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This study investigated social responsibility among college students involved in three different types of service learning. Social responsibility, the dependent variable, was analyzed using scores on the Social Responsibility Inventory. Three institutions, representative of Masters I Colleges and Universities, were involved in the study and 198 students completed the questionnaire. A one-way analysis of variance was run, which demonstrated that there was a significant difference among the mean scores on the Social Responsibility Inventory in the three types of service learning.

Type of service learning, the independent variable, included traditional community service, co-curricular service learning, and curricular service learning. Traditional community service was operationalized as membership in Alpha Phi Omega, a national co-ed service fraternity. The student sample was drawn from the membership on each campus. Co-curricular service learning was operationalized as involvement in Alternative Spring Break, a week-long service immersion experience. The student sample was randomly drawn from participants on two of the three campuses. Curricular service learning was operationalized as enrollment in a
for-credit service learning course. The student sample was the participants in one randomly drawn course on each campus.

Using a Tukey post hoc procedure, it was found that traditional community service and co-curricular service learning both had higher mean scores on the Social Responsibility Inventory than curricular service learning. No difference was reported between traditional community service and curricular service learning. Results may reflect initial differences between the three groups of students participating in the study rather than the types of service learning, a typical flaw in ex post facto studies. Both traditional community service and co-curricular service learning are voluntary activities that may attract students who have a higher sense of social responsibility than students enrolled in a curricular service learning course.
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CHAPTER I

SERVICE LEARNING AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Experience is not what happens to a man; it is what a man does with what happens to him.
—Aldous Huxley (1956)

The last two decades have been a period of great debate and public scrutiny of American higher education. A series of reports, beginning with *A Nation at Risk* (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983), which was followed by *Involvement in Learning* (Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education, 1984) and *College: The Undergraduate Experience* (Boyer, 1987), called for revisiting the mission and purpose of higher education. Other more recent reports (Barr & Tagg, 1995; Boyer, 1990a) have cited the need for higher education to establish a renewed focus on teaching and learning and explore alternative pedagogies. Many argue that the traditional forms of instruction, namely lecture and didactic instruction, have not fully met the needs of individual students, institutions, or communities (Boyer, 1996; Ehlrich, 1997).

During the last decade, the late Ernest Boyer wrote passionately about the possibilities of American higher education and lamented the fragmentation of the undergraduate experience (1987, 1990a, 1990b, 1996). Boyer (1990a) set out to develop a “new American College” and a new form of scholarship, in which students and faculty, and in fact institutions, could serve their communities in mutually
beneficial ways. The new form of higher learning was entitled the scholarship of engagement (Boyer, 1990a).

The concept of a new American college has been defined as an institution that "celebrates teaching and selectively supports research, while also taking special pride in its capacity to connect thought and action, theory to practice" (Coye, 1997, p. 13). Among the three priorities for these "new" institutions of higher education are (1) clarifying the curriculum, (2) connecting to the world beyond the classroom, and (3) creating a campus community.

Other authors (Barr & Tagg, 1995) specifically have called for moving from a paradigm of instruction to a paradigm of learning. They suggest that learning needs to be learner centered and learner controlled, creating a new kind of milieu in which faculty and students are partners in the learning process, fostering collaboration toward a new form of scholarship.

While these new paradigms for education have been widely debated, the American public has also shown a renewed interest in revisiting and reconnecting to our national heritage. The inherent spirit of giving and community life in America was richly described by de Tocqueville (1945) during his visit to the United States in the early 19th century. Other authors (Coles, 1993; Palmer, 1987; Rhoads, 1998) have more recently emphasized the importance of community in a democratic society and the need for actively engaged and informed citizens. Rethinking the conflict between our individualism and our need for community and commitment to
one another has become a topic of national interest (Bellah, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985; Putnam, 1995).

The commitment to building community and civic-minded citizens has also re-emerged on the American legislative agenda. Two of the most recent United States presidents have advocated citizenship and a national ethic of service through the creation of the Points of Light Foundation by President Bush in 1989 and the National Community Service Trust Act by President Clinton in 1993. Both of these efforts have helped put the spotlight on community service and have initiated some of the dialogue about the purposes of education.

National data collected annually on college freshman over the last 30 years have also caused alarm among educators and the public alike (Astin, 1998). These data detailing the values and beliefs of entering freshman have shown a markedly negative decline in attitudes towards helping others, finding a meaningful philosophy of life, and other goals of a liberal education. The shifts in student beliefs, however, are contrasted by a renewed interest among young people to become engaged in their communities, volunteer their time at social service agencies, and align themselves with particular social issues (Sax & Astin, 1997).

The combination of new forms of scholarship, and changes in faculty and student attitudes and beliefs, have contributed to an impending paradigm shift in American higher education. The potential of these changes in educational philosophy, mission, and pedagogy, however, need to be clarified and more fully explored prior to any permanent changes within institutions.
Change in Higher Education

Higher education has long had its roots in service to the community (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). Since their early beginning in colonial America, institutions of higher education have been called upon to serve in the nation’s interest. With the creation of the land grant colleges in the mid-19th century, higher education was called upon to serve more local and regional needs (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). More recently, institutions of higher education have been asked to reconsider their role in local communities, tapping their vast resources to solve society’s most serious social problems (Boyer, 1990a; Palmer, 1987).

Arguments regarding liberal education have waged on and off since the turn of the century. The Hutchins-Dewey debate over the “great” books theory and a more pragmatic and practical education has re-emerged. Dewey’s concepts of experiential learning and an emphasis on a social and democratic education are beginning to take a more central role in undergraduate education and are being argued by a number of prominent authors (Bok, 1986; Boyer, 1990a; Sax & Astin, 1997). After many years, Dewey’s arguments for a more pragmatic education appear to be gaining favor within the academy and are becoming more mainstream.

Changes in the curriculum and more focused and participatory forms of instruction, both curricular and co-curricular, are also being advocated. Among the new forms of instruction cited most often are problem-based learning, collaborative learning, and character education (Boyte, 1991; Ehlrich, 1997; Gaudiani, 1997; Stanton, 1991). These new forms of instruction are based on experiential
pedagogies that also stress as outcomes the need for learners to develop skills that will contribute to a more democratic and civil society.

Co-curricular programs, as well, have emerged as an important source of learning and personal development for students (Astin, 1993; Sax & Astin, 1997). Some argue that the role of co-curricular programs is not peripheral to the educational mission of higher education but rather is integral to the undergraduate experience (Bok, 1986). When co-curricular programs are infused with intentional learning outcomes, they become more than “extra” curricular, but rather as a source of context for the student learning experience. These experiences can become a means of creating a seamless web between in-class and out-of-class experiences, and become more central to the educational mission of the university.

It is important to note, however, that the changes being advocated become a part of the existing curriculum and co-curriculum rather than separate and distinct experiences. Traditional liberal education concepts need to be merged with these new forms of learning. Alternative pedagogies can strengthen our liberal education programs while increasing our capacity to serve society and democracy (Sax & Astin, 1997).

In an essay on American higher education, Boyer and Hechinger (1981) urged colleges and universities to “use the current period of transition to rediscover how their own unique historic purposes can serve the nation’s interests in new and vital ways” (p. viii). Advocating public policy studies for all students was among four goals outlined in the essay and the authors encouraged a new program of civic

Bok (1986), Boyer (1990a), and Astin (1996b) have also emphasized the central role of higher education in teaching citizenship, values, and the importance of citizen participation in a democracy. Swift (1990) called for higher education to actively support pedagogies that teach youth about civic responsibility and suggested that volunteerism, citizen participation, and personal involvement are fundamental to a successfully functioning society. The notion that the development of civic values and individual character is the responsibility of everyone within higher education, including administrators, faculty, and staff, is itself a new paradigm and one that requires more discussion across disciplines and functions (Coles, 1993; Gaudiani, 1997).

The need for more relevant pedagogies and for a more institutional and comprehensive approach to undergraduate education was captured by Rhoads (1998), who stated that

somewhere in the chasm between faculty work and student affairs practice, encouraging students to develop the sense of community-mindedness necessary for democracy to thrive has been lost . . . Higher education should reconsider the development of students as caring and community-oriented citizens. Part of the solution clearly involves not only closing the chasm between faculty and student affairs professionals, but also the division between “in-class” and “out-of-class” student experiences, as well as the separation of practical and academic knowledge. (p. x)

Two recent books on this topic (Barber, 1992; Lisman, 1998) decry the need to re-kindle civic literacy and responsibility among undergraduate students. They suggest that service learning, as one form of experiential education, has tremendous
value, not only as a pedagogy, but as an added value for students, faculty, educational institutions, and communities. Barber (1992) argues that civic education rooted in service learning can be a powerful response to civic scapegoatism and the bad habits of representative democracy (and that) education-based community service programs empower students even as they learn. They bring the lessons of service into the classroom, even as they bring the lessons of the classroom out into the community. (p. 252)

These initiatives for undergraduate education reform and student involvement in the community have not been adequately linked (Stanton, 1991). The bridge between academic and student affairs, between campuses and communities, and a renewed focus on social and civic education must be interwoven. Service learning is one approach to these issues that is gaining favor within the academy, as is evident in the literature.

Service Learning

Service learning is a pedagogy that combines academic learning with meaningful student community service (Kendall, 1990). It is an umbrella term that is both a philosophy of education and a social movement. It is a form of experiential education that has its theoretical roots in the works of John Dewey (1916, 1927, 1938) and David Kolb (1984). It is also rooted in the developmental theories of Kohlberg (1975), Perry (1970), and Chickering (1990).

Jacoby (1996) defined service learning as "a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student..."
learning and development” (p. 5). Unlike traditional volunteerism, and other forms of community based learning, service learning meets actual community needs and includes an opportunity for focused reflection which helps produce learning outcomes. It emphasizes focused student learning through meaningful community action, and reciprocity between student and service recipient. Service learning can be offered as a co-curricular program or can be imbedded within an academic course in which credit is given for the learning rather than the service. It is these various types of service learning programs that were of particular interest in this study and which will be discussed more thoroughly in Chapter II.

Robert Sigmon (Jacoby & Associates, 1996) developed a useful typology for understanding the various types of service learning. He suggested that service learning can be viewed in terms of what aspect of service and/or learning is being emphasized. He distinguished among those that emphasize service over learning (SERVICE-learning), those that emphasize learning over service (service-LEARNING), those that do little to link service and learning (service learning), and finally, those that link and emphasize the service and learning equally (SERVICE-LEARNING) (Jacoby & Associates, 1996, pp. 5–6).

It is through Sigmon’s typology that one can begin to differentiate between traditional community service, service learning that is based in the curriculum, and service learning that is based in the co-curriculum. Understanding how these different types of service learning produce outcomes for students is critical, and this knowledge can help service learning practitioners and faculty design experiences
that maximize student learning, benefit the local community, and create meaningful partnerships between institutions and communities.

Service learning has grown rapidly in recent years in both secondary and postsecondary settings (Korbin & Nadelman, 1995). For nearly two decades, the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) has actively promoted service learning as a legitimate pedagogy and as an educational philosophy. With the creation of the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) in 1984 and the Campus Compact in 1985, community service and service learning programs have blossomed on American college campuses. Over the last 13 years, Campus Compact, an organization advocating community service and service learning, reported that 546 institutions of higher education (of approximately 4,000 institutions nationally) had initiated community service and service-learning programs on their campuses, representing nearly 20% of all institutions of higher education (Korbin & Nadelman, 1995).

The growth of community service and service-learning programs has been widely discussed in the literature. The outcomes of service-learning, as well, have been prevalent in the literature but only modestly demonstrated in a handful of empirical studies. The outcomes of each of these types of service learning need to be documented and more fully understood in order for higher education to embrace this pedagogy and philosophy as a potential paradigm shift for higher education.
Outcomes of Service Learning

Service learning has been cited as a means to actively engage students in the classroom and their communities, contributing to their psychosocial and cognitive development (Conrad & Hedin, 1991). It has also been cited as a model way to teach citizenship, values, and community leadership (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990; Morse, 1989). Ultimately, service learning has been proposed as a means to reform and transform American education (Astin, 1996a; Rifkin, 1996).

There is a wide range of research studies that suggest that service learning may have an impact on the growth and development of students in a variety of ways. It has been reported that service learning can improve basic skills and comprehension (Cohen & Kinsey, 1994; Markus, Howard, & King, 1993; Miller, 1994; Shumer, 1994) and critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Batchelder & Root, 1994; Crytzer, 1993). It has also been suggested that service learning may have an impact on developing a sense of civic responsibility and learning to work with and understand people who are different (Myers-Lipton, 1996a), and developing an understanding and interest in social problems (Markus et al., 1993). Finally, service learning has also been shown to enhance identity formation (Rhoads & Nuerurer, 1998), self-esteem (Conrad & Hedin, 1991), moral development (Boss, 1994), and academic achievement (Greco, 1992; Markus et al., 1993).

