

## Toward a New Framework of “Server” and “Served”: De(and Re)constructing Reciprocity in Service-learning Pedagogy

Sue Ellen Henry  
*Bucknell University*

M. Lynn Breyfogle  
*Bucknell University*

This article problematizes the contemporary view of reciprocity and offers a philosophical foundation for an enriched view based on Dewey’s critique of early stimulus-response theory in psychology and his view of democracy. We situate the argument for reconsidering the provider/recipient model of service learning in the context of a collaboration between a university and school serving children 5-9 years old while implementing an after-school tutoring program. We develop and describe the traditional and enriched models of reciprocity and create a vision for the future establishment of similar collaborations.

In early attempts to distinguish service learning from community service and other forms of volunteerism, scholars have consistently argued for the importance of “reciprocity.” Understood as a key feature to service-learning programs and to pedagogy that supports service-learning activities, reciprocity is usually described as a mutuality between the needs and outcomes of the “provider” and the “recipient” in a service-learning relationship. As Kendall (1990) describes, reciprocity is critical to defining an activity as a service-learning experience:

The second factor that distinguishes service learning from other community service programs is an emphasis on **reciprocity**. Reciprocity is the exchange of both giving and receiving between the ‘server’ and the person or group ‘being served.’ All parties in service learning are learners and help determine what is to be learned....Such a service-learning exchange avoids the traditionally paternalistic, one-way approach to service in which one person or group has resources which they share ‘charitably’ or ‘voluntarily’ with a person or group that lacks resources (p. 21-22, bold in original).

Over the years, this understanding of reciprocity as a giving and receiving between parties in association has remained a consistent feature of much of the research on the results of service-learning experiences (Gelmon, Holland, Seifer, Shinnamon, & Connors, 1998; Greene, 1998; Jacobi, 2001; Skilton-Sylvester & Erwin, 2000) as well as principles of best practice for service-learning programs (Jacoby, 1996).

Only recently has there been criticism of this approach toward service learning. For example, Harry Boyte, co-director of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship at the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota, asserts that the contemporary service-learning model is

inadequate and suggests a movement toward political action. Boyte (2003) outlines the philosophical differences between “[t]wo approaches to civic learning” (p. 8), namely two approaches he terms as “service” and “organizing,” and describes how they differ in terms of their discourse, goals, definition of citizenship, motive, method, site, and outcomes. Boyte asserts that by enacting the “thick” version of service-learning, “organizing” is required for social change to emerge from these relationships and that “service” (a “thin” association) is more oriented toward maintaining the status quo. Although most service-learning models heralded in the literature fall somewhere on a continuum between these two approaches, they are much closer to the “service” than the “organizing” approach Boyte describes. Boyte argues for these changes because he believes it is important for “putting politics back into civic engagement” (p. 1). What Boyte means by “politics” is the notion of democracy that Dewey suggested over a century ago. Consistent with Dewey’s approach to public problem solving and the evolution of human thinking, Boyte maintains that “politics is the way people with divergent values and views work together to solve problems and create common things” (p. 6). Developing these types of relationships, however, is reliant upon firm, deep, and organic notions of whom the stakeholders are, thus leading to social, systemic change over time.

Similar to Boyte, we wish to problematize the contemporary understanding of reciprocity and suggest that, while this definition might be useful for some forms of service-learning partnerships, it can also be an inadequate guide for others, particularly relationships between education departments at universities and local schools. Viewing service learning from the perspective of John Dewey’s work on the evolutionary nature of cooperative work and the importance of establishing rich processes of democratic life, we assert that the traditional view of reciprocity omits the important component of

evolutionary change in the service-learning relationship: that multiple parties in service-learning relationships, including “providers” and “recipients,” will be changed in the process of their service-learning venture. We begin our discussion by describing a situation in vignette form that typifies the characteristics of a traditional view of reciprocity.

