including internships and student teaching provide the opportunity for application and feedback (Briody, 2005). In the field of early childhood/early childhood special education (ECE/ECSE), developing partnerships with families is a foundational practice (Rupiper & Marvin, 2004). More specifically, understanding the nature of working with families becomes especially important given the variety of needs (e.g., economic, social, cultural) practitioners face. Although essential to success, many preservice early educators identify working with families as intimidating (Zygmunt-Fillwalk, 2006). Thus, providing opportunities to confront those fears through hands-on experiences in the field that promote reflection within the safety of a college classroom is essential.

Patricia Korzekwa Hampshire is an assistant professor in the Department of Special Education and Early Childhood Studies, Megan Luy is a doctoral student in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and Jennifer Call is a graduate assistant for early childhood studies in the Department of Special Education and Early Childhood Studies, all with Boise State University, Boise, Idaho. Katie Havercroft is an associate professor in the Department of Special Education at Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois. patriciahampshire@boisestate,edu, kahavercroft2@eiu.edu, meganluy@boisestate.edu, & jennifercall1@boisestate.edu

One area that appears to directly relate to the success that teachers have in developing collaborative partnerships is how they feel about their own ability (i.e., self-efficacy) to effectively work together towards a common goal (Hiatt-Michael, 2006). Often, preservice teachers have negative attitudes about parents even before entering the classroom believing that parents lack competency and the skills necessary for helping their child academically (Sewell, 2012; Staples & Diliberto, 2010). Research (Haitt-Michael, 2001; McBride, 1991; Tichenor, 1998) suggests that many teachers do not feel they were provided with the tools necessary in their teacher preparation program for effectively working with families. Teachers reported either a lack of relevant coursework and/or hands-on learning opportunities. Research further suggests that the attitudes teachers' hold are closely tied to the extent to which they will implement family programs in their classroom (Bingham & Abernathy, 2007; Sewell, 2012). Proactively addressing preservice teacher's need for training in how to establish reciprocal relationships with all families is paramount.

Preparation for Working with Families

Within the field of EC/ECSE there are several identified dispositions that are essential for teachers as they work with families including (a) engaging families as partners; (b) valuing and supporting cultural and social differences; (c) a commitment to effective communication; and (d) envisioning the teacher as learner (Baum & Swick, 2008). Children whose families are involved in school partnerships have been shown to score higher on achievement tests, have higher self-esteem, demonstrate motivation for learning, have higher rates of graduation, and are more likely to attend college (Christie, 2005; Zygmunt-Fillwalk, 2006). In addition, teachers who also benefit from collaborative partnerships with families report higher moral and job satisfaction. Parents involved in these collaborations tend to be more confident, have better decision-making skills, and have increased access to community resources (Christie). When families and educational professionals work together, school personnel become active members in the community and families feel validated.

Although the benefits of collaboration between home and school are easily identified, research suggests that universities are not adequately preparing educators for developing collaborative partnerships with families and community agencies (Bingham & Abernathy, 2007; Sewell, 2012). Current efforts in teacher preparation programs focus on preparing students for dealing with challenging situations verses building relationships with parents (Staples & Diliberto, 2010). In a survey conducted by the National Center for Early Development and Learning (Chang, Early & Winton, 2005) researchers found that just under 60% of associate and bachelors level programs in early childhood education offer at least one families course. Outcome recommendations from this study suggest that all teacher preparation programs provide not only course work on this topic, but hands-on learning opportunities as well.

Leaders in the Division for Early Childhood (DEC), a special interest group of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), suggest that practitioners who work in

early intervention settings be prepared to work with families encompassing a variety of cultural, language and ethnic backgrounds (Sewell, 2012). For early childhood educators, working with children and families of differing economic and cultural backgrounds is common within the practice of home visiting. This practice further emphasizes the need for preservice early childhood candidates to learn strategies for successfully working with these families. In light of these needs, identifying meaningful learning experiences for students that provide them with opportunities to interact with families and observe practitioners in action is key (Couse & Chorzempa, 2005). One such strategy that has been found to be effective is service learning (Baker & Murray, 2011).