The majority of these studies are limited to curricular-based service learning and have a variety of limitations in the methodology and study design. Many of the studies are also limited to one course within a single institution, employ small and
underrepresentative samples, and poor methodology and design. They also have not adequately defined the different types of service-learning experiences utilized. The extent to which each of the three types of service learning influences student outcomes needs to be more thoroughly studied and documented if service learning is to be taken seriously as a new paradigm for American education.

The Campus Compact (1998) recently published a national research agenda which was established for the field of service learning. Among the priorities listed, understanding the outcomes of different types of service learning was listed as the third priority. Partly in response to this document, the present study has addressed this issue in particular.

Statement of the Problem

From the literature, it is clear that types of service learning models need to be more fully explored in terms of outcomes on students (Campus Compact, 1998). The national interest in civic and social responsibility has also been widely advocated (Barber, 1992; Boyer, 1990a; Lisman, 1998). Therefore, this study investigated the outcomes of service learning from three pedagogically distinct models: a curricular based model, a co-curricular based model, and a traditional community-service model. It explored one particular student outcome, civic and social responsibility, using the Social Responsibility Inventory (SRI). This outcome has also been explored as it relates to issues of student development as rooted in the theories of Chickering (1990), Kohlberg (1975), and Perry (1970).
The specific research question addressed is: Are the civic and social responsibility outcomes different for students who participate in three pedagogically distinct models of service learning? The research question has been addressed using a sample drawn from multiple campuses.

Purpose and Importance of the Study

This study has advanced our knowledge about service learning in the following ways: (a) provided quantitative data on the sense of civic and social responsibility of college students participating in three pedagogically distinct models of service learning, (b) identified differences in the outcomes of these three types of service learning programs, and (c) gathered data from each of these three types from multiple campuses.

Chapter I has attempted to frame the importance of service learning as a new paradigm for postsecondary education and has identified the research question to be addressed. Chapter II will provide a synthesis and critical analysis of the literature related to service learning and further assert that it is a phenomenon worthy of more scholarly inquiry.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research studies on service learning have been criticized as being anecdotal and limited in scope. Although many studies have appeared in the literature in recent years, the majority of these studies involve one course within a single institution, small sample sizes, and little or no randomization. The vast majority of studies include both quantitative and qualitative designs and involve both secondary and postsecondary school populations. As indicated, these studies have also suggested a broad array of outcomes. A major criticism, however, is that many of the recent studies have focused on only one type of service learning, curricular service learning. These studies have been summarized in this chapter, showing the range of variables studied, the range of methods used, and the limited basis for inferences concerning service learning.

The literature has been organized into three general areas. First, views of outcomes of higher education are explored in four distinct areas, including college impact models, the affective/psychosocial approach, the cognitive developmental approach, and the post-hoc empirical approach. These studies provide the framework within which any higher education innovation should be studied. Types of service learning have also been presented in terms of the various characteristics that make each of the three types of service learning unique. These three types
include traditional community service, co-curricular service learning, and curricular service learning. Finally, outcome variables associated with service learning have been synthesized and critically analyzed. Outcome variables have been reviewed in terms of affective/psychosocial and cognitive development. The literature review also explores the strengths and weaknesses of these studies, building an argument for the present study undertaken.

Views of Outcomes of Higher Education

Since the Student Personnel Point of View was first published in 1937, developing the whole person has been a focus for many educators. This important document also emphasized treating students as individuals and stressed the importance of creating socially responsible citizens (American Council on Education, 1937). It helped ground the field and fostered the development of theories for understanding the unique developmental needs of college students (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBritto, 1998).

The growth of the student affairs profession, and consequently the development of theory applied to college students, has caused us to re-examine the purpose of the undergraduate experience and allowed researchers to explore the outcomes of college from a variety of approaches. The development of students' cognitive, affective, and moral reasoning skills has come to be seen as critical and, for some, as important as the traditional intellectual goals of higher education. Pedagogies and environments that foster these developmental issues need to be
more fully explored in order to realize and maximize the potential of higher education.

The variety of views of outcomes of higher education can be summarized within the broad construct of student development (see Table 1). Miller and Prince (1976) defined student development as “the application of human development concepts in post-secondary settings so that everyone involved can master increasingly complex developmental tasks, achieve self-direction, and become interdependent” (p. 3). Most approaches to student development view the outcomes of higher education using college impact models, and/or affective or cognitive developmental theories. Post-hoc empirical studies (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991) are another approach in which years of research regarding the outcomes of higher education have been synthesized. Each of these views has been summarized in Table 1 and is explored more fully in the following section. Taken together, they represent all of the various value positions on the effects of higher education.

**College Impact Models**

Sanford (1962, 1966) and Astin (1979, 1993) both offer models that illustrate the impact college can have on students’ personal development. These models can help practitioners design interventions that can maximize the developmental opportunities during the undergraduate experience.

Sanford (1962, 1966), one of the early pioneers of the student personnel movement, advocated the concept of challenge and support, arguing that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Constructs/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Impact Models</td>
<td>Sanford (1962)</td>
<td>Student development occurs through balancing challenges &amp; supports; dissonance, disequilibrium &amp; anxiety facilitate student growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective/</td>
<td>Chickering (1990)</td>
<td>Sequence of stages define life cycle; Seven vectors include (1) developing competence, (2) managing emotions, (3) moving through autonomy to interdependence, (4) developing mature interpersonal relationships, (5) establishing identity, (6) developing purpose, and (7) developing integrity. Environmental factors are also critical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kohlberg (1975)</td>
<td>Three stages of moral development: Pre-conventional, conventional, post-conventional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-hoc Empirical</td>
<td>Pascarella &amp; Terenzini (1991)</td>
<td>Outcomes include (1) development of verbal, quantitative, and subject matter competence; (2) cognitive skills and intellectual growth; (3) psychosocial changes in identity, self-concept, and self-esteem; (4) psychosocial changes in relating to others and the external world; (5) attitudes and values; (6) moral development; (7) educational attainment; (8) career choice and development; (9) economic benefits of college; and (10) quality of life after college.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
development occurs when challenges are appropriately balanced with supports. He suggested designing learning environments that create dissonance, disequilibrium, and anxiety, which can facilitate some of the developmental issues faced by college students. Sanford’s model is a practical and useful strategy for achieving some of the basic educational goals outlined in Chapter I.

Alexander Astin’s (1979, 1993) extensive work has not only broadened the work of student development theorists and the purposes of the undergraduate experience, but has also begun to bridge the gap between student and academic affairs. His models suggest that students learn through their involvement in direct experience, echoing the earlier work of John Dewey (1916, 1938). Astin’s model elaborates on five postulates, which state that (1) involvement requires the investment of psychological and physical energy in objects, of one sort or another, whether specific or highly general; (2) involvement is a continuous concept in which different students will invest varying amounts of energy in different objects; (3) involvement has both quantitative and qualitative features; (4) the amount of learning or development is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of involvement; and (5) educational effectiveness of any policy or practice is related to its capacity to induce student involvement (Astin, 1993).

Astin also proposed a college impact model (1993) that stresses three elements of student development. These include: (1) inputs, or characteristics that students bring with them to college; (2) environments, or structures and programs that exist at the institution to influence personal development; and (3) outputs, or
characteristics that students develop after their exposure to the college environment. Astin has also explored outcomes of college through his taxonomy of outcomes (1979), which is based on cognitive, affective, behavioral, and psychological outcomes.

Through his extensive work with entering college freshman, Astin (1998) has also recorded changes in values, attitudes, and beliefs of college students over the last 30 years. These data reveal that entering college freshman have significantly different values than their predecessors from a generation earlier. He has reported that recent entering freshman are more concerned about "being well-off financially" and are less interested in "developing a meaningful philosophy of life" than college freshman in the past (Astin, 1998). This trend has alarmed many educators and has become an often cited reason that service learning programs are needed to reinvigorate the curriculum and student learning.

The college impact model suggests that educators must design interventions and consider a variety of environmental factors that influence student development. These views are critical in light of the recent arguments regarding educational reform and change in higher education that were discussed in Chapter I.

**Affective/Psychosocial Approach**

Another view of the outcomes of higher education focuses on the affective/psychosocial approach which is concerned with examining students' personal and interpersonal lives (Evans, 1996). Affective/psychosocial outcomes include
attitudes, values, concepts of self, aspirations, and personality traits. Psychosocial theorists, such as Chickering (1990), examine the content of development and the important issues students face as their lives progress. These issues include how to define themselves, their relationships with others, and what to do with their lives (Evans et al., 1998, p. 32).

Chickering (1990), based his theory of psychosocial development on the earlier work of Erikson (1950, 1968). He argued that identity was at the core of psychosocial development and proposed a model that addressed the developmental issues faced by college students. He also stressed that environmental factors could influence a student’s development.

Chickering’s (1990) model is premised on seven vectors of development, each with its own direction and magnitude. Developmental crises or turning points occur which force students to re-examine their own beliefs, attitudes, and identities. Students may move back and forth through the seven vectors, depending on life experiences, new and greater challenges, and different crises with which the student is confronted. The seven vectors identified by Chickering are: (1) developing competence, (2) managing emotions, (3) moving through autonomy to interdependence, (4) developing mature interpersonal relationships, (5) establishing identity, (6) developing purpose, and (7) developing integrity. Each of these stages can be used as “markers” for understanding students’ unique developmental needs and strategies for facilitating growth.
Chickering also suggested that a variety of environmental factors at the institution can affect students’ psychosocial development. These environmental factors include: (a) institutional objectives; (b) institutional size; (c) student faculty relationships; (d) curriculum, teaching, and evaluation; (e) friendships and small communities; (f) student development programs and services; (g) integration of work and learning; (h) recognition and respect for individual differences; and (i) acknowledgment of the cyclical nature of learning and development. Each of these developmental tasks and environmental factors are critical to a student’s development and therefore should be of primary concern to educators. These psychosocial issues need to be considered when designing and implementing both curricular and co-curricular programs. Chickering’s theory has clearly impacted Tinto (1987) in the development of the major explanatory model on retention and completion of the baccalaureate.

Cognitive Developmental Approach

The cognitive developmental approach includes changes in higher levels of intellectual processes, such as knowledge acquisition, decision-making, ability to synthesize, and reasoning. It includes theorists such as Perry (1970), Kohlberg (1975), and Gilligan (1982), who have each elaborated on the ways in which students develop their ability to solve complex problems and make meaning of their world.
Perry (1970), along with most cognitive developmental theorists, expanded on the work of Piaget (1952). Perry (1970) studied freshman men at Harvard University and developed seven positions of intellectual and ethical development. He postulated that students develop intellectually and ethically in their thinking about truth, values, and the nature of knowledge. Perry's nine positions can be categorized into four general areas, including dualism (positions 1-2), multiplicity (positions 3-4), relativism (positions 5-6), and commitment to relativism (positions 7-9).

Kohlberg's (1975) theory of moral development identifies three general stages that explain how individuals reason and make decisions. These three stages include the pre-conventional stage, the conventional stage, and the post-conventional stage. The pre-conventional stage suggests that individuals make moral decisions based on cultural rules and whether something is "good or bad." Decisions are primarily based on the pain or punishment associated with each decision. The conventional stage suggests individuals make decisions based on authority and the expectations of social norms. The post-conventional stage suggests a more principled and autonomous effort to define moral values and is the pinnacle of moral development.

Gilligan (1982), dissatisfied with Kohlberg's limited male perspective, developed a theory of moral development for women who, she suggested, make decisions based on relationships rather than on rules or mores. She also stressed the role of self and morality, and on crises and transition in the moral development of women.
Together, the cognitive and affective/psychosocial developmental approaches suggest a framework for understanding the level of development an individual student has achieved. In turn, they also suggest interventions that would be appropriate in order to "move" students toward a higher level of development.

**Post-hoc Empirical Approach**

The post-hoc empirical approach considers the outcomes of higher education based on survey and empirical research from previously collected data. Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) provide a thorough synthesis and analysis of the published research on the effects of college on students over the last several decades. They summarized the research on the outcomes of college on students in 10 distinct areas, including (1) development of verbal, quantitative, and subject matter competence; (2) cognitive skills and intellectual growth, much like Kohlberg and Perry's theories; (3) psychosocial changes in identity, self-concept, and self-esteem, much like Chickering's theory; (4) psychosocial changes in relating to others and the external world, much like Chickering and Astin's work; (5) attitudes and values; (6) moral development, much like Kohlberg and Gilligan's theories; (7) educational attainment; (8) career choice and development; (9) economic benefits of college; and (10) quality of life after college.