#### A “Successful” Tutoring Program Vignette

A university needs field placements for its pre-service teachers to observe and apply content they are learning in their courses. One solution that the university faculty consider is to supply tutors for an after-school tutoring program to take place at a local school. They first contact the Director of Service Learning, who suggests writing a grant proposal to pilot a program. She contacts the head administrator for local schools and invites him to a meeting to discuss the situation. The administrator agrees that an after-school tutoring program would be beneficial, especially considering the increased focus on annual assessment of academic progress. He suggests that the program begin with younger students (ages 5-9) and then grow over the years to accommodate older students.

Together, over the next couple of months, the administrator, Education Department faculty, and the Service-Learning Director outline the program and write a grant proposal to create a Director of the Tutoring Program position to help organize the program. The grant proposal receives funding!

To inform the teachers about the after-school tutoring program, university faculty and the Director of Service Learning give brief a presentation for the elementary school faculty. The intent is to also solicit teacher volunteers (paid by the school) to develop the tutoring training program and work out some logistics.

Once the Director of the Tutoring Program is hired, groups meet to determine the content and structure of the tutoring training sessions. In the mean time, substantially more elementary school students accept the invitation for the tutoring than expected. As a result of more tutors needed, university courses that do not traditionally have a field component are altered to allow students to participate in lieu of other course assignments. University tutors are trained by a collaborative team made up of university faculty and elementary school faculty, and the program begins. All constituents seem happy, except for the minor issues that occur at the start of the program.

Once the program is in full swing, issues begin to emerge. University students are frustrated because the elementary teachers are not providing feedback and suggestions on the collaboratively developed “Session Summary” form. A few teachers express concern that the university tutors are “going ahead” and teaching the

wrong content. In addition, because of a new semester and new tutors, a second training session needs to be planned. No elementary teachers are willing to help train the mathematics tutors, and only one elementary teacher is willing to help with reading training.

At the end of the first year of piloting the program, the school administrator is pleased with the success of the program and looks forward to next year’s program. Most teachers are pleased with their students’ growth and anticipate having the program available next year. Elementary students enjoy attending the tutoring, and the numbers of students and their parents who want to attend grow. The university students learn a lot from the experience and find it worthwhile, but many are disappointed with the lack of teacher interaction. The university faculty and Director of the Tutoring Program are exhausted, disappointed with the lack of interest and involvement from the teachers, and unsure they wanted to repeat the program at this elementary school.

This vignette, though specific to a program we participated in, could describe any number of tutoring programs. In particular, the problems that emerged will likely sound familiar to many. As we began to review our collective work on this program, we saw that some of the problems came about as a result of an insufficient view of reciprocity. Many of the issues that arose seemed to revolve around six essential components, namely: goals, perception of power, partner identity, boundaries, outcomes, and scope of commitment (Enos & Martin, 2003). These issues manifest as questions such as: Whose program was this? How were each of the parties invested in it supposed to benefit? How were the benefits being accomplished?

We had created a program that met the criteria for reciprocity set out in the service-learning literature: we were “giving and receiving between ‘server’ and ‘...served’” (Kendall, 1990, p. 21-22). But as we thought more about the required giving and receiving of the traditional form, we began to question whether this form was enough to help solve problems that inevitably emerge in collaborations.

#### Reciprocity Redefined

Reciprocity has been central to the study and work of service-learning practitioners since the beginning of the movement to document the activities and benefits of service learning. The current literature on service learning often mentions the importance of reciprocity; several studies even examine reciprocity specifically as a feature of the service-learning relationship (Bains & Mesa-Bains, 2002; Porter and Monard, 2001; Skilton-Sylvester, 2000). Most often in these studies, reciprocity is understood as a connection between service providers and service receivers or as a “mutuality [of] respect and collaboration between

community partners and service providers” (Porter and Monard, 2001, p. 1).