The Value of Service Learning

Service learning (SL) is a widely utilized strategy in higher education for providing direct real world experiences that relate to course content (Freeman & Knopf, 2007). Research suggests that SL experiences are successful in changing cultural and social bias (Dunn-Kenney, 2010) while helping to reinforce the learning objectives in both general and special education coursework (Baldwin, Buchanan & Rudisill, 2007). As compared to more traditional forms of field experiences, SL is a teaching strategy that integrates course content with relevant community service. Through course assignments and class discussions, students are given a forum to critically reflect on the service in order to deepen their understanding of course content (Brandes & Randall, 2011). Recommendations for utilizing service learning in college coursework includes guided discussion, confrontation of stereotypes facilitated by the instructor, and repeated and varied experiences in service learning sites (Sullivan-Catlin, 2002).

SL is an evidence-based practical response to the Carnegie Report (1998), which calls for improved pedagogy at the university level recommending inquiry-based learning, involvement in research processes, and cultivating a sense of community. SL provides opportunities for community collaboration and enhanced student learning while allowing students to apply knowledge and resources gained through traditional coursework (Briody, 2005). Through SL, a "win-win situation" can occur in that the university student is given real life learning opportunities and the community partner is provided with a service that may not otherwise be accessible given time and financial restraints (Baker & Murray, 2011). Faculty working with preservice early childhood/early childhood special education students may find value in furthering a sense of service among students, while helping them to connect previous knowledge with field experiences.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of SL on ECE/ECSE preservice teachers' perceptions of and skill set for working with families from a variety of community settings and programs. The results of this study will directly

inform the design and implementation of the current course content and syllabus. In an effort to be responsive to the learning needs of students, this study sought to determine if SL is an effective strategy for delivering course content. The goal of this study was to longitudinally determine the potential impact of the SL experiences given a variety of students over a five-year period. This article summarizes the data collected in year one. Specifically, this study focused on answering the following research questions:

> 1. What impact does SL have on the perceptions of preservice early childhood special education students who are working with families from differing social, cultural and economic backgrounds?

> 2. How do these SL experiences impact the preservice teachers' self-efficacy for working with families from backgrounds differing from their own?

> 3. Does the use of SL as a mediated learning strategy help students to apply content learned in class and improve their engagement with families?

Methods

This study utilized qualitative methods to answer the research questions. Data were gathered through weekly journal submissions, small group discussions and a final group project (i.e., research poster). As defined by Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klinger, Pugach, and Richardson (2005), "qualitative research is a systematic approach to understanding qualities, or the essential nature, of a phenomenon within a particular context" (p. 195). Qualitative research can also be used to explore attitudes, describe settings, and explain the impact that one practice has on an individual (Brantlinger et al.).

Participants

The participants for this study included 27 female students who were taking an undergraduate course focused on building partnerships with families in early childhood settings. The majority of students were Early Childhood Education/Early Childhood Special Education majors between the ages of 18 and 25. The majority of students reported having prior experience with volunteering, but only half of those had previously participated in SL.

At the beginning of the semester, a colleague of the course professor came to class to ask students if they would be willing to participate in the study. Students were informed that participation was optional and that their identity would be protected and would not impact their grade. If students chose not to participate, they still completed all SL activities and course assignments, but their work was not analyzed. All student data was de-identified by removing names from assignments. All data was stored in a locked file cabinet and was not analyzed until final grades had been posted for the semester.

Setting and Projects

Students chose between five different sites for their SL experience. Before signing up for a site, representatives from each agency came to class to provide an overview of their project and requirements for participation. At this time, students were also given the chance to ask questions. The five sites included a day shelter and educational program for homeless families and children, a center providing English services for refugee families, a local Head Start, a Muscular Dystrophy support group, and a local learning center for children with learning disabilities. Sites for this class were chosen based on their previous work with the university Service Learning Department and their stated interest in working with undergraduate education students.