Each of the theoretical approaches discussed earlier are embedded within Pascarella and Terenzini's (1991) work. Their work, however, also includes other tangible outcomes of higher education, such as the effects of college after
graduation and the monetary value of a higher education. Their approach is included here because it offers a very broad view of the outcomes of higher education, and is a view that is not only concerned with developmental change.

Pascarella and Terenzini's (1991) work is helpful in understanding the multitude of outcomes that can be facilitated during the undergraduate experience and the profound impact that college can have on an individual's life. This, in turn, suggests that college can also have an impact on the larger community and on society in general.

Summary of Outcomes

Higher education clearly offers students more than an opportunity for a career and a secure financial future. It offers a host of developmental opportunities that can increase an individual's capacity and satisfaction with life. It also seems to suggest that it may affect the quality of all of our lives (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). The work of Sanford (1962), Chickering (1990), and Astin (1979), in particular, provide a framework for understanding the unique characteristics and developmental needs of college students. These theoretical approaches also suggest outcomes which can and should be facilitated through student involvement in curricular and co-curricular experiences. The types of experiences that best facilitate this development, however, are still being debated.

Many of the theorists discussed in this chapter, especially Astin (1997), have suggested that service learning can be an effective means of facilitating the kinds of
student development that are most desirable. Service learning, through its emphasis on action, reciprocity, and reflection, may also provide an ideal structure and environment for student development to occur. He also argues that service learning has the potential to transform learning and American higher education. Specific outcomes of service learning within these areas have been more fully explored in this chapter, following a discussion about the types of service learning.

Types of Service Learning

As defined in Chapter I, service learning is a pedagogy that combines academic learning with meaningful community service (Kendall, 1990). It has also been described as an educational philosophy, a program type, and a pedagogical method (Giles & Eyler, 1994a).

One of the dilemmas facing educational researchers interested in studying service learning is the myriad of meanings associated with the term. Many people define service learning as occurring only through an academic course, while others suggest that it can be part of the co-curriculum. Campus volunteer centers and student organizations also offer a range of traditional community service activities that, when designed properly, have the potential to be powerful service learning experiences. Other authors have developed theoretical models to authenticate and legitimize service learning (Delve et al., 1990). These models suggest a continuum of service learning in which traditional community service experiences, when
properly designed, become progressively more meaningful in terms of the potential learning outcomes.

The differences between the various types of service learning are currently under debate, but it is possible to begin to differentiate the different types when they are viewed as a continuum. Figure 1 illustrates one possible continuum of service learning which can be helpful in understanding the focus of each type and their progression from traditional community service to, what some consider to be “real” or legitimate” service learning.
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**Figure 1.** Continuum of Service Learning.

From the continuum, the various types of service learning can be understood as progressing from a charity-based model to a social-action model. One of the primary tenets of service learning is the idea that it not only offers individual students a powerful learning experience, but can also transform communities and its citizens through a tripartite focus on service, learning, and reciprocity. As one moves along the continuum, these three foci become more a central part of the experience.

One other way to better understand each of the three types of service learning is through a review of the salient features of each type, including duration,
controlling agents, and focus of the experience. A critical review of the literature in this area becomes somewhat difficult, however, since definitions of service learning vary widely among authors and the sample or experience is not always clearly defined within much of the literature. Table 2 summarizes the types of service learning, which will be discussed in this section.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Service Learning</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Controlling Agents</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Community Service</td>
<td>Varies; typically a one-time experience</td>
<td>Student organization activity; little or no staff involvement</td>
<td>Altruism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular</td>
<td>Varies; can be on-going or over several weeks</td>
<td>University-wide activity or program; moderate to intense staff involvement</td>
<td>Personal development; issue based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular</td>
<td>Varies: Typically over the course of one semester</td>
<td>Single class; typically closely monitored by a faculty member</td>
<td>Academic goals; subject matter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traditional Community Service**

As indicated in Chapter I, student volunteer programs have been thriving and blossoming on American college campuses for the last two decades (Campus Compact, 1998). Many campus student organizations, as well, have long held the
tradition of voluntary service to the community (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). Although this type of community service may result in learning outcomes, they very rarely incorporate the kinds of objectives and interventions necessary for them to be considered "legitimate" service learning experiences. They are often rooted in a charity-based model of "giving" rather than learning and often do not involve direct service experiences or interaction with others. Most importantly, they also do not incorporate an opportunity to reflect on or learn from the experience, one of the critical elements of service learning.

This type of service has not been studied as thoroughly in the recent literature as the other two types of service learning shown on the continuum. In fact, many researchers and practitioners do not consider traditional community service to be service learning at all; for them it stands outside the continuum shown in Figure 1. Through Astin’s (1979) theory of involvement and from the literature on experiential learning, however, some conclusions can be drawn regarding the validity and benefit of these kinds of experiences, and many studies have in fact shown them to have the potential for serving as valuable learning experiences.

Co-curricular Service Learning

Co-curricular service learning includes those experiences that, although not a part of the formal curriculum, do incorporate many of the necessary components to be considered service learning. One example of this type of service learning is Alternative Spring Break (ASB), a week-long service immersion experience. Many
non-credit international service experiences may also fall within this realm of the continuum. Although there are only a handful of empirical studies that explore this type of service learning, they do enhance our understanding of the effects of these types of experiences.

The duration of co-curricular service learning experiences ranges from one-time projects that may last 2 hours, to ongoing projects where students volunteer once each week. They also include week-long experiences such as ASB, or longer term international experiences, which may last for a week, an entire semester, a year, or even longer. The primary difference between traditional community service and co-curricular service is the level of institutional commitment; traditional community service programs often have a voluntary advisor with little financial support from the institution, while co-curricular service learning programs often have a full or part-time advisor with considerable financial support from the institution. The primary difference between co-curricular service learning and curricular service learning is that the former is not credit-bearing and is typically not linked to any academic discipline or formal classroom requirement. The role of the faculty member in curricular service learning also distinguishes it from the other types.

Some co-curricular service learning experiences are required by institutions prior to graduation, while others might be required as admittance to a particular academic program. Most types of co-curricular experiences are entirely voluntary. Many of these types of experiences may require an application or interview prior to
participation, making them rather selective and desirable for students, or they may be open to anyone at the institution.

As indicated, only a handful of empirical studies exist related to co-curricular service learning, many of them as comparison groups to curricular service learning (Rhoads & Neururer, 1998). Other studies (Bringle & Kremer, 1993; Newmann & Ruetter, 1983; Pyle, 1981) are strictly co-curricular. The authors of these studies seem to suggest that, although they can be powerful experiences, co-curricular service learning experiences do not offer the same opportunities for learning as curricular service learning experiences.

Curricular Service Learning

By far, curricular service learning is the most often studied form of service learning and, for some, considered to be the only form of “legitimate” service learning. These studies, however, vary in terms of duration, controlling agents, form, and outcomes for students, depending greatly on the quality of the experience and the role of the faculty member.

Like other types of service learning, the duration of curricular service learning programs can vary greatly. Typically, it is offered in a course that has as one of its primary requirements, a service component. Some courses specify a particular number of service hours per week, while others may specify a total number of service hours to be completed prior to the end of the semester. This may vary between one-time, 2- or 3-hour experiences, to a commitment of 60 or more
hours during the semester. In curricular service learning, however, it is important to stress that credit in the course should be based on the learning achieved rather than the number and quality of service provided.

Another important variation in curricular service learning, as can be true with other types of service learning, is the type of service placement and the quality of the experience. Type of placement may range from direct service at a soup kitchen or school to an indirect service placement where the focus is on advocacy, policy, or administrative service. This variation in placement and experience may have a great impact on the quality of learning achieved. No studies were found related to this variation in curricular service learning, or co-curricular service learning, for that matter.

A final variation in curricular service learning is the type of class in which the service learning takes place. Most curricular service learning projects are based in traditional, discipline-based courses, such as education or social work, in which the service learning experience allows students to gain new skills and insights into a particular profession. Other service learning courses and disciplines, such as arts and humanities, may serve to encourage students to apply more general concepts from the curriculum to a community-based experience. Still other curricular service learning programs may be part of an independent seminar or internship experience.

Finally, some curricular service learning courses are developed around the theme of service learning and allow students to focus on their own lives through service to others and apply their experiences in a more general way. These types of
service learning experiences are often offered in one-credit seminar format and are not directly linked to any one traditional academic program. Many are housed within a university or college honors program.

Empirical studies of curricular service learning projects have become more prevalent in the literature. Most, however, are limited to a single course at a single institution, using quasi-experimental methods and no randomization.

**Theoretical Models**

A model of service learning, developed by Delve et al. (1990), has helped guide the literature and suggest several developmental and research strategies. The model suggests that service learning is an appropriate intervention in college student development and helps to differentiate among the various types of service learning. Delve et al. build their model on the work of Perry (1970), Kohlberg (1975), and Gilligan (1982). The model identifies five phases, each of which is impacted by a variety of developmental variables, including type of intervention, level of commitment, behavior, and level of challenge and support. The five phases include: (1) exploration, in which students demonstrate an eagerness to participate in service with little focus on what they would like to accomplish; (2) clarification, in which students continue to explore service experiences and begin to clarify their own personal values; (3) realization, in which students begin to experience a change in their orientation, learning about themselves and their community; (4) activation, in which students begin to understand more complex social issues and seek to
influence these issues; and (5) internalization, in which students integrate their experience into their lives and make more long-term commitments towards their personal and career goals.

The goal of the practitioner, then, is to design service experiences that facilitate student movement from a model of service based on charity to a model based on social justice. This movement allows students to live consistently with their values, develop a lifelong commitment to service, and develop a sense of belonging in the community and society (Delve et al., 1990). This model parallels the continuum of service learning shown earlier in Figure 1.

Summary of Service Learning

Service learning has become a pedagogy for facilitating many of the developmental needs addressed earlier in this chapter. There is, however, a great deal of variation in each of the three types of service learning. Some traditional community service activities can be very powerful service learning experiences, while some curricular service learning programs can be poorly designed and implemented, resulting in fairly weak learning experiences for students. These variations in type of service learning need to be explored more fully in terms of their effect on the developmental outcomes that are possible for students.
Outcomes of Service Learning

The literature on service learning indicates that, as a pedagogical method or program type, service learning can influence a wide range of outcomes in both secondary and postsecondary settings. Cognitive outcomes include intellectual growth and skills, knowledge and subject matter competence, moral developmental change, career choice and development, and quality of intellectual life after college. Affective outcomes include psychosocial changes in attitudes, values and beliefs, increases in personal identity and self-esteem, and civic and social responsibility. Thus, the dependent variable in the literature on service learning has mirrored the entire dependent variable set in literature on higher education. Much of the literature suggests that further studies need to be undertaken to more fully understand the phenomenon of service learning. Despite the recent fervor over this pedagogy, it is surprising how little research exists that can support or refute many of the claims being made about service learning.

One of the difficulties that exists in summarizing and analyzing the literature includes the variation in definitions that exists for service learning. It is also difficult to design studies that take into account the variety of applications of service learning. There is also great variation in service learning settings, type of placement, number of hours spent in service, and type of contact with service recipients. Each of these vary greatly from study to study and confound any systematic inference from the literature.
Outcome variables associated with service learning are summarized in Table 3. As can be seen from the table, the review of the literature will synthesize and critically analyze these outcome variables along two dimensions, cognitive and affective/psychosocial. Cognitive outcomes include grade point average and academic achievement, and moral development and reasoning. Affective/psychosocial outcomes include identity and personal development, attitudes, beliefs and values, civic and social responsibility, and racial understanding and tolerance of others.

Service learning studies will be reviewed according to outcome variable, with consideration for type of study (curricular, co-curricular, or traditional community service), sample size, number of institutions involved in the sample, general study design, flaws of the study, and a summary of findings. This review will lead to a statement regarding the hypothesis being considered for the present study.