We wish to augment this current understanding of reciprocity and provide a philosophical foundation for an enriched view of reciprocity that builds on this earlier work. We assert that a truer form of reciprocity for service learning can be found in John Dewey’s work on the evolutionary nature of cooperative work and the importance of establishing rich processes of democratic life. Because reciprocity in service learning is essential in creating the transactional and transformative partner development that Enos’s and Morton’s (2003) recent work reveals, we are particularly interested in analyzing how such an enriched form of reciprocity influences these partnerships. Specifically, we suggest that Dewey provides the philosophical foundation for thinking differently about forms of reciprocity. We argue that a traditional form of reciprocity is categorized differently and is in sharp contrast to an enriched form of reciprocity in these essential components that Enos and Morton (2003) illuminate. According to Enos and Morton, the essential elements of these two different approaches to reciprocity can be seen in Table 1.

TABLE 1.  
Differences between Traditional and  
Enriched Forms of Reciprocity

	Traditional	Enriched
Goal/Objective	Individual	Collective whole
Perception of Power	Levels of authority	Shared authority
Partner Identity	Maintains institutional identity	Larger definition of community
Boundaries	Works w/in systems to satisfy	Transcends self-interests to create larger meaning
Outcomes	Students changed	All parties are changed
Scope of Commitment	Tightly defined	Generative

Comparison of Essential Elements in Traditional vs. Enriched Forms of Reciprocity, (Enos and Morton, 2003, 25).

In what follows, we describe each of these components in the context of how they lay the foundation for the traditional and enriched forms of reciprocity. The following discussion is separated into the traditional and enriched forms but is organized according to the table of essential elements in parallel fashion. Following the table is an explanation of each of the cells of the table from the traditional service learning understanding of reciprocity. We then explore an enriched form of reciprocity which uses a detailed examination of Dewey’s work reforming several enduring dualisms in psychology and his approach to collaborative democracy as its underpinning.

## The Traditional Form of Reciprocity

### *Goal/Objective*

In a traditional form of reciprocity, each party in the collaboration has goals and objectives that the service-learning relationship is meant to meet. Through their collaborative work, service-learning parties develop these mutually informative strategies to meet the needs they each have with their respective resources; in our case, the university needed field placements for pre-service teachers, and the elementary school faculty needed support in making academic gains for their most needy children. The emphasis on this definition of reciprocity in service-learning partnerships is important, particularly for protecting the community from being exploited by academic interests and concerns. Rather than depicting the community as a laboratory in which university participants “try out” their skills and ideas, the principle of reciprocity suggests that parties work together to assure that their mutual interests and needs are accounted for in the programs that result from their collaboration. While recognizing that there is a constant tension between the interests of parties engaged in service learning, Jacoby (1996) reinforces the importance of reciprocity in making certain that everyone’s interests play a substantive role in shaping collective work: “The degree to which we enter the service-learning endeavor committed to reciprocal relationships will determine whether we move the academy away from seeing the community as a learning laboratory and toward viewing it as a partner in an effort to increase each other’s capacities and power” (p. 36). Critical to fostering this type of relationship are two elements of reciprocal partnerships: 1) all parties in service learning function as teachers/learners, and 2) all parties are perceived as colleagues rather than clients (Jacoby, 1996). In this view of reciprocity, goals and objectives are written and understood as individual partner goals, although they are to be mutually beneficial.

### *Perception of Power*

There is a perception, in this view, of a hierarchical structure of power, with the university and school administrators at the top. The school district is at the mercy of the university to continue this service and feel they have no real say in the process or the program. The idea of tutoring is handed to them to accept or reject but not to redefine or recreate. The teachers feel an obligation to the program, but only because it is imposed from a powerful authority.

### *Partner Identity*

Consistent with the perception of power, the partners work within the binary of “server” and “served,” in which the school is at one point and the university at the other. The university provides a service to the elementary school. The elementary school receives the service and provide students with whom university students work. The university students learn from their tutoring experience. Much like a stimulus-response loop, a circuit is completed when the university offers service received by the elementary school, which then maintains the tutoring program. As suggested in the opening vignette, our tutoring program serves as a bridge between our two entities; it is, quite literally, the thing that is shared between the two entities and the way in which the respective organizations interact with each other.