Students participated in their SL site for a total of 15 hours during the semester. Hours could be completed on a weekly basis or in concentrated periods of time based on the nature of their project. Each site lead met with the instructor for the course before the start of the semester to identify a basic framework for the agency project. Some projects required more independent work including researching local resources and developing materials. Other sites included more hands-on experiences like attending support groups and planning family events. See Table 1 for details about each site and project.

Data Collection Strategies

Data for this study were collected through small group discussions in class, reflection journals and a final course project. Data collection tools were chosen based on the identified research questions. In an effort to understand how perceptions shifted over the semester, a structured journal assignment (i.e., a list of questions guiding the weekly assignment) was collected and was later analyzed for themes. See Table 2 for the list of journal prompts. Small group discussions that were audio recorded were also used two times per month to further understand changes in perception and students' feelings about their own skill set for working with families.

To better understand SL as a mediated learning strategy, a final group project was assigned that required students to prepare a research poster that summarized their project and identified lessons learned. For the poster students were asked to describe their SL project, specific learning goals for participants, and reflect on what they learned from the experience and how that related to course content. These posters were also included as a third source of data in an effort to triangulate findings.

Data Management and Analysis

A constant comparative method of analysis (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006) was used to identify patterns in student experiences during the course of the semester. This analysis took place in three major phases. During phase one, small group discussion recordings were reviewed and transcribed into text. Transcripts were read and initial themes were identified. Weekly journal reflections were then

read and a list of identified themes across data sources were transformed into a codebook. Last, the student group projects were analyzed to confirm the presence of the themes defined in the codebook. Throughout the analysis the researcher and a graduate research assistant hired to work on the project applied a reiterative process to refine identified themes.

During phase two, the themes identified in the initial analysis were used to

Table 1
Student Placements in Service Learning (SL) Sites

SL Site	Project focus	# of students at site	# of hours required	Type of project
Corpus Christi House and Education Center	Corpus Christi House and Education Center is a day shelter for the homeless where adults and children receive tutoring for GED preparation. Students worked with the education coordinator to develop a weekend play and learn time for parents to learn strategies for interacting with their young child surrounding structured activities.	8	15	face-to-face
English Language Center	The English Language Center provides English language training to refugees and other language learners. Students conducted home visits where they interviewed parents regarding early home literacy practices. This data was then used to develop an early family literacy class.	10	15	face-to-face
Head Start/ Friends of Children & Families, Inc.	Head Start/Friends of Children & Families, Inc. provides early childhood education to children from income-eligible families and to children with physical and developmental challenges. Students helped to develop a set of visuals used to explain to parents the process of early identification and supports provided under IDEA.	6	15	mixed
Muscular Dystrophy Association	The Muscular Dystrophy Association is a voluntary health agency aimed at conquering neuromuscular diseases. Students worked with members of the parent support group to develop a list of local resources for families and children.	3	15	mixed
Lee Pesky Learning Center	The Lee Pesky Learning Center aims to improve the lives of those that learn differently through prevention, evaluation, treatment, and research. Students helped to research apps that promote early literacy and numeracy skills in young children with disabilities.	4	15	research

Note. Face-to-face=hands-on learning opportunities, Research=activities including gathering information and putting together resource materials, Mixed=a mix of both hands-on and research based activities.

code the journal reflections, transcripts from the small groups, and final student projects. Following this initial coding, a tally was taken of each individual code to determine the strength of the theme in the data set. For "weaker" themes (i.e., those with less than ten tallies) the definition was discussed to determine if it needed further clarification or could be collapsed into another major theme. A second coder who was not involved directly in the study was asked to verify the codes using the newly revised codebook.

During phase three, data were further analyzed to identify themes that shifted over time. Connections between early and later journal reflections and small group discussions were identified and agreed upon by the researcher, graduate student and outside coder. In addition, individual groups (i.e., students in the same project sites) were compared to ensure that themes were evident across and within groups. Last, quotes supporting identified themes were organized and non examples were identified.