**Cognitive Outcomes**

As described earlier, cognitive developmental outcomes suggest changes in intellectual processes, such as knowledge acquisition, decision-making skills, synthesizing ideas, and ability to reason. The research in this area has been summarized into two general areas. These areas are grade point average (GPA) and academic achievement, which includes knowledge of subject matter, analytical/problem-solving skills, and decision-making skills; and moral development and reasoning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>General Design of Study</th>
<th>Flaws</th>
<th># of Institutions</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COGNITIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA &amp; academic achievement</td>
<td>All curricular</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>22-96</td>
<td>5 quantitative/1 qualitative/Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>No randomization</td>
<td>All single institutions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral development &amp; reasoning</td>
<td>All curricular</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>16-71</td>
<td>4 quantitative/1 qualitative/Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>No randomization, Small sample sizes</td>
<td>4 used single institutions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFECTIVE/ PSYCHO-SOCIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes, beliefs, and values</td>
<td>12 curricular</td>
<td>All positive</td>
<td>21-3450</td>
<td>7 quantitative/2 qualitative/4 combined</td>
<td>Difficult to measure attitude change over short duration</td>
<td>11 used single institutions</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 co-curricular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity &amp; personal development</td>
<td>3 curricular</td>
<td>All positive</td>
<td>24-4000</td>
<td>1 quantitative/1 qualitative/2 combined</td>
<td>One shot case study; instruments</td>
<td>All used single institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 co-curricular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic &amp; social responsibility</td>
<td>1 co-curricular</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>122-1193</td>
<td>2 quantitative/1 combined Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Some randomization</td>
<td>2 used single institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 curricular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial understanding &amp; tolerance</td>
<td>All curricular</td>
<td>All positive</td>
<td>21-4000</td>
<td>All quantitative/1 combined</td>
<td>No randomization</td>
<td>3 used single institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GPA and Academic Achievement

Several studies have explored the impact of service learning experiences on grade point average and academic achievement. These studies include Markus et al. (1993), Shumer (1994), Greco (1992), Calabrese and Shumer (1986), Miller (1994), and Knapp and Stubblefield (2000). The results of these studies, in general, were fairly inconclusive with regard to the effects of service learning on GPA and academic achievement.

All but one study (Miller, 1994), however, reported some minor positive effects of service learning on GPA and academic achievement. All of the studies, however, considered only one course at a single institution in the study design. Sample size ranged from 22 to 96. Three of the six studies involved college students, while three studies involved high school students.

In each of the studies, a quasi-experimental control group was used, with little or no randomization. As would be expected, all studies in this area involved curricular service learning, since traditional volunteerism and co-curricular service learning do not generally involve academic credit or academic assessment. They were also primarily quantitative in nature, although two studies incorporated qualitative data. In most cases, grade point average and academic achievement were measured at the conclusion of the experience using traditional methods of course assessment.
As indicated earlier, results from these studies were mixed. Several studies reported that students involved in service learning were more likely to learn to apply principles from the course to new situations and that grades and classroom learning increased as a result of participation in the service learning component (Greco, 1992; Knapp & Stubblefield, 2000; Markus et al., 1993; Shumer, 1994). These results were also shown with high school students (Calabrese & Shumer, 1986).

Contrasting results were reported in only one study (Miller, 1994). Although no significant differences in terms of general learning or in course grades were reported, students involved in service did report that they were better able to apply concepts learned in the course and to solve problems in that particular subject area better than students who were not involved in service.

Moral Development and Reasoning

The effect of service learning on students' moral development has been explored in a number of different studies. These studies include Boyd (1980), Boss (1994), Batchelder and Root (1994), Gorman, Duffy, and Heffernan (1980), and Greene (1997). Three of these five studies demonstrated that a number of modest to significant gains in moral development were achieved through involvement in service learning programs. One study (Greene, 1997), however, suggested that service learning had a negative effect on moral development, while another study (Boyd, 1980) was inconclusive.
Regarding general study design, four of the five studies applied a primarily quantitative design, while one study (Boyd, 1980) employed a combined quantitative and qualitative design. Sample sizes ranged from 16 to 71, a small but varied range of sample sizes. All studies involved college level participants in a curricular service learning experience, and because of this, none of the studies were able to control for randomization of samples. Three of the five studies were limited to a single course within a single institution. Gorman et al. (1980), however, involved 24 different sections of two different courses at a single institution. Greene (1997) was the only study to involve more than one institution. All studies utilized a pre- and posttest, contrast group design.

In general, three of the five studies showed that service learning had an effect on moral development and reasoning, along with a number of other outcomes. Two of these studies (Boss, 1994; Gorman et al., 1980) employed the Defining Issues Test, while another (Greene, 1997) used the Student Development Task Inventory and the Sociomoral Reflection Measure. These studies and instruments correspond to the theoretical work of both Kohlberg (1975) and Gilligan (1982).

The combined results of these five studies were inconclusive with regards to the effect of service learning on students' moral development and reasoning skills. While three of the five studies showed positive results, two others were negative or inconclusive. Among the significant findings, Batchelder and Root (1994) reported significant increases in pro-moral decision making and reasoning among participants compared to nonparticipants. Boss (1994) reported that students involved in service
learning showed increases toward more principled reasoning than the contrast group. Increases in moral sensitivity and that students involved in service learning were more likely to view themselves as "moral individuals" were also reported. Gorman et al. (1980) also showed a higher rate of growth on moral development using the DIT than students not involved in service learning.

Greene's (1997) study was the exception. In this study, it was reported that neither the contrast group nor the service learning group showed any increase in moral reasoning. In fact, Greene reported that one of the two groups studied showed a decrease over time in moral reasoning, questioning the readiness of undergraduates in terms of their ability to engage in moral reasoning at this level.

Affective/Psychosocial Outcomes

Affective or psychosocial outcomes include changes in attitudes, values, concepts of self, aspirations, and personality traits. The areas of affective development reviewed within this section include attitudes, beliefs, and values; identity and personal development; civic and social responsibility; and racial understanding and tolerance of others.

Attitudes, Beliefs and Values

By far the largest number of service learning studies was concerned with affective development in the areas of psychosocial development, primarily in the area of increases in self-esteem and general changes in attitudes, beliefs, and values.

Sample size varied widely in this area. Several smaller studies had sample sizes ranging from 21 to 88, while three larger studies had sample sizes of 1,500, 3,450, and 4,000. All but three of the studies involved single institutions. Two were qualitative, seven were quantitative, and four combined these two methodologies. All but one of the studies involved curricular service learning. Three involved high school populations while the remainder involved college student populations.

As in other studies, the vast majority utilized quasi-experimental designs with little or no randomization. A variety of instruments was used to measure attitude change, including the Student Development Task Inventory, the Social Responsibility Inventory, and a variety of self-designed survey instruments. Many of these instruments correspond to the theoretical work of Chickering (1990) discussed earlier. Most studies reported changes in students’ attitudes, values, and beliefs. Some of these changes included different attitudes, values, and skills, a better understanding of social issues and that the experience had an impact on stereotypes. Several studies reported an increase in appreciation for diversity, equality, and
justice, and general positive attitude change toward others, self, and community. Increases in self-understanding and self-esteem were also commonly reported.

Many studies reported the difficulty in measuring attitude change in the short time frame in which most service learning experiences occur. These attitude changes are difficult to detect following a short-term service learning experience. Further work needs to be done in this area.

Identity and Personal Development

Four studies were reviewed within the area of identity and personal development. These included Rhoads and Neururer (1998), Conrad and Hedin (1991), Newmann and Ruetter (1983), and Greene (1997).

Sample sizes in these studies ranged from 24 to 4,000, with all studies involving only a single institution. All studies involved college populations except Conrad and Hedin (1991), which involved high school students. Most studies employed a combined quantitative/qualitative design, while one study employed a purely quantitative design, and one employed a purely qualitative design. All of these studies involved curricular service learning with the exception of Rhoads and Neururer (1998), which involved participants in a co-curricular Alternative Spring Break program.

Each of these studies reported gains in psychosocial development using a variety of instruments. Results were rather conclusive regarding the effect of service learning on students' identity and personal development. Results ranged from
increases in understanding, self, others, and community (Rhoads & Neururer, 1998), gains in self-esteem and working with others (Conrad & Hedin, 1991), and an increase in sense of personal competence (Newmann & Ruetter, 1983).

Civic and Social Responsibility

Three studies pertained to changes in students' sense of civic and social responsibility. These included Newmann and Ruetter (1983), Myers-Lipton (1996a), and Kendrick (1996).

Studies investigating civic and social responsibility varied somewhat in terms of the type and design quality of the study. Sample sizes were relatively large: 122, 332 and 1,193, respectively. One study (Newmann & Ruetter, 1983) involved data from 1,193 high school students collected nationally from eight high schools. These data included both curricular and co-curricular service learning experiences and offered both quantitative and qualitative data using a variety of instruments. By contrast, the other two studies (Kendrick, 1996; Myers-Lipton, 1996a) involved college students in similar courses at single institutions. Both of these studies were quantitative using the Social Responsibility Inventory.

Results from these studies were somewhat inconclusive. All studies reported statistically significant changes in social responsibility, while one study (Newmann & Ruetter, 1983) suggested that while social responsibility increased, it did not necessarily suggest that civic responsibility was affected to any degree.
Racial Understanding and Tolerance of Others

Five studies dealt with racial understanding and tolerance of others. These included Myers-Lipton (1996a), Conrad and Hedin (1991), Vandeboncoeur et al. (1996), and Greene (1997).

Two of these studies (Greene, 1997; Vandeboncoeur et al. 1996) had relatively small sample sizes: 21, 52, and 93, respectively. Two other studies (Conrad & Hedin, 1991; Myers-Lipton, 1996a) had rather large sample sizes of 332 and 4,000 respectively. All studies involved curricular service learning and used a pre- and posttest design, with the exception of one study (Conrad & Hedin, 1991) which employed national survey data.

Samples also varied in terms of number of institutions and courses involved. One study used one course at a single institution (Vandeboncoeur et al., 1996), one compared two campuses (Greene, 1997), while another (Myers-Lipton, 1996a) involved four courses at one institution over a 2-year period. All used college populations with the exception of one (Conrad & Hedin, 1991), which used high school students.

Results were consistent with regard to changes in racial understanding and tolerance of others. The studies variously reported increases in students’ appreciation for diversity (Greene, 1997), understanding others (Conrad & Hedin, 1991; Greene, 1997), and an interest in equality and justice (Greene, 1997). Decreases in racial prejudice were also reported (Myers-Lipton, 1996a).
One additional recent study (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000) involved 11 dependent measures, all of which suggested positive outcomes as a result of participation in service learning. The study involved longitudinal data from 22,236 undergraduates at multiple institutions, and included both quantitative and qualitative data. The authors reported, in particular, that service learning had an impact on students' heightened sense of civic responsibility.

Summary of the Review

As evident from the literature, service learning can influence a variety of psychosocial and cognitive outcomes. A summary of the literature reviewed in this chapter was presented in Table 3. The range of issues studied, sample size employed, and methodologies used varies greatly, making it difficult to make any general conclusions regarding the effect of service learning on student cognitive and affective/psychosocial development. Many studies report positive effects, while others were inconclusive or showed no change. Since the results of many of these studies are inconsistent and inconclusive, more in-depth studies are needed to explore the outcomes of service learning more fully.

As stated earlier, pedagogically distinct models of service learning also need to be explored. The literature suggests that service learning can impact students in a variety of powerful ways; however, the delivery of service learning, through the curriculum and co-curriculum, must be better understood in order to move this potential paradigm shift for higher education forward.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Chapter III describes the methodology of the study. It begins with an overview of the study objectives, followed by a thorough description of the methodology undertaken. The overview is followed by an operational description of the independent and dependent variables, a description of the population and sample, the setting in which the study took place, the instrument utilized, and how the data were collected. Finally, the chapter ends with a statement of the hypothesis tested and a description of the analysis techniques that were employed.

Overview of Study Objectives

It has been suggested that higher education is undergoing a radical paradigm shift from teaching to learning (Boyer, 1990a; Ehlrich, 1997). This shift is occurring across the curriculum and co-curriculum in many of our secondary and postsecondary institutions. Calls for a renewed focus on citizenship, social responsibility, and the value of a democratic education have been widely cited in the literature.

Service learning is a pedagogy which focuses on individual student growth and learning, as well as promoting issues of citizenship, social responsibility, and
community development. Understanding the efficacy and utility of differing models of service learning is critical to the advancement of this type of pedagogy.

The study explored how college and university student perceptions of their own social responsibility is influenced by three pedagogically distinct models of service learning. These types include traditional community service, co-curricular service learning, and curricular service learning. This study has helped us better understand the efficacy of these three pedagogically distinct models of service learning. The question addressed in this study was: Does the perception of a student's social responsibility differ among three types of service learning?