### *Boundaries*

Boundaries between school and university are held firm, and all parts of the tutoring program work within the existing system and structure to carry out the program. What has typically been the responsibility of the elementary school teachers remains, and what is traditionally expected of university faculty prevails. There is no blurring of the boundaries, nor is the work shared across these rigidly held beliefs.

### *Outcomes*

Clearly, the outcome of such a service-learning placement is that the university students providing the tutoring, as well as the students being tutored, grow from the experience. The hope is that both these parties benefit from the experience and are individually changed in the process.

### *Scope of Commitment*

The scope of commitment is tightly defined. The focus is on the one program at the exclusion of other more generative ideas. For example, our work with the school district started primarily from the university position of needing placements for pre-service teachers; when we approached the district, we learned that they had a problem with the academic achievement of some students who might benefit from particular attention by a university tutor. Thus, our mutual interests were voiced, and the idea of a tutoring program was born, to the exclusion of any other ideas. In addition, once the decision was made to move ahead with the tutoring program, no other ideas were considered as time passed. At the conclusion of

the first year, under the traditional form, it would be expected to continue the program in a similar form.

A consistent issue that arises from the traditional form of reciprocity is that the parties involved in establishing the reciprocal relationship remain the same throughout the tenure of their exchange. The static view of the parties is likely to help foster the same types of problems that created the need for the service-learning relationship in the first place, rather than reforming the nature of the parties such that both are changed as a result of their common work together. An enriched form of reciprocity based upon John Dewey’s work can help parties understand and expect change in themselves, and thus their mutual work, as a result of their collaboration.

### *An Enriched Form of Reciprocity*

In 1896, John Dewey wrote his groundbreaking critique of psychology’s stimulus-response theory in his work “The Reflex Arc Concept in Psychology.” Remarkably similar to the traditional view of reciprocity as an act in which “servers” provide service to “served” who accept service, the dominant psychological point of view of the time was that stimuli create responses, which then influence further stimuli, creating a “circuit” of energy that generates further action within the system. Dewey’s critique of this static understanding of the relationship between stimuli and their responses was the notion that such a circular approach maintained each entity as separated from one another, or as Dewey put it “a patchwork of disjointed parts, a mechanical conjunction of unallied processes” (Dewey, 1896, para. 3). Consistent with Dewey’s lifetime project of raising awareness of dualisms that got in the way of successful thinking and problem-solving, Dewey made clear that understanding stimuli and responses as independent parts in a larger system was an insufficient notion, primarily because in the act of being acted upon, both stimuli and responses were changed as a result of their relationship with one another. Thus, central to his critique of the stimulus-response model was Dewey’s focus on activity rather than entities, as well as the idea that activity is both influenced by and influences the context of the activity. Absent from the more common understanding of the stimulus-response model were the evolutionary outcomes of cooperative work over time. As Bredo (1998) suggests:

Dewey’s proposal...suggested a view of the organism as co-evolving with the environment that it helps to create, rather than as passively conforming to given environmental structures or operating according to fixed inner rules. Seeing

organisms as acting to change their environments, rather than as merely adapting to them, was consistent with Dewey's social activism, including his activity-based approach to education and his emphasis on democratic self-governance. (p. 456)

In contrast to this additive, stimulus-response approach, the elements in an interaction were to be seen from a dynamic point of view in the context in which they functioned. As Dewey maintained,

What is wanted is that sensory stimulus, central connections and motor responses shall be viewed, not as separate and complete entities in themselves, but as divisions of labor, function factors, within a single, concrete whole, now designated as the reflex arc. (Dewey, 1896, para. 3)

We are calling for a similar reformation of the dominant understanding of reciprocity in service learning, particularly for certain types of service-learning relationships. Instead of understanding each entity as "separate and complete entities in themselves" (Dewey, 1896, para. 3) enhanced with "a mutuality [of] respect and collaboration" (Porter and Monard, 2001, p. 1), we are calling for schools of education and local school districts to see themselves as "divisions of labor" (Dewey, 1896, para. 3) within the same activity: the education of students.