Establishing Credibility

In an effort to establish credibility, multiple data sources were used for collection including discussion groups, reflective student journals and a review of the final group poster project. When themes were identified during analysis, evidence for that theme was supported by all three sources in an effort to triangulate data (Glesne, 2006). During analysis of the data, peer debriefing occurred with both the graduate research assistant and the department graduate assistant. Weekly debriefing occurred between the researcher and research assistant and bimonthly debriefing occurred with the department graduate assistant.

Table 2
Sample Journal Prompts

Week	Question
3	What are your initial thoughts on participating in a service learning project this semester? What are you looking forward to? What are you worried about? What do you hope to learn? At this point, what project do you plan to sign up for?
6	Reflect on your first experiences in your service learning site. What have you done so far? What has been interesting/exciting? What has been challenging? What questions do you have so far?
8	Describe the types of partnerships you have observed in your service-learning site. Discuss each of the seven principles of partnership and how those relate to these relationships. What have you seen evidence of? What areas do you feel need more attention?
11	Think about your own strengths and weaknesses in the area of communication. How do you think this will impact your work with families in your future job setting? What kinds of strategies have you observed in your service-learning placement?
13	How does has this experience added to our understanding of families, culture, and building collaborative relationships between home and school?
15	How can we as educational professionals play a part in developing more successful school/ home partnerships?

Results

Several themes were identified throughout the course of the study. These themes were present across all participant groups (i.e., groups defined by the site projects) and data sources (i.e., journals, small groups and course project). Of the themes identified, each appeared to shift as the course progressed and students became familiar with their agency. For example, at the start of the study, students voiced a desire to help those at their SL placement sites, but they didn't know how. As the study progressed, students learned how to help using the Seven Principles of Partnership (Turnbull, Turnbull, Erwin, Soodak & Shogren, 2011) discussed in class. This resulted in students having a better understanding of the importance and value of volunteering in their communities. Also, at the beginning of the study, students made assumptions and judgments about the population being served at their SL sites based solely on prior experience. By the end of the study, students' perceptions had changed; they were more understanding and less judgmental of the populations with whom they worked. They also expressed feeling more prepared to work effectively with a variety of families.

I Want to Help!

At the onset of this study, students approached their SL project with excitement, anxiety, and a sense that their experience would be beneficial to their personal and professional lives. In Week 3, several students reported a desire to contribute to their SL placement sites and their community as a whole. A few students also mentioned gratitude for this opportunity and being able to help those in need. One student stated, "I have not had the courage or the free time to do this on my own and I am happy that I am going to get this opportunity."

Some students expressed excitement for hands-on experiences and the opportunity to apply strategies learned in school in real world settings. As one student explained, "I think the service projects will give us valuable hands-on experiences that will help tie the class to real life."

Some students also expressed anxiety, as they were unsure of what to expect in their SL site. Some feared appearing foolish or incompetent in the midst of experienced professionals. Others were concerned about time commitments and being able to balance work with school. For example one student expressed, "To be completely honest, the service learning project for this semester initially makes me a bit stressed because of the time commitment."

Other students expressed a desire to help those at their SL sites, but said they didn't know how to help and despite their good intentions, felt like they were not making a beneficial contribution. As stated by one student, "I felt lost and that I did not have the skills to meet the need. I want to help, but I am not sure what my role will be."

Another student who was helping to find and organize applications for children

with disabilities explained, "I have found this project very challenging in the fact that I don't completely know what I am doing or if I am helping."

Applying What I Learned. As the semester progressed and students spent more time working with the individuals at their SL sites, they learned that in order to help, they needed to collaborate with other people using the Seven Principles of Partnership (Turnbull, Turnbull, Erwin, Soodak & Shogren, 2011) discussed in class. As stated by one student, "As each week of class passed, I felt more prepared and confident to enact what I was learning." Another student commented, "I feel like I have some tools to use with these families based on the activities and readings from class."

One student expressed the importance of demonstrating respect between professionals and families in order to build a collaborative team saying, "One thing that I learned in class that I use in my site is the importance of respect for those that you may be working with and to listen." Another student spoke of the importance of commitment in working together as a team saying, "I think teamwork is one area that I learned a lot about in class and I definitely use this in my site."