Operational Description of the Variables

Independent Variable

The independent variable in this study, service learning type, was operationalized into three fixed categories. The first type was traditional community service, which was defined as a community service experience in which a student participates voluntarily outside of the classroom, and which focuses on the “act” of service rather than as an intentional experience of self-development or structured learning. For the purposes of this study, traditional community service, referred to in the study as Type One, was defined as student membership in a national, co-ed, service fraternity, Alpha Phi Omega, as defined by the Alpha Phi Omega national constitution.
The second type of service learning was co-curricular service learning, which was defined as a service learning experience in which a student participates voluntarily outside of any coursework, yet has as a central component, some general educational purpose, such as exposure to multicultural perspectives or learning about a particular social issue. For the purposes of this study, co-curricular service learning, referred to as Type Two in the study, was defined as participation in a Breakaway-sponsored Alternative Spring Break, a national co-curricular service learning experience.

The third type of service learning was curricular service learning, which was defined as a service learning experience that is a required and integral component of an academic course. For the purposes of this study, curricular service learning, referred to as Type Three in the study, was defined as any for-credit course that includes a service-learning requirement.

In order to help define traditional community service and co-curricular service learning, two national organizations were chosen due to their prominence on American college campuses and their focus on voluntarism and service learning. These two national organizations were Alpha Phi Omega, a national honorary service fraternity, and Breakaway, a national organization supporting Alternative Spring Break programs.

Alpha Phi Omega was founded in 1925 at Lafayette College in Pennsylvania. As part of its vision statement (1999), Alpha Phi Omega purports to be “the nation’s foremost campus-based, inclusive, service-oriented, leadership development
organization for university and college students . . ." (Alpha Phi Omega, 1999, paragraph 1). It was founded on the principles of the Boy Scouts of America and stresses community service. In 1999, there were approximately 350 active chapters of Alpha Phi Omega at campuses across the country (Alpha Phi Omega, 1999).

Alternative Spring Break (ASB) is a national program promoted by Breakaway, a non-profit organization founded in 1991 at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee. Breakaway invites institutions to become campus chapters, in which ASB programs are registered and provided with a plethora of resources. In 1999-2000, Breakaway recognized 52 institutions as part of their campus chapters program.

Participation in ASB is voluntary and students are typically selected for participation by other students based on an application. Students are typically selected and trained during the fall semester and the service learning and reflection component occurs during spring break during the winter semester. The service learning experience lasts 1 week and takes place in a variety of service settings across the United States. Participants are generally undergraduate students from a variety of academic majors. Involvement of university staff in ASB programs generally ranges from moderate to high. Some campuses require university staff to travel to sites with students and participate in the service projects as well as processing discussions and reflection activities. In other programs, staff may only be involved in discussions upon the students return from the experience. In general,
co-curricular service learning would have less university staff involvement than Type Three, but more than Type One.

Curricular service learning is a pedagogy that makes connections between student experiences in community service and a particular course of academic study. In this sense, curricular service learning has the greatest involvement of university staff, since it has an academic component. Discussion and reflection on the service experience and issues being considered in class occurs on a weekly basis and, therefore, learning outcomes should be greatest as compared to Type One and Type Two.

**Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable in this study was social and civic responsibility. As a central theme of many service learning programs, it is important to further the research in this area in order to more fully understand the impact of service learning on students' development of civic and social responsibility. The dependent variable was analyzed using scores on the Social Responsibility Inventory (SRI). The SRI is a self-report instrument that measures student perceptions of civic and social responsibility. This particular instrument was chosen due to its brevity and utility and since it has been employed in several other studies (Kendrick, 1996; Myers-Lipton, 1996a, 1996b). The instrument is defined more thoroughly later in this chapter.
Population of Institutions

The population of institutions included in the study was any colleges or universities in the United States that met a minimum set of criteria. Because heterogeneity of institutions was a possible confounding factor, institutions were successively selected according to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classification system. Restricting institutions involved in the study allowed for relative homogeneity of institutions helped to restrict variance within the sample and improved the overall quality of the research design.

Definition of Sample

The Carnegie Foundation classification system categorizes all institutions of higher learning in the United States into 10 broad categories. These categories and their definitions can be found in Appendix A. The 1999 Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education was used, as published in the Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac (1999). Approximately 3,000 institutions of higher education exist in the United States, representing the initial population of institutions for the study.

Masters (Comprehensive) College and University I institutions were chosen for the study since these institutions offer a relative complexity of programs of study, as well as a broader sample of student participants, and generally have common ACT and SAT scores for entering freshman. Smaller institutions, represented by Carnegie Baccalaureate I and II and Masters II, do not offer as broad
a spectrum of academic programs, and have a more homogeneous student body. Larger institutions, represented by Carnegie Research I and II and Doctoral I and II, may be too complex, offer too many options, and are difficult to access for the purposes of this study.

The Masters (Comprehensive) College and University I institutions are defined by the Carnegie classification system as institutions that offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 40 or more masters degrees annually in three or more disciplines (Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 1999). In 1999, approximately 430 institutions were listed as Masters I by the Carnegie Foundation.

From the list of all Masters I institutions, those institutions that also had a service learning program in each of three categories were asked to participate in the study. These three categories included having a campus chapter of Alpha Phi Omega, an ASB Breakaway campus chapter, and at least one service learning course. As described in the operational definitions of the variable, the program choices were made due to their specific nature and focus on service and service learning.

Active membership in both Alpha Phi Omega and Breakaway was verified through consultation with both of these national organizations. Whether or not institutions offered academic service learning courses was verified with a contact person at each participating institution.
Starting with Type Two of the independent variable was the most efficient place to begin the successive restrictions for the sample. Therefore, the initial sample of Masters (Comprehensive) College and Universities I was selected from the 1999–2000 list of Breakaway Campus Chapters program. Of the 52 campus chapters, 14 institutions met this initial criteria. A complete list of Breakaway Campus Chapters (Type Two) can be found in Appendix B.

The progressive elimination of institutions from eligibility for the study is demonstrated in Table 4. As can be seen, the process moved from an initial population of approximately 430 Masters I institutions, to 52 campus chapters of Breakaway, to 14 which had chapters of Alpha Phi Omega, to 6 which had both Type One and Type Two programs, finally, to 3 which met all three conditions. Institutions that did not meet each of the three conditions were eliminated from the study. Two institutions, Humboldt State University and Mercer University, were excluded from the study, although it initially appeared that these campuses met all three conditions. Upon contacting these institutions, however, it was confirmed that all three conditions could not be met.

The three institutions asked to participate in the study included East Tennessee State University, Eastern Michigan University, and James Madison University. Confirmation of the existence of all three conditions of service learning at these institutions was accomplished through verification with the institutional contacts identified at each of the three institutions.
To conclude the sampling of the population of institutions, Institutional Contact Letters were sent to the contact person identified at each of the three participating institutions. A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix C. These letters helped define the parameters of the study and how the data were to be collected. Confidentiality of institutional data was ensured to each contact person and was maintained through reporting aggregate data by independent variable only, not by institution. As an incentive to participate in the study, institutions were offered a summary of their respective institutional data at the completion of the study.

Table 5 provides summary data on each of the three institutions included in the study. The table includes geographical location, total student enrollment, locus of control, and average ACT scores for entering freshman. From the table, the three institutions selected suggest a fairly broad spectrum of Masters (Comprehensive)
College and University I institutions, in terms of geographical location, total enrollment, and ACT scores.

Table 5
Summary of Institutions Selected for the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
<th>ACT Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Tennessee State University</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>14,414</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Student Sampling

The sample of students for this study were drawn from the three institutions described in the preceding section. Students selected for the study were currently involved in one of three types of service learning, during the 2000–2001 academic year: traditional community service (Type One), co-curricular service learning (Type Two), and curricular service learning (Type Three), as defined earlier.

Table 6 illustrates the approximate number of students involved in each of the three types of service learning at each participating institution or the total pool of students eligible for the study. This approximate information was collected through phone calls to each of the contact persons at each institution. The table helps illustrate that there were at least 30 students in each category at each
institution. Type One represents the total membership in Chapters of Alpha Phi Omega at each campus. Type Two represents the number of Alternative Spring Break projects offered multiplied by the number of students participating in each project. Type Three represents the approximate number of service learning courses (curricular service learning) offered at each institution.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Type One</th>
<th>Type Two</th>
<th>Type Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Tennessee State University</td>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>40 (4 x 10)</td>
<td>21 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90 (9 x 10)</td>
<td>57 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>319 (29 x 11)</td>
<td>20 courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample size in each condition was determined first by the smallest condition group on each campus. Since Alternative Spring Break programs (Type Two) and curricular service learning programs (Type Three) tend to be fairly large in terms of the number of students involved, and since Alpha Phi Omega chapters (Type One) tend to be relatively small, the total membership in Alpha Phi Omega was used as the yardstick for estimating sample size for each of the three groups on all campuses. Using more or less the same sample size was important to the quality of the internal validity of the design of the study. Therefore, an equivalent number of students in both traditional community service, co-curricular service learning programs, and curricular service learning programs was selected. Eskewing
representation to get an equal number of participants from each of the three types helped to improve the design of the study. The purpose of this study was the contrast of the three categories, not the representation of each category.

Using this technique, and from the data presented in Table 6, approximately 90 students from each campus participating were to be included in the study, 30 from each of the three categories. Total membership in Alpha Phi Omega at each institution was used as the sample for Type One. Students selected for Type Two (participation in ASB) and Type Three (students enrolled in service learning courses) were randomly selected to participate in the study. Approximately 30 students involved in two randomly selected ASB projects served as Type Two at each campus. Another 30 students were selected from one service learning course randomly selected among all service learning courses at each institution, and among courses in which at least 25–30 students were enrolled.

Table 7 illustrates the target number of students intended to be sampled in each of the three types of service learning from the three campuses asked to participate in the study. With approximately 30 students selected from each of the three types at each of the three institutions, a total of 270 students were expected to participate in the study. All categories of students selected have a random component, thus fairly representing the independent variable category throughout the institution.
Table 7

Target Number of Students in Each Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Type One</th>
<th>Type Two</th>
<th>Type Three</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Questionnaires Mailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETSU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrument

All participants completed the Social Responsibility Inventory, an instrument developed at the University of Michigan by Jeffrey Howard and Wilbert McKeachie in 1992. As stated earlier, this particular instrument was chosen due to its brevity, utility, its use in previous studies, and lack of availability of other appropriate measures. Permission to use and revise the instrument was secured by the author in December 1999. A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix D. A copy of the questionnaire can also be found in Appendix E.

The SRI is a paper and pencil instrument that allows students to self-report changes in their attitudes towards civic and social responsibility. It uses an interval scale to rate items that are personally important to participants (e.g., working toward equal opportunity for all U.S. citizens) and regarding their values and beliefs (e.g., adults should give some time for the good of their community or country).
The SRI (revised) includes 30 questions and takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. Seven items pertain to issues that are personally important to the respondents. Eleven items pertain to actions regarding social responsibility. Nine items pertain to perceptions regarding social responsibility following a specific community service experience. Three items pertain to demographic data. Taken together, the instrument gives an overall rating of a student’s sense of civic and social responsibility. Scores range from 24 (low) to 108 (high). Demographic data, including gender, class standing, and involvement in other types of service learning, are also reported by the study questionnaire. Two reasons for collecting the demographic data were to describe the sample and because it was one way to understand potential contamination of the data.

Reliability and Validity of the Dependent Variable

Reliability and validity of the instrument had not been reported in the literature. As part of the present study, the researcher determined internal consistency of reliability by running a Cronbach Alpha Reliability test using SPSS (1999, version 10.0). A Cronbach Alpha Reliability test is a model of internal consistency, based on average inter-item correlation. This statistical test determines internal consistency and reliability between individual questions on the instrument used, the Social Responsibility Inventory. Because no other reliability data were reported in the literature, and since the instrument was slightly modified, it was
believed that the use of this statistical procedure would be important to the overall study design.

The alpha level reported after running the Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient test was .85, which is fairly typical of affective instruments. The results from this test seem to indicate that there is some internal consistency among questions on the Social Responsibility Inventory.

No authors that have used the SRI have systematically identified the calculated validity of the instrument. The two other studies cited that have used the SRI (Kendrick, 1996; Markus et al., 1993) did not analyze data using total scores but rather analyzed individual items on the instrument. Results from this study will provide initial validity of the instrument by establishing preliminary mean scores for the population of students included in the study.

Data Collection

Prior to data collection, permission for the study was secured through the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) at Western Michigan University. A copy of this approval can be found in Appendix F. Permission from each participating institution was secured through phone calls and letters of approval. Copies of the approval from each campus can be found in Appendix G. Support from the national Breakaway office was also secured to encourage participation in the study. A copy of this letter of support can be found in Appendix H.
A faculty or staff member at each participating institution was identified using a copy of the 1999 Campus Compact national directory. This faculty or staff member at each institution was asked by phone to serve as the contact person and to administer the questionnaire and collect the data. A letter of commitment from each of these contacts can be found in Appendix I.