Such a move is more than mere semantics. Viewing the reciprocity of schools of education and school districts from this vantage point emphasizes their combined commitment to a larger goal, one that emerges from their underlying mission and purpose. This reorientation is essential, as this dynamic relationship between entities and their environment results from the intentionality Dewey saw implicit in human behavior. Paul F. Ballantyne (2002) explains how the focus on intentionality leads to change in both the context of the situation and the parties involved:

By the act of attending to some aspect of its environment, an organism 'constitutes' that aspect as a stimulus. Similarly, by manipulating some aspect of its environment the organism 'constitutes' that action as a response. Thus the above mentioned 'genesis' of the stimulus or response is not to be sought outside but inside the act (as a larger intentional 'coordination'). (p. 6)

This approach served as the basis for Dewey's understanding of democracy as a "form of associated

living" which places attention on the ways in which people come together to solve the problem they experience and to enhance their mutual experience of living in community. Wishing to change democracy from a noun to a verb, in *The Public and Its Problems* (1927/1954) Dewey outlined a philosophical process people could use to coordinate their actions in productive, positive ways. Essential to this process was Dewey's understanding of cooperative intelligence. This "method" suggested that people and groups affected by the consequences of their mutual action (both intended and unintended) would work together to define the nature of their problems, determine potential solutions, test these solutions, and finally, implement a course of action that accounted for the side effects of such actions.

Seeing reciprocity from this enriched vantage point, or as Dewey would put it "an organizing principle to hold together the multiplicity of fact" (Dewey, 1896, para. 1) offers several advantages for service learning. Central to the benefits is that such a repositioning of reciprocity avoids what Dewey might call an unnatural dualism that has been created by the service-learning literature between the server and the served. While many in the literature take such a break between entities as organic, natural, and perhaps even necessary, Dewey asks those involved in this work to critically question the usefulness of such thinking; what is more, he asks us to consider how this thinking actually creates difficulties that might not occur otherwise. One of the quickest advantages to arise from such a change in thinking is that the static and rigid nature of each entity is avoided and replaced with a view founded in mutual goals and flexibility; by viewing each other differently, we set the stage for considering our possible mutual actions not merely in response "to" the "other" but rather "into" it. Such an understanding extends the idea of coordination to overcome our "disjointed...series of jerks, the origin of each jerk to be sought outside the process of experience itself" toward coordination that helps us see "unity of activity" (Dewey, 1896, para. 8).

From the point of view of Enos's and Morton's six essential characteristics, the following application of an enriched form of reciprocity based upon Deweyan principles of evolutionary change over time and collaborative problem solving is in marked contrast to the traditional view.

#### *Goals/Objectives*

Different from the traditional form of reciprocity where parties come together to contribute their respective resources to some commonly defined interests from an individual position, this alternative approach starts from the position of collective activity

and emphasizes systemic, evolutionary change over time. From an enriched view, goals for a program such as the tutoring arrangement would include not only providing quality tutoring support to early learners of mathematics and reading, but would include notions of how the people involved in constructing such a program would be changed over time as well. How would university faculty understand themselves differently, as well as their work with pre-service elementary educators, as a result of this collaboration with the local elementary school faculty? How would elementary faculty understand themselves, their work with the children of university faculty, and supervisors of pre-service elementary educators differently as a result? How would the relationship between the university department of education and the elementary school alter the conception of each of these entities and the activities they have historically undertaken?