The Value of Volunteering. By the end of the semester, most students perceived their SL experiences to be worthwhile and valuable. These students mentioned a desire to continue volunteering at their placement sites, finding opportunities to make a meaningful impact, and hoped to apply the knowledge they took away from their experiences to their profession. For many of these students, SL became a rewarding experience instead of just a class assignment. One student expressed, "The experiences that I gain from this service learning placement will not only help me in my career as a teacher but in my own personal life as well." Another student said, "After volunteering, I feel confident I have gained more insight to working with diverse families, different techniques, strategies, and tools to incorporate into my work." A student summarized their SL experience saying, "Service learning is a great experience to have. It puts a meaning behind the information you get from class."

Confronting Assumptions

A second major theme that was evident in the data was a shift in perception regarding how the students viewed those populations with whom they were working. At the beginning of the study, students made assumptions about their populations. As stated by one student, "Having never worked with the homeless population, I was under the impression that most of the people, would be sharp in attitude and somewhat rude." Another student remarked about homeless individuals, "I see them on the street and I assume they are on drugs or don't have any family who cares about them." A student commented, "I was also afraid that I would offend them or that they would be mean and not want my help."

A Shift in Perception. As the semester progressed, students reported that they were gaining insight into the lives of others that differed from previously held as-

sumptions. One student who was working at a refugee agency wrote, "Soon after I started volunteering I realized their characteristics were totally the reverse of what I had expected." Another student who worked at a homeless shelter expressed, "I found out that I was completely wrong when I walked in the doors the first Tuesday night I visited."

Students confronted prejudice, stereotypes, and fear. Many found that the reality of their experiences were not as overwhelming as expected. Several reflected on how they felt better prepared to work with diverse groups in the future. For example, one student mentioned, "I learned that the saying 'you can't judge a book by its cover' is definitely true." Another student described, "Somewhere along the way during my service learning experience, I lost the fear of working with families different from my own." One student added, " I was no longer unsure about myself or my abilities to interact with families."

Discussion

Several key findings from this study demonstrate the usefulness of SL as a tool for preparing preservice teachers for working with families. Although students felt anxious about these experiences, they also found meaning through interactions with families and agency providers. Through these experiences, students were able to identify the value of developing collaborative partnerships with families and the importance of volunteerism. Assumptions previously held were also confronted through hands-on learning experiences and were reflected in journal submissions and small group discussions. Findings in relation to the research questions posed at the start of this study are discussed below.

Is Service Learning an Effective Mediated Learning Strategy?

Hands-on learning opportunities for preservice teachers are invaluable. Having the chance to apply materials and ideas learned in class to the real world helps to bridge the gap between theory and practice. When teaching students to work with families, the college classroom should be just one of the settings for learning and applying strategies. Traditionally, case studies, roleplaying and video have been used to provide students with opportunities to practice what they are learning (Staples & Diliberto, 2010). Although these strategies may be sufficient, having "real life" opportunities to practice strategies in the field is more effective. These opportunities assist students in "understanding by doing" by helping them to formulate solutions to real problems, better understand the specific needs of a population, and experience roles they may hold in their future profession. As Kolb (1984) argues, acquiring content does not transform the individual, rather transformation occurs as the student interfaces with content and reflects on what was learned.

As an instructional strategy, SL is intentional and explicit as it helps students link learning objectives to experiences in the field (Freeman & Knopf, 2007). In this

class, a forum was established which allowed students to reflect on their experiences throughout the semester by critically thinking about what they saw in their service learning sites and how that related to course content. Small group discussions during class time further allowed students to hear ideas from classmates, which helped to both confirm and challenge perceptions gained in fieldwork. The final presentation helped students to reflect on their experiences and highlight areas where they were able to contribute, providing a framework for self-exploration and identification of skills attained through the project.

What Impact Does Service Learning Have on Student Self-Efficacy?