Guidelines for administration of the questionnaire and data collection procedures were distributed along with copies of the questionnaire for each of the three service learning types. A copy of the guidelines can be found in Appendix J.

Each institution participating in the study was given 120 copies of the questionnaire for the approximately 30 students involved in each of the three service learning categories defined. Questionnaires were color-coded (gray for Type One, tan for Type Two, and yellow for Type Three) as one measure to ensure that data for each of the three groups were clearly identified. Copies of the questionnaire were mailed to the contact person at each institution during the beginning of the winter term in February 2001. This time frame allowed for a mid-point in student participation in service learning activities and took place shortly before ASB had occurred, during the traditional spring break months at most campuses.

Questionnaires were administered by the contact person at each institution in March and April 2001. Consistency of administration at each institution was ensured through the identification of specific procedures to be followed. Each copy of the questionnaire also included a copy of the Script for Administration of the
questionnaire, describing their voluntary participation in the study and guidelines for completing the instrument. A copy of this script can be found in Appendix K.

Participants in Type One were administered the instrument at a regular meeting of Alpha Phi Omega. Type Two participants were administered the instrument at a meeting of all participants shortly following the ASB experience. All Type Three participants were administered the instrument during and within the classroom in which the service learning experience was to be required.

The contact person at each institution collected questionnaires from each of the three groups and returned these to the researcher, no later than April 30, 2001. A Post-Data Collection Questionnaire was provided to the contact person to gauge whether there were any flaws in the collection of data and a summary of general data collection procedures. A copy of this questionnaire can be found in Appendix L. Follow-up phone calls were made to each contact person to discuss data collection procedures and sample selection.

Hypotheses and Analysis Techniques

The null hypothesis tested was: There is no difference among mean scores for social responsibility among the independent variable of three different types of service learning. These types included traditional community service, co-curricular service learning, and curricular service learning.

The 1999 version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 10.0) was utilized to organize and analyze the data. Total mean scores on
the SRI were compared among the three groups to ascertain the level of change among participants. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used at an alpha level of .05 to test the hypothesis. In the event that the null hypothesis was rejected, a post-hoc test would be run using the Tukey LSD method.

A limited set of demographic data was also presented. The demographic data have been collected to describe the sample in terms of the distribution among the three categories and mean scores.

Summary

The study employed an ex-post facto design to test the hypothesis whether social responsibility, the dependent variable, was different among students who participate in traditional community service, co-curricular service learning, and curricular service learning, the independent variable.

The study design offered several strengths and weaknesses. The strengths of the design include the cross-participation of students and the relative homogeneity of institutions involved. Few studies on service learning have included multiple campuses nor have they investigated the three pedagogically distinct models of service learning.

One of the weaknesses of the design included potential contamination of the data due to student participation in multiple types of service learning programs during the same semester. This weakness and limitation is addressed in greater detail at the conclusion of Chapter V.
This chapter offered a detailed description of the methodology of the study that was undertaken. A rationale for the study and review of objectives was specifically stated. The methodology, population and sample, instrument, and data collection procedures were all described. Finally, the null hypothesis was stated along with a description of the analysis techniques that were employed. Chapter IV details the findings of the study and reports on the data analysis and hypotheses stated in Chapter III.
Chapter IV begins with a description of the sample involved in the study, including institutional response, total number of participants, and demographic data. This is followed by an analysis of the measure of the dependent variable. A further discussion of the data collection methods and any anomalies which were discovered in the course of the study are also described. Finally, the chapter concludes with an analysis of the inferential results of the hypothesis tested.

Description of the Sample

Institutional Response

Institutional response and valid data are shown in Table 8. Although a total response of 270 was expected, 235 questionnaires were completed and returned. This is an approximate response rate of 87%. The total number of participants from each of the three institutions ranged between 61, 77, and 97.

Due to incomplete surveys, 37 participants were eliminated from the study. Therefore, there were a total of 198 participants included in the final analysis. These data include 90 participants from Type One (traditional community service), 36 participants from Type Two (co-curricular service learning), and 72 participants from Type Three (curricular service learning). The breakdown by institution is also
shown, with 51, 58, and 89 students included from ETSU, EMU, and JMU, respectively.

Table 8
Institutional Response and Valid Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lower than expected response from the sample was due to the fact that one of the three institutions involved in the study was not able to gather data from all three types of service learning groups. One institution reported shortly after data collection began that the Alternative Spring Break group (Type Two) at that institution had lacked student leadership and would not take place during the semester in which data were collected. Therefore, no data were collected from one of the three types at that institution. This occurrence affected not only the total
number of participants from that institution, but also the total number of participants in Type Two, co-curricular service learning. This occurrence also affected the overall quality of the study design. An equal number of student participants from each institution would have helped to ensure homogeneity among the institutions and types of service learning.

It is also important to note that more than 30 participants were included in some sampling procedures. This occurred at two institutions in Type One, traditional community service, since the total membership of Alpha Phi Omega was selected as opposed to a random sample of their membership. In both of these cases, estimates in membership in Alpha Phi Omega had increased from the previous year when sampling procedures were established.

In another case at one institution, the number of participants in Type Two, co-curricular service learning, exceeded the estimated 30 participants in that group. Again, Type Two participants were selected based on randomly selected groups whose total membership may vary from year to year.

Overall, representation in each of the three types of service learning and at the three institutions remained fairly consistent. It was believed that a satisfactory data set was collected for the study.

**Gender and Class Standing**

Demographic data collected from the study participants were limited to gender and class standing. Data on gender of participants are presented in Table 9.
and are broken down into male and female. Data on class standing of participants are presented in Table 10 and are broken down into Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Graduate Student, and Other/Faculty. These data were collected in order to describe the sample and are not directly related to the hypothesis tested.

Table 9 shows that 24.2% of the entire sample was male, while 75.8% was female. From the table it can be seen that the one to three proportion, although not typical in the general population, holds relatively consistent in each of the three types of service learning. Because the proportions hold consistent, it does not appear to adversely affect the quality of the data collected for the study.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender by Service Learning Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type I (Traditional)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II (Co-Curricular)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III (Curricular)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48 (24.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type I (Traditional)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II (Co-Curricular)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III (Curricular)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150 (75.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Standing of Participants

Table 10 shows that class standing of participants was less consistent among service learning types than was gender of participants. Although the proportions among all three types of service learning are relatively consistent, freshman (5.0% of total sample), graduate students (1.5% of total sample), and other/faculty (0.5% of
total sample), are clearly less represented than the other three classifications.

Sophomores, juniors and seniors, in fact, represent 92.4% of the total sample.

Among these three classifications, there is a relatively consistent proportion in the
total sample as well as within the three types of service learning.

Table 10
Class Standing by Service Learning Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Standing</th>
<th>Type I (Traditional)</th>
<th>Type II (Co-Curricular)</th>
<th>Type III (Curricular)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 (5.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57 (28.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61 (30.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65 (32.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Faculty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90 (45.5%)</td>
<td>36 (18.2%)</td>
<td>72 (35.9%)</td>
<td>198 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One item to be reported related to demographic data is that the other/faculty participant reported in Type Two was a faculty member who enrolled in Alternative Spring Break as a participant. Therefore, this particular individual was treated as a student participant and included in the final analysis.
Participation in Other Service Learning Experiences

One of the items asked on the questionnaire related to participants' involvement in any of the other types of service learning explored in the study. This was to ensure that there would not be too many students who had participated in one or more types of service learning, therefore affecting the quality of the data and study design.

From Table 11 it can be seen that only 25 (12.6%) of the respondents reported being involved in service learning activities other than those for which they were involved in the study. This is a relatively small percentage and does not appear to adversely affect the data. However, within Type One, traditional community service, 16 participants (17.8% of Type One) reported involvement in one other type of service learning.

Table 11

Involvement in Other Types of Service Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items reported on the questionnaire related to demographic data were intended to help describe the sample. Gender and class standing helped describe important characteristics of the participants involved in the study. The item
reporting involvement in other types of service learning was another important characteristic that might have affected the sample. In all three cases, the data do not seem to suggest that there are concerns with the sample included in study.

Anomalies in the Data and Data Collection

One anomaly in the data occurred after the instrument had already been sent out for data collection. This related to question number 13 on the instrument, which asked participants to respond to the statement “I make quick judgments about homeless people.” The question appeared to be inverted, suggesting a movement away from social responsibility, which was inconsistent with the other questions on the instrument. This anomaly was treated after data were entered into a spreadsheet. Data were reverse scored on that particular question using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 10.0). These entries were then carefully double-checked to ensure that accuracy of the data was maintained. All data were double-checked by hand after being entered into SPSS.

Inferential Results

Tables 12 and 13 summarize the one-way analysis of variance conducted as part of the study, as well as the post-hoc procedure conducted. Data presented in Table 12 indicate an $F$ value with two degrees of freedom between groups and 195 degrees of freedom within groups, which was significant at an alpha level of .05. Effect size (eta squared) was reported at .10, which is generally considered small.
Table 12
Analysis of Variance for Social Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1172.59</td>
<td>586.29</td>
<td>10.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>10754.73</td>
<td>55.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>11927.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores on the SRI, standard deviation for each of the three types of service learning, and the results from the Tukey Test are presented in Table 13. Mean scores ranged from 82.69 for Type Three, 87.08 for Type One, and 88.83 for Type Two. Standard deviations ranged from 7.14 for Type Three, 7.54 for Type One, and 7.70 for Type Two.

Table 13
Mean Scores, Standard Deviation and Tukey Results by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type I (Traditional)</th>
<th>Type II (Co-Curricular)</th>
<th>Type III (Curricular)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>87.08</td>
<td>88.83</td>
<td>82.69</td>
<td>85.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukey</td>
<td>III at .001</td>
<td>III at .0001</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .05 level.
The post-hoc procedure employed the Tukey LSD method and is also presented in Table 13. The results from the test produced a significance level of .0001 and .001, relatively high levels of significance and lower alpha levels than the .05 required. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected in two cases. Table 13 illustrates that a significant difference between Type One and Type Three was found at a significance level of .001. A statistically significant difference was also found between Type Two and Type Three at a significance level of .0001. No significant difference was found between Type One and Type Two, in which a level of .45 is reported. The meaning and significance of these results will be discussed more fully in Chapter V.

Summary

Three institutions were involved in a study exploring social responsibility and involvement in three types of service learning. A total of 198 participants were included in the study. Gender and class standing were reported to help describe the data. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted and the null hypothesis was rejected.

The null hypothesis tested was: There is no difference among mean scores for social responsibility among the independent variable of three different types of service learning. These types included traditional community service, co-curricular service learning, and curricular service learning. Scores on the Social Responsibility Inventory were used to measure social responsibility.
A post-hoc procedure found that Type One and Type Three (traditional community service and curricular service learning) were significantly different. In this case, traditional community service had a higher mean score on the Social Responsibility Inventory. In the second case, Type Two and Type Three (co-curricular service learning and curricular service learning) were also significantly different. In this case, co-curricular service learning participants had a higher mean score on the social responsibility. In the last case, no significant difference was found between Type One and Type Two (traditional community service and co-curricular service learning).

Chapter IV presented the results of the study. A thorough description of the sample was presented, including institutional response, total number of participants, and demographic data. This was followed by a discussion of the measure of the dependent variable and anomalies in the data. Finally, it was demonstrated through the use of inferential statistics that the null hypothesis was rejected.
Chapter V begins with a discussion of the findings and a summary of the salient features of the study. This is followed by a discussion about the limitations of the study and implications and suggestions for future research. Finally, conclusions to be drawn from the study are presented.

Discussion

From the data collected and presented in Chapter IV, results of the study found that there is a significant difference between type of service learning and outcomes of social responsibility. Social responsibility was analyzed by comparing mean scores on the Social Responsibility Inventory. Type of service learning included traditional community service, co-curricular service learning, and curricular service learning. Two of the three types of service learning had a higher difference that was statistically significant. This difference was established under a rigorous study design and at an alpha level of .05.

In particular, the results seem to suggest that Type Three, curricular service learning, appears to be significantly lower from Type One, traditional community service. Type Three also appears to be statistically lower from Type Two,
co-curricular service learning. No difference can be reported between Type One, traditional community service, and Type Two, co-curricular service learning.

The hypothesis tested intended to explore how the three pedagogically distinct types of service learning affected issues of social responsibility outcomes for college students. From the one-way analysis of variance and post-hoc procedure conducted, it appears that Type One, traditional community service, and Type Two, co-curricular service learning have a higher mean score on the SRI than the other type included in the study.