#### *Perception of Power*

Strongly related to the integrated nature of the goals of such relationships is the nature of the power that emerges. From an enriched point of view, the perception of power between entities working in united collaboration is flat versus the hierarchical orientation of the traditional view. Because the parties understand how their mutual actions are important to the relationship, the perception of the power needed to make such outcomes happen is equitable. Indeed, it might be more telling to describe the perception of power as a perception of responsibility and accountability, as compared to a notion of power over, or power to accomplish, certain tasks. Parties working from an enriched vision would see that they have mutual and interdependent requirements that help attain both institutional goals as well as inter-institutional goals.

#### *Partner Identity*

Especially important to this process is a broad definition of the public and encouraging the public's full participation. The broader public defined to take part in cooperative action to solve a common problem would, especially in our particular case, include children, students, parents, teachers, university faculty and administrators, and local school district administration. Understanding these people and groups as stakeholders literally and figuratively suggests that the interests of these groups should shape practices that change the lives they lead: that the people who will live with the outcomes of these relationships should be

instrumental in shaping the practical elements of any arrangements that emerge from them.

#### *Boundaries*

One unique way to look at boundaries from a Deweyan point of view is to consider the metaphor of larger expanding "envelopes within envelopes" (Ballantyne, 2002, p. 6), or interdependent elements of coordinated activity. Enriched reciprocity would be honest about the elements under relative control; in this situation, the university is responsible to provide sufficient numbers of tutors to meet school demand, and the elementary school is responsible to coordinate the tutoring program with other after-school activities. These responsibilities, however, are not seen in terms of their relative territory, as is consistent with the traditional view. Instead, these responsibilities are framed within the relationships and mutual accountability required of interdependent actions to make the tutoring program a success. In essence, boundaries are fluid and flexible versus fixed and stable because the larger goals of mutual change over time and the collaborative problem-solving process require a more sophisticated level of attention.

#### *Outcomes*

Perhaps one of the most important criteria for this enriched notion of reciprocity we advocate is the idea that all stakeholders and their work will be changed as a result of their collective effort. Thus, it is important for stakeholders to discuss, reflect and examine how they are changing and how these changes influence their respective efforts in the collective action. The expected outcomes that result from an enriched view of reciprocity necessarily include examination of how stakeholders are fairing as a result of the collaborative work, as well as how the actual program is working. The outcomes are thus generative: they create more opportunities for further problem solving and collaboration, and they enhance future chances for working together on issues that concern multiple stakeholders. Additionally, one of the more important outcomes that results from an enriched view of reciprocity is the experience of working in tandem to coordinate activity that can be transferred to other types of interactional issues that arise so frequently when addressing social problems.

#### *Scope of Commitment*

In the end, such a holistic view of the organizations involved in service-learning relationships operating with an enriched view of reciprocity understand that

their mutuality is not limited necessarily to the boundaries of a one-time project. Instead, such relationships produce the possibility for unlimited exchange and problem-solving largely due to the evolving nature of the parties and their conjoined work. For instance, in the tutoring situation described in this article, perhaps sometime in the future the parties involved in this project would revisit whether academic support in the form of tutoring remains the best way to collaborate; stakeholders might even take a further step back and ask themselves, “What else can we be doing for each other as we’ve changed along the way that might better serve our needs and further our intra- and interdependent growth and development?” As Bredo (1998) writes, “Conceived in this way, adaptation is a dynamic affair of continually working with the changing tendencies and possibilities in a situation which one’s own actions alter, rather than a matter of achieving a static fit between one structure and another” (p. 458). In accordance with this more enriched view of reciprocity, we offer a revised vignette that addresses the same six components in an enriched way and also considers how the parties could grow and change in the process.