When it comes to the field of EC/ECSE, working with families is at the heart of our practice. Students should be given the opportunity to interact with families representing a variety of backgrounds to determine if this is a role they are comfortable with (Baum & Swick, 2008; Sewell, 2012). Based on Dewey's theory of education, in order for students to bring meaning into existence, they must have an opportunity to engage in the world (Couse & Chorzempa, 2005). At the start of the study students expressed apprehension at the thought of working directly with parents. As the study progressed, students were able to start identifying their future roles in working with families and the importance of collaboration. As students gained tools and an expanded view of teaching and working with families, their voices became more confident and focused. Instead of fearing collaboration, they began identifying tools and concepts from the course that they were using or planned to use to more effectively build relationships with families and coworkers.

In particular, the Seven Principles of Partnership (Turnbull, et al., 2011) were referenced by several students. These principles include communication, professional competence, respect, trust, commitment, equality and advocacy. Students referenced the need for implementing these principles when interacting with both families and other professionals. Instead of simply discussing these key principles, students were able to connect the content to actual practice at their sites. The real value of these principles became evident in the way students described the importance of building trust and demonstrating respect. By identifying specific concepts and strategies that they were currently using or planned to use in the future, students demonstrated that their "bag of tricks" was growing.

What Impact Does Service Learning Have on Student Perception?

Working with a variety of families from differing backgrounds is a characteristic of practice in the field of EC/ECSE. Students were upfront at the start of the class as they openly discussed their perceptions of the families who were being served at their site. When probed further, students also explained that these views were based on limited personal experiences. By immersing themselves in the community at their site, many students were able to openly identify how their initial views had changed regarding the families that were being served at the agency.

As the semester progressed, students' comments were based on experiences and facts they learned from their mentors at the site. In addition, course materials and class discussions helped facilitate changes in perception as the weeks progressed. By confronting prejudice, stereotypes and assumptions, students gained an expanded view of their own limitations and the families with which they will work once in the field. As Densmore (2000) describes several benefits for students and teachers participating in and learning about social change including helping to clarify the reality of institutional inequalities, clarifying the relationship between various forms of oppression and highlighting the importance of citizenship and volunteerism. Boyle-Baise and Efiom (2000) further suggest that service learning can foster an increased awareness and acceptance of cultural diversity and motivate prospective teachers to examine their own prejudicial and stereotypical beliefs. Providing opportunities where students can further explore their own beliefs and how they influence their interactions with colleagues and families is especially important in the field of early childhood special education given the diverse nature of families they will encounter.

Limitations

There are several limitations that can be identified in this study. First, this research was conducted in one class in one university program. By conducting research on this project over an extended period of time, the authors hope to identify themes that may be valuable to other teacher preparation professionals dealing with similar issues. Another limitation of this study is the lack of varied data sources. Although triangulation did occur with small group discussions, a final project and journals, sources of data that provide a deeper understanding of the issues are needed. Future plans to include surveys and interviews will address these limitations.

Implications for Practice and Future Research

The lack of preparation for working collaboratively with families at the preservice and inservice level is well documented (Staples & Diliberto, 2010). If adequate training is not occurring at either the preservice or inservice level, it is no surprise that teachers report a lack of skill and confidence in this area. Given the importance of building collaborative relationships with families and its potential impact on programming, efforts to work with teachers at both the preservice and inservice level is essential. Universities and local school districts should work to identify ways in which preparation at the preservice level can be complimented and strengthened at the inservice level. Addressing these needs at both levels provides a more unified approach to improving practice in this area.

Future research in this area should continue to focus on the use of SL as a mediated learning strategy for helping preservice teachers learn to work with families. Researchers should focus on determining the types of service learning experiences that are most beneficial. This would include the types of experiences students have,

their level of participation, the amount of time in the field and the level of support from both the university and agency. In addition, future research should work to identify reliable quantitative tools for measuring student self-efficacy.

The results of this study are aimed at informing teacher educators who are working with preservice EC/ECSE students about the potential benefits of using SL in their coursework. Teacher educators may find SL to be a valuable strategy in helping students to bridge the content learned in class to the field. By considering this gap between theory and practice, teacher educators may identify service learning strategies as a viable option for improving student outcomes.