One of the reasons for this difference might stem from the nature and focus of membership in these two types of service learning. Alpha Phi Omega (Type One) and Alternative Spring Break (Type Two) offer a social component, whereas curricular service learning (Type Three) does not offer as clear a social component.

Alpha Phi Omega is a national, co-ed service fraternity that offers students an opportunity to join with other service-minded individuals. It can be argued that many students join Alpha Phi Omega due to their interest and commitment to service. This might help explain the higher mean scores on the Social Responsibility Inventory. As with other fraternity experiences, Alpha Phi Omega also has many social benefits.

Alternative Spring Break, likewise, may offer benefits that a curricular service learning experience typically would not offer. ASB includes a significant amount of time for students to socialize together, and has the added dimension of being an immersion experience, which typically does not happen in a curricular
service learning experience. This might help explain the higher mean scores on the Social Responsibility Inventory for students involved in Type Two service learning, or Alternative Spring Break.

Another factor affecting the results of the study might be individual motivation to join these two types of service learning experiences. Both Alpha Phi Omega and Alternative Spring Break are voluntary programs. Students with similar characteristics may be more likely to join these types of organizations, whereas students often do not know when they are registering for a curricular service learning course, or, the course may be a required part of their academic program. This motivational characteristic might also affect the results of the study.

The three courses involved in the study as part of Type Three service learning varied in academic discipline. None of the courses were from professions where service is a central focus. The courses included a course in social gerontology, a course in research in speech communication, and a humanities course. The courses involved in the study were different enough to argue that the type of course was not a confounding factor.

Both Alpha Phi Omega and Alternative Spring Break provide a structure that makes them inherently different from curricular service learning. As described earlier, they are both social organizations but also both offer an “organizational” structure that might contribute to the differences found, unlike curricular service learning, which is often structured as a fairly traditional classroom experience.
As stated earlier, the mean scores on the Social Responsibility Inventory for curricular service learning was 82.69. This may still be construed as a relatively high score on the SRI, since possible scores range from 24 to 108. This score is, in fact, lower than the other two types of service learning included in the study, traditional community service and co-curricular service learning.

The results presented in this study do not intend to limit or minimize the other types of service learning. Scores on the SRI can range from 24 to 108. Mean scores for the three groups tested ranged from 82.69 to 88.83. The present study merely investigated whether any of the three types resulted in significantly different scores. While other studies (Kendrick, 1996; Markus et al., 1993) did not report total scores on the SRI, this study does provide some preliminary benchmarks related to total scores.

In conclusion, initial differences among participants may account for the difference in total scores on the SRI. Other factors, including nature of the environment and organization within the service occurred, as well as motivation to participate, may also have contributed to the final results of the study.

Limitations of the Study

As with other studies of this nature, a number of limitations became evident. The following limitations are presented not to degrade the value of the study, but rather as a guide to future studies wishing to investigate issues related to type of
service learning and social responsibility. It is also hoped that the study will help to improve practice within the field of service learning.

There were several limitations with the study design and within the data collection procedures. These limitations include data collection methodology, reliance on several data collectors, use of Breakaway as an indicator of a strong ASB program, and the brevity and simplicity of the instrument.

Some of the limitations identified by previous research studies dealing with service learning include duration, intensity of service projects, and quality of experience. As might be expected, many research studies have suggested that the longer the duration, the greater the intensity, and the higher the quality of the actual experience. These factors will have a greater impact on the outcomes of service learning experiences. This study did not consider these issues to any great extent, but rather was concerned with the way service learning is structured and delivered to students. This is not to say that these factors did not contribute to the outcomes of the study, however. Duration, intensity, and quality of each of the three types of experiences were not investigated and, therefore, cannot be considered at any great length.

The difficulty of measuring social responsibility has also been a dilemma for researchers investigating service learning. The present study is no exception to this problem. Each of the three types of service learning explored involved experiences that may have varied, not only among the three types, but among the three institutions as well. This is particularly true for curricular service learning, which
varies greatly from discipline to discipline, and, in fact, from faculty member to faculty member. Standardization among experiences is not the norm and this, too, may have had an effect on the results of the study. Perhaps in-depth information on the curricular service learning courses should have been collected.

Data collection methodology, including reliance on several data collectors, was another potential limitation of the study. Although the study design allowed for random sampling and a national sample, this also created challenges in data collection and methodology. In addition to the primary data collectors needed on each campus, faculty and staff from each of the three institutions needed to be involved, further complicating the data collection process. This may also have affected the results of the study. Although one data collector was identified at each institution, and specific instructions were provided, as well as a script, the need for involvement from several other individuals was also required. In some cases, a faculty member from each of the three institutions, along with the Alpha Phi Omega advisor and advisor to Alternative Spring Break, was needed to be involved. This logistical issue presented some challenges in completing the study.

As part of the data collection process, a post-data collection questionnaire was sent to each of the campus contacts. The post-data collection questionnaire inquired about any anomalies in the data collection process. These questionnaires did not reveal any abnormalities in the data collection.

One other limitation was the assumption that Breakaway was an indicator of strong ASB programs, which was part of the sampling procedure for Type Two.
This assumption proved to be false since one of the institutions selected for the study did not have an Alternative Spring Break experience, even though it was indicated so at the onset of the study. It was assumed that membership in Breakaway suggested a strong campus program. In fact, membership in Breakaway may also indicate struggling or weak ASB programs that need the support that this national network provides.

This situation affected not only the results of the study, but the heterogeneity of the number of participants from each institution and the total number of participants involved in the study. This may have been the primary limitation of the study, as it had the greatest impact on the study design.

The Social Responsibility Inventory itself was another limitation of the study, due to its brevity and simplicity as an instrument. Internal reliability, as measured by a Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient, was neither high nor low. Modifying the instrument also may have had an impact on the results of the study. Approximately five participants in the study made comments on the instrument, asking for clarification of some of the questions, or challenging some of the assumptions that the instrument seemed to suggest. As reported earlier, in the cases where instruments were not fully completed, they were eliminated from the final analysis. This situation affected the heterogeneity among participants in the study and may have affected the final results. Due to its brevity and ambiguity, therefore, the Social Responsibility Inventory itself was a limitation of the study.
Another limitation is the possibility that the different settings for administration of the SRI may have affected the results of the study. In particular, the classroom setting may have affected results of SRI for Type Three. It is suggested that the formal classroom setting for Type Three may have been unlike the informal, organizational meeting setting of Types One and Two. These settings may have affected the results of the study by creating falsely higher scores in the informal settings and lower scores in the formal settings.

Although there was some disproportion among gender and class standing among participants, this is not considered to be a major limitation of the study. Likewise, although 12.6% of the total sample had reported being previously involved in some other form of community service or service learning, it is believed this did not severely affect the results of the study. They could, however, be considered minor limitations of the study.

Implications and Suggestions for Future Research

The study resulted in several implications and suggestions for future research. These include suggestions related to methodology, the instrument, and several other areas demanding further exploration.

As with other studies in the area of service learning, it is important to consider the important issues of duration, intensity, and quality of experience in designing future research studies. Although these issues are difficult to control and predict, it is important to take into account these issues in order for further research
to be conducted. Multiple studies that take into account the duration, intensity, and quality of the experience, would help us understand the effects of service learning and the direction in which this form of pedagogy should travel.

The development of other instruments that measure social responsibility and civic education are also needed. Refinement of the Social Responsibility Inventory would also assist in this area. It needs to be refined and tested more rigorously if it is to continue to be helpful in the research field. A more detailed instrument that captures the essence of social responsibility and civic education is needed.

In comparing the three types of service learning identified, it is important to find groups that are more equivalent level of experience. As suggested earlier, Breakaway chapters in particular were a poor choice for Type Two service learning. It was assumed these groups would represent quality ASB programs (and, in general, they do). The fact that one institution, however, was not able to produce data from this group affected the quality of the study. In future studies, if ASB chapters are to be used, only chapters with multiple ASB experiences should be involved. In that way, if one group does not materialize, it will not affect the entire data for that group.

Traditional community service was also a troublesome category for the researcher. Since the study intended to explore service learning, it was problematic to include one type that, in fact, was not truly service learning, but rather a volunteer experience. This form of service, although important to society, somewhat falls outside the realm of "legitimate" service learning, for the reasons stated in earlier
chapters. In future studies, it might be important to more clearly define and
differentiate among the various types of service learning and community service
programs. This, in fact, has been an on-going dilemma for researchers in the field. It
is the hope of the researcher that this study has not contributed to this ambiguity.

The national research agenda on service learning, published by the Campus
Compact in 1999, outlines many areas in need of further exploration. In particular,
type of service learning was included in this agenda. Exploration into types of
service learning needs to be more fully explored to understand the outcomes of
service learning and the various delivery mechanisms that exist.

One final suggestion would be to clarify, in the cover letter to participants
and in the verbal script, the importance of answering the questionnaire verbatim,
asking participants to refrain from adding items or scales. Participants should also be
encouraged to complete both sides of the questionnaire. These oversights resulted in
the elimination of 36 questionnaires, which could have been avoided with these
clarifications.

Conclusions

This study explored type of service learning and outcomes of social
responsibility. It was shown that among three types of pedagogically distinct
models, traditional community service and co-curricular service learning had higher
mean scores on the SRI than curricular service learning. In this case, there was a
statistically significant difference in outcomes as they relate to social responsibility.
No difference could be reported between traditional community service and co-curricular service learning.
Appendix A

Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education
Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education

Research University I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive annually between $40 million or more in federal support.

Research University II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive annually between $15.5 million and $40 million in federal support.

Doctoral University I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award at least 40 doctoral degrees in five or more disciplines.

Doctoral University II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award annually at least ten doctoral degrees - in three or more disciplines - or 20 or more doctoral degrees in three or more disciplines.

Masters (Comprehensive) College and University I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 40 or more masters degrees annually in three or more disciplines.

Masters (Comprehensive) College and University II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 20 or more masters degrees annually in one or more disciplines.

Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) College I: These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. They award 40 percent of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields and are restrictive in admissions.

Baccalaureate College II: These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. They award less than 40 percent of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields or are restrictive in admissions.
Associate of Arts Colleges: These institutions offer associate of arts certificate or degree programs and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees.

Specialized Institutions: These institutions offer degrees ranging from the bachelors to the doctorate. At least 50 percent of the degrees awarded by these institutions are in a single discipline (Rodenhouse, 1998).
Appendix B

1999-2000 Breakaway Campus Chapters
and Summary Data
## Classification of Institutions with Breakaway Chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution (State)</th>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Alpha Phi Omega Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT Academy (TX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Southern College (AL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University (ID)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>No chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford College (MA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University (OH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Eastern Utah (UT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of St. Benedict (MN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Wooster (OH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth College (NH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson College (NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depauw University (IN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson College (PA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University (IA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Tennessee State University (TN)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University (MI)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University (FL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Pierce College (NH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University (VA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State University (MI)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell College (IA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton College (NY)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>Active/No Category III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt State University (CA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University Kelly School of Business (IN)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>No chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iona College (NY)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>No chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville University (FL)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University (VA)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson State College (VT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan College (NY)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer University (GA)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>Active/No Category II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University (IL)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>No chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk University (NY)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College (VT)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>Active/No Category III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity University (TX)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona (AZ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida (FL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hartford (CT)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>No chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas (KS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine at Orono (ME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami (FL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan (MI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri (MO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution (State)</th>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Alpha Phi Omega Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Diego (CA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin (TX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vermont (VT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia (VA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University (TN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University (VA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wartburg College (IA)</td>
<td>Masters I</td>
<td>No chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washburn University (KS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University (MI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia Wesleyan College (WV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Institutional Contact Letter
Dear service learning coordinator,

Thank you for agreeing to help collect data from students at your institution regarding their involvement in community service. These data are being collected as part of a doctoral dissertation at Western Michigan University. All data will be kept confidential and will not reveal any individual student or institutional data. In return for your participation in the study, I would be happy to return to you an aggregate report from your institution, as well as an executive summary of the data collected as part of the study.

The study concerns student attitudes towards social responsibility based on their involvement in three types of service and service learning. These types include traditional community service, curricular service learning, and co-curricular service learning. Data will be collected using the Social Responsibility Inventory, a pencil and pencil instrument with thirty questions. The instrument will take approximately ten minutes for students to complete.

I have enclosed the following items to assist you in the administration of the questionnaire:

- An approximate number of questionnaires and cover letters for distribution to the following groups of students on your campus: members of Alpha Phi Omega National Service Fraternity, participants in Alternative Spring Break, and participants in an academic service learning course. Approximately thirty students from each of the three groups will be needed to participate in the study.

- Guidelines for administration of the questionnaire and selection of the sample. It is important that the guidelines provided be consistently followed by each campus participating in the study.