#### A Second “Successful” Tutoring Program Vignette

A university needs field placements for its pre-service teachers to observe and apply content they are learning in their courses. University faculty contact local school district stakeholders including superintendent, principal, teachers, parent-teacher organization, students, and parents to collectively brainstorm solutions to the deficits in performance in reading and mathematics for local elementary-aged students. The representative stakeholders continue to meet. Surveys are developed and distributed for all stakeholders to provide feedback and suggestions. For several meetings they continue to invite and include any other members of the community who might be affected or provide critical input. Eventually, they begin to narrow the focus and determine the type of program that would most benefit all of the participants. Finally, an after-school tutoring program is chosen as the program.

The stakeholders outline the components of the program and develop goals for the program and roles for each stakeholder. Stakeholders write a grant proposal to create a Director of the Tutoring Program position to help organize the program. The grant proposal receives funding!

Stakeholders meet to determine: 1) the goals and role for each stakeholder, 2) the content and structure of the tutoring sessions, 3) the content and structure of the tutoring training, and 4) administrative logistics, e.g.,

days, times, transportation, and referral process for students.

Once the Director of the Tutoring Program is hired, elementary school students are invited, and those who plan to participate are confirmed. Because of frequent conversations, university faculty members know the numbers of university students needed and can plan accordingly. The Director of the Tutoring Program pairs the students with appropriate tutors and has an orientation for parents, students, and university tutors. All constituents seem happy, except for the minor issues that occur at the start of the program.

All stakeholders re-evaluate their goals and roles in the program. Collaborative groups continue to meet to brainstorm about issues and problems that arise. Their negotiations toward solutions might sometimes be awkward and messy, but using their mutual goals as direction resolves the differences. They seek feedback through surveys and focus groups from all stakeholders and evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Using the positive and negative responses as considerations, they begin planning for the next round of university tutors and the training.

On-going evaluation of the program is performed, in which notes are made to document the positive aspects of the program to continue and the issues that need to be addressed. A summative evaluation of the program identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The stakeholders discuss the goals and roles for the members and look to the future to determine how to proceed. They also recognize that there might be times of struggle for balance of power and boundaries that cause tensions. Through the negotiation of these tensions the stakeholders grow and evolve as individuals and strengthen the collective whole.

#### Conclusion

The value of the enriched form of reciprocity primarily comes about as a result of the systemic changes it can initiate as well as the deeper understandings among participants. When advancing his argument for “organizing” instead of “service,” Harry Boyte (2003) maintains that organizing has greater power because it uses the power of politics for the benefit of all. “Service” is more likely to be used to “hide patterns of power and actions that create greater dependency” (p. 5), while “organizing” brings to light the ways in which systems maintain the structures they create the need for “service” in the first place. The argument for an enriched form of reciprocity follows the same logic. Wherein the traditional form of reciprocity *maintains* the current unequal relationships between participating parties in service-learning relationships, the enriched form of reciprocity

*transforms* them, allowing for greater individual understanding of various life experiences as well as alteration of rigid social systems over time.

Creating systemic change and deeper understandings of our collective work are just two of the important goals that can occur when we use this enriched notion of reciprocity informed by Dewey's work. Adopting an evolutionary approach to reciprocity would initiate the question: how are people and the context different after having participated in this process? Among university faculty, the second author has significantly changed one of her elementary mathematics content courses to integrate the tutoring program into the course. For example, she recreated her course to include the writing of cases by her students about problems that have arisen during their tutoring sessions and sharing of those cases in small groups during class. The college students use these times to grow as professionals as they brainstorm solutions together and develop a professional community. Instead of merely providing tutoring experiences for the college students to practice new knowledge learned from the classroom, this has allowed for the creation of a community of professionals reflecting on real issues of teaching mathematics that might eventually serve as a model for collaborations with teaching colleagues. The first author has reconsidered the kinds of service-learning opportunities she offers students in several of her classes and has clarified the relative goals for each set of relationships. For example, the first author has implemented several assignments wherein college student "providers" examine what qualities, aims, and goals they share with the community "recipients" of the service-learning project. Some of the other potential outcomes of adopting this point of view for appropriate service-learning relationships include: actually changing classroom teaching practices as a result of the teacher seeing how tutoring activities can help aide student learning, changing how elementary school teachers incorporate university students into their classrooms, and changing classroom teachers' understanding of how their students think.