References

Baker, P. H., & Murray, M. M. (2011). Building community partnerships: Learning to serve while learning to teach. *The School Community Journal, 21*, 113-127.

Baldwin, S. C., Buchanan, A. M., & Rudisill, M. E. (2007). What teacher candidates learned about diversity, social justice, and themselves from service learning experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*, 315-317.

Baum, A. C., & Swich, K. J. (2008). Dispositions toward families and family involvement: Supporting preservice teacher development. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 35*, 579-584.

Bingham, A., & Abernathy, T. V. (2007). Promoting family-centered teaching: Can one course make a difference? *Issues in Teacher Education, 16*, 37-60.

Boyle-Baise, M. & Efion. P. (2000). The construction of meaning: Learning from service learning. In C. R. O'Grady (Ed.), *Integrating service learning and multicultural education in colleges and universities* (pp. 45-57). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.

Brandes, K., & Randall, K. G. (2011). Service learning and civic responsibility: Assessing aggregate and individual level change. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 23*, 20-29.

Bratlinger, E., Jimenez, R., Klingner, J., Pugach, M., & Richardson, V. (2005). Qualitative studies in special education. *Exceptional Children, 71*, 195-207.

Briody, J. (2005). Infusing preservice teacher preparation with service learning. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 26*, 149-155.

Carnegie Corporation of New York. (1998). *Carnegie Corporation of New York annual report*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Chang, F., Early, D. M., & Winton, P. J. (2005). Early childhood teacher preparation in special education at 2- and 4-year institutions of higher education. *Journal of Early Intervention, 27*, 110-124.

Christie, K. (2005). Stateline: Changing the nature of parent involvement. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(9), 645.

Couse, L. J., & Chorzempa, B. (2005). Service learning: Field experience for advanced early childhood degree candidates. *Journal of Early Childhood Education, 26*, 47-58.

Densmore, K. (2000). Service learning and multicultural education: Suspect or transformative? In C. R. O'Grady (Ed.), Integrating service learning and multicultural education in colleges and universities (pp. 45-57). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.

Dunn-Kenney, M. (2010). Can service learning reinforce social and cultural bias? Exploring

a popular model of family involvement for early childhood teacher candidates. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 31*, 37-48.

Freeman, N. K., & Knopf, H. T. (2007). Learning to speak with a professional voice: Initiating preservice teachers into being a resource for parents. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 28*, 141-152.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. Boston: Pearson and Allyn & Bacon.

Hiatt-Michael, D. (2001). Parent involvement in American public schools: A historical perspective, 1642-2000. In S. Redding & L. Thomas (Eds.), *The community of the school* (pp. 247-258). Lincoln, IL: Academic Development Institute.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McBride, B. (1991). Preservice teachers' attitudes toward parental involvement. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 18*(4), 57-67.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Rupiper, M., & Marvin, C. (2004). Preparing teachers for family centered services: A survey of preservice curriculum content. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 27*, 384-395.

Sewell, T. (2012). Are we adequately preparing teachers to partner with families? *Early Childhood Education Journal, 40*, 259-263.

Staples, K. E., & Diliberto, J. A. (2010). Guidelines for successful parent involvement: Working with parents of students with disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 42*, 58-63.

Sullivan-Catlin, H. (2002). Food, hunger, and poverty: A thematic approach to integrating service learning. *Teaching Sociology, 30*, 39-52.

Tichenor, M. (1998). Preservice teachers' attitudes toward parent involvement: Implications for teacher education. *The Teacher Educator, 33*, 248-259.

Turnbull, A., Turnbull, R., Erwin, E., & Soodak, L. (2011). *Families, professionals, and exceptionality: Positive outcomes through partnerships and trust* (6th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Zygmunt-Fillwalk, E. M. (2006). The difference a course can make: Preservice teachers' perceptions of efficacy in working with families. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 27*, 327-342.