- A sample script to be read prior to the administration of the questionnaire.

- A Post Data Collection Questionnaire to summarize the data collection procedures or to describe any difficulties experienced during the course of the study.
• A self-addressed stamped envelope for the return of the completed questionnaires.

Please review these materials prior to distribution. All materials must be returned to me no later than April 31, 2001.

Thank you again for your involvement in this project. I appreciate the time you have taken to assist me in my studies and to further advance the field of service learning. Feel free to contact me if you should have any questions regarding the study or the procedures. I can be reached at 616-895-2345 or by email at cooperj@gvsu.edu.

Sincerely,

Jay R. Cooper
Doctoral Candidate
Western Michigan University
Appendix D

Permission to Use the Social Responsibility Inventory
April 11, 2000

Jay Cooper
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, Michigan

Dear Jay:

I hereby give you permission to use the "Social Responsibility Inventory" with your dissertation, and look forward to reading your work upon its completion.

Best of luck.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Howard
Assistant Director
Appendix E

Questionnaire for the Study
Student Survey

Part 1: Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements and how important they are to you personally:

SD = strongly disagree  D = disagree  A = agree  SA = strongly agree

1. Working toward equal opportunity for all U.S. citizens
   SD  D  A  SA

2. Developing a meaningful philosophy of life
   SD  D  A  SA

3. Becoming involved in a program to improve my community
   SD  D  A  SA

4. Being very well off financially
   SD  D  A  SA

5. Volunteering my time helping people in need
   SD  D  A  SA

6. Giving 3% or more of my income to help those in need
   SD  D  A  SA

7. Finding a career that provides the opportunity to be helpful to others or useful to society
   SD  D  A  SA

8. Adults should give some time for the common good of their community or country
   SD  D  A  SA

9. Having an impact on the world is within the reach of most individuals
   SD  D  A  SA

10. Most misfortunes that occur to people are frequently the result of circumstances beyond their control
    SD  D  A  SA

11. If I could change one thing about society it would be to achieve greater social justice
    SD  D  A  SA

12. I can learn from prison inmates
    SD  D  A  SA

13. I make quick judgments about homeless people
    SD  D  A  SA

14. Individuals should be ready to inhibit their own pleasures if these inconvenience others
    SD  D  A  SA

15. People, regardless of whether they have been successful or not, ought to help those in need
    SD  D  A  SA
16. People ought to help those in need as "payback" for their own opportunities, fortunes, and successes

17. If I had been born in poverty, chances are that I would not be attending college

18. I feel that I can make a difference in the world

My involvement in community service has strengthened my ...

19. Intention to serve others in need

20. Intention to give to charity to help those in need

21. Sense of purpose or direction in life

22. Orientation toward others and away from yourself

23. Intention to work on behalf of social justice

24. Belief that helping those in need is one’s social responsibility

25. Belief that one can make a difference in the world

26. Understanding of the role of external forces as shapers of the individual

27. Tolerance and appreciation for others

Part 2: Please circle the most appropriate response.

28. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

29. Class standing
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Graduate student

30. I have participated in the following community service experiences this academic year:
   a. Alpha Phi Omega sponsored service projects
   b. Alternative Spring Break
   c. Curricular service learning or community service required as part of an academic course.

Thank you for your participation
Appendix F

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
Letter of Approval
Date: January 22, 2001

To: Mary Anne Bunda, Principal Investigator
    Jay Cooper, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Michael S. Pritchard, Interim Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 00-07-02

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled “Social Responsibility and Types of Service Learning: A Comparison of Academic Service Learning, Co-Curricular Service Learning, and Traditional Community Service” has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

The reviewers have asked that you distribute the document you call “Script for administration of the questionnaire” so that subjects can read along while it is read to them, and so they will have the relevant phone numbers to call if they have questions. I have revised this document into the appropriate format for a consent document.

In reading your survey, the reviewers found two things you might want to change. The reviewers found statement 10 confusing and suggest that you remove the word “Most” at the beginning of the statement. Statement 12 has no choices for participants to circle.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: 22 January 2002
Appendix G

Permission for the Study From Participating Institutions
Proposal Approval Form
The Institutional Review Board (IRB) on the Use of Human Subjects in Research
James Madison University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jay R. Cooper

PROJECT TITLE: Social responsibility and types of service learning: a comparison of academic service learning, co-curricular service learning, and traditional community service

In accordance with JMU Policy Number 1104 and the Guidelines of the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, it is hereby certified that the above stated project:

XX being exempt from full review was reviewed by subcommittee and in its present form was

_____ being exempt from full review was reviewed by subcommittee and in its revised form was

_____ was reviewed by the IRB and was

_____ was reviewed by the IRB and in its revised form was

Approved on 9/22/00

Disapproved on ________

Comments: A follow-up Report for Research Proposal form is attached and should be returned on or before May 1, 2001.

Human subjects are adequately informed of any risks.

Signature: Janet W. Steckel

Date: 9/22/00

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Friday, September 22, 2000

Jay R. Cooper
Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis
70,550

RE: Social Responsibility and Types of Service Learning and Traditional Community Service
IRBNo: 00-043e

I reviewed the above-referenced study and find that it qualifies as exempt from coverage under the federal guidelines for the protection of human subjects as referenced as Title 45—Part 46.101. If you feel it is necessary to call further IRB attention to any aspects of this project, please refer to the above-titled project and IRB number. I appreciate your bringing this project before the IRB for its concurrence of exempt status.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Woodruff, Ph.D.
Associate Vice President for Research—ETSU
January 4, 2001

Mr. Jay R. Cooper  
Associate Director of Student Life  
Kirkhof Center  
Grand Valley State University  
Allendale, MI 49401

RE: Social Responsibility and Types of Service Learning: A Comparison of Academic Service learning, co-curricular service learning, and traditional community service.

The Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Eastern Michigan University has granted approval to your proposal, "Social Responsibility and Types of Service Learning: A Comparison of Academic Service learning, co-curricular service learning, and traditional community service."

After careful review of your application, the IRB determined that the rights and welfare of the individual subjects involved in this research are carefully guarded. Additionally, the methods used to obtain informed consent are appropriate, and the individuals are not a risk.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the IRB of any change in the protocol that might alter your research in any manner that differs from that upon which this approval is based. Approval of this project applies for one year from the date of this letter. If your data collection continues beyond the one-year period, you must apply for a renewal.

On behalf of the Human Subjects Committee, I wish you success in conducting your research.

Sincerely,

Dr. Denise Tanguay  
Faculty Co-Chair  
Human Subjects Committee

Dr. Patrick Melia  
Administrative Co-Chair  
Human Subjects Committee
Appendix H

Letter of Support From Breakaway
June 12, 2000

Jay R. Cooper  
Associate Director of Student Life  
Kirkhof Center  
Grand Valley State University  
Allendale, MI 49401

Dear Jay,

I am excited to hear that you will be conducting research into the true impact of quality alternative breaks. Break Away has found that alternative break programs that incorporate the Eight Quality Components (Strong Direct Service, Diversity, Education, Orientation, Training, Reflection, Reorientation, Alcohol and Other Drug Free) have proven to change lives while developing socially conscious citizens. However, since Break Away is a national organization with a small staff, we are often unable to research and document the success of these programs. Your work will undoubtedly strengthen the alternative break movement by providing valuable statistical proof of the effectiveness of quality alternative breaks to those who may not have experienced an alternative break first-hand. Break Away is in full support of your efforts and will be happy to assist you in any way that we can. Additionally, I look forward to receiving a final copy of your findings. Thanks again and good luck with the project!

Sincerely,

Dan McCabe  
Executive Director
Appendix I

Letters of Commitment From Participating Institutions
January 8, 2000

Jay R. Cooper  
Associate Director of Student Life  
Kirkhof Center  
Grand Valley State University  
Allendale, MI 49401

Dear Mr. Cooper:

This letter shall serve as confirmation of my willingness to serve as a campus contact and assist you in the collection of data at East Tennessee State University during the winter term of 2001. I agree to follow the procedures set forth in your guidelines to the best of my ability and will forward collected questionnaires to you as soon as they have been collected.

I also understand that I can contact you at anytime regarding questions I may have about data collection procedures and will be reimbursed by you for any mutually agreed upon expenses incurred during the course of the semester.

Sincerely,

Joy Fulkerson  
Coordinator for Community Service Programs  
Center for Student Life and Leadership  
East Tennessee State University  
Campus Box 70618  
Johnson City, Tennessee 37614
November 6, 2000

Jay R. Cooper
Associate Director of Student Life
Kirkhof Center
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, MI 49401

Dear Mr. Cooper:

This letter shall serve as confirmation of my willingness to serve as a campus contact and assist you in the collection of data from Eastern Michigan University during the winter term of 2001. I agree to follow the procedures set forth in your guidelines to the best of my ability and will forward collected questionnaires to you as soon as they have been collected.

I also understand that I can contact you at anytime regarding questions I may have about data collection procedures and will be reimbursed by you for any mutually agreed upon expenses incurred during the course of the semester.

Sincerely,

Ms. Peggy Harless
McKenney Union
Volunteer Coordinator
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, MI 48197
October 5, 2000

Jay R. Cooper
Associate Director of Student Life
Kirkhof Center
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, MI 49401

Dear Mr. Cooper:

This letter shall serve as confirmation of my willingness to serve as a campus contact and assist you in the collection of data at James Madison University during the winter term of 2001. I agree to follow the procedures set forth in your guidelines to the best of my ability and will forward collected questionnaires to you as soon as they have been collected.

I also understand that I can contact you at any time regarding questions I may have about data collection procedures and will be reimbursed by you for any mutually agreed upon expenses incurred during the course of the semester.

Sincerely,

Katie Morrow
Coordinator, Student Organization Services
Appendix J

Guidelines for Administration of the Questionnaire
Guidelines for Administration of Questionnaire

- Please allow respondents the necessary time (approximately 15 minutes) to complete the questionnaires.

- Please administer questionnaires using the following color coded process:
  - Alpha Phi Omega - Gray
  - Alternative Spring Break - Tan
  - Academic Service Learning - Yellow

- Each group of questionnaires can be found in an individually labeled envelope, one for each of the three types. Following the completion of the questionnaire, please place the completed questionnaires in the marked envelopes and return to the researcher.

- Questionnaires should be administered to each of the three groups in the following ways:
  - Alpha Phi Omega, all members at a regularly scheduled meeting of that group (approximately thirty)
  - Alternative Spring Break, participants from two ASB projects, randomly selected from all ASB projects offered (approximately thirty)
  - Academic service learning course, all members of one randomly selected service learning course, among courses with 25-30 students enrolled (approximately thirty).

- Please ensure that each questionnaire includes a cover letter and that participants have the opportunity to read the letter prior to completing the questionnaire.

- A sample script has been provided to ensure consistency of administration of the questionnaire. Please read this script when the survey is administered to each of the three groups.

If you should have any questions regarding the administration of the questionnaires, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher, Jay Cooper, at 616-895-2345 or CooperJ@gvsu.edu.
Appendix K

Script for Administration of the Questionnaire
"You have been invited to voluntarily participate in a research project entitled
"Service Learning and Social Responsibility" designed to analyze student outcomes
from participating in different forms of community service. The study is being
conducted by Dr. Mary Anne Bunda and Jay Cooper from Western Michigan
University as part of the dissertation requirements for Jay Cooper. Your
participation in this study will help further our understanding of these forms of
learning and will help advance the field of education. Please take a few minutes to
complete this questionnaire.

This questionnaire is comprised of thirty multiple choice questions and will take
approximately ten minutes to complete. Your replies will be completely confidential
and anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose
not to answer any question and leave it blank. If you choose to not participate in this
study, you may either return the blank questionnaire or you may discard it in the box
provided. Returning the questionnaire indicates your consent for use of the answers
you supply. Each of these questionnaires will be destroyed after they have been
entered into a data spread sheet. If you have any questions, you may contact Jay
Cooper at 616-895-2345, the Human Subjects Review Board (616) 387-8293 or
the Vice President for research (616) 387-8298.
This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Review Board as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. You should not participate in this project if the corner does not have a stamped date and signature.

“When you have finished completing the questionnaire, return it to me and place it in the envelope provided. Thank you for your time and participation.”
Appendix L

Post-Data Collection Questionnaire
1. Please describe any problems in selecting students in each of the three categories of students requested (Alpha Phi Omega, Alternative Spring Break, academic service learning).

2. Please describe any problems encountered in the administration of the questionnaire.

3. Please describe any general problems in the data collection procedures.

4. Do you have any other questions or comments regarding the study?
BIBLIOGRAPHY