We want to be clear: we are not suggesting that all service-learning relationships require this type of reciprocity. In fact, the first author's review of her own courses suggests that the type of reciprocity advanced by the service-learning literature is potentially adequate for many of the curricular and social expectations that exist. We are suggesting, however, that because of the political and moral nature of educating, particularly educating young children, the types of relationships forged between universities and local schools requires a more organic definition of, and approach to, establishing reciprocity. There may be other areas within the university where a re-evaluation of "reciprocity" would prove fruitful, perhaps as close as

one's own classroom. Children are relying on these relationships to help them; we (broadly understood) have a sincere duty to deliver on that obligation. Our argument is that in an attempt to fulfill this responsibility, a deeper sense of reciprocity is required, one which very well might look like our enriched model.

#### References

- Bains, R. & Mesa-Bains, A. (2002). A reciprocal university: A model for arts, justice, and community. *Social Justice*, 29(4), 182-197.
- Ballantyne, P. F. (2002). "Dewey's muffled call for a larger unit of psychological analysis," speech given to the American Psychological Association, 103<sup>rd</sup> meeting, Toronto, Canada, August, 1996. Retrieved February 9, 2004 from <http://www.comnet.ca/%7Epbballan/Dewey.htm>.
- Bredo, E. (1998). Evolution, psychology, and John Dewey's critique of the reflex arc concept. *The Elementary School Journal*, 98(5), 447-466.
- Boyte, H. (2003, Summer). Putting politics back into civic engagement. *The Campus Compact Reader*, Summer 2003, 5-8.
- Dewey, J. (1927/1954). *The public and its problems*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1896). The reflex arc concept in psychology. Retrieved February 24, 2006 from [psychclassics.yorku.ca/Dewey/reflex.htm](http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Dewey/reflex.htm).
- Enos, S., & Morton, K. (2003). *Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships*. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Building service partnerships* (pp.20-41). Indianapolis, IN: Jossey-Bass.
- Gelmon, S. B., Holland, B.A., Seifer, S.D., Shinnamon, A., & Connors, K. (1998). Community-university partnerships for mutual learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5, 97-107.
- Greene, D. (1998). Reciprocity in two conditions of service-learning. *Educational Gerontology*, 24(5), 411-424.
- Jacobi, T. (2001). Redefining need in community-university partnerships: A collaborative perspective. Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Denver, CO. ERIC Document # 452 572.
- Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kendall, J.C. (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service* (Vol. 1). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.
- Porter, M. & Monard, K. (2001). *Anyi* in the global village: Building relationships of reciprocity through international service-learning. *Michigan*



*Journal of Community Service Learning*, 8(1), 5-17.

Skilton-Sylvester, E., & Erwin, E.K. (2000). Creating reciprocal learning relationships across socially-constructed borders. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, 65-75.

---

SUE ELLEN HENRY is an Associate Professor of Education at Bucknell University. She received her Ph.D. in Educational Foundations from the University of Virginia in 1996. Her research interests include moral education, multicultural and democratic education, as well as service-learning. She has published in *Teachers College Record*, *Educational Theory*, *Educational Studies*, and the *Journal of Negro*

*Education*. She has also published a book chapter exploring the influence of service-learning on social class identity in *Service-Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Dan Butin.

M. LYNN BREYFOGLE, PhD, is an Assistant Professor of Mathematics Education in the Mathematics Department of Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA. She received her Ph.D. in Mathematics Education from Western Michigan University in 2002. Her research interests include mathematics teacher education at both the elementary and secondary school levels. Her current focus is investigating how service-learning placements and the writing of cases based on these experiences influence prospective elementary teachers' beliefs about and pedagogical content knowledge of the teaching of mathematics.