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ABSTRACT

The Effect of Service-Learning in Higher Education on Students' Motivation to be Civically Engaged

by

Joy Pedersen Harkins

The purpose of this study is to determine if components of service-learning, such as interaction with service beneficiaries, can be linked to significant gains in civic responsibility and motivation to continue community service. Specifically, this study examines self-efficacy as a catalyst for these increases. All data collected provides insight into how students internalize the service-learning experience and their outward demonstration of learning.

The study utilized a pre/post-test quasi-experimental design. The course ECON 303 (Economics of Poverty, Race and Discrimination) was used for this research. The control group was made up of three sections, and the experimental group was made up of two sections. Both groups participated in a service-learning component in the course. The experimental group had a component added to the service-learning process – a panel presentation by members of the homeless community.

In this study, both groups were less motivated to perform community service at the end of the study. In particular, the experimental group, in contrast to the control group, showed a greater decrease, in motivation to do service. When
weighing the possible implications of the limitations of this study, it appears that the most likely explanation for the pre- to post-test decrease in motivation to be civically engaged was the brevity of the treatment.

If the results of the study are to be believed, we have to have greater placement quality, duration of service, intensity of interaction, reflection, and feedback. Another plausible explanation for the findings is the limitation of the instrument utilized to measure change. Future research should focus on more experimental designs that use intervention and more methods of measuring change in motivation.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Background

In the past several decades undergraduate education has faced heavy criticism. Foreign competition, economic shifts, advances in technology, and political changes have influenced the public's view of American education. In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education wrote a report entitled, *A Nation at Risk*, which stated "the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people" (n.p.). Soon after the attack on public schools, policy makers and university scholars began calling for reform in higher education. Buried in the reports and critiques of these reformers is a call for American universities to renew their civic mission.

The call for educational reform is not new to higher education. In the 17th century, the ideal of an intense undergraduate education by which young adults are prepared for leadership and service was set by the English universities of Oxford and Cambridge. In the beginning of the 19th century, Thomas Jefferson developed a new model for higher education which focused on history, politics, commerce, physics, and zoology. This new model for higher education was central to the formation of the University of Virginia, which was founded by Jefferson. As scientific knowledge and more general learning was demanded by merchants, artisans, and farmers, the religious education at the university lost some of its importance. With the passage of
the Morill Land Grant Act of 1862, states began developing universities that were designed after the German university system. These new universities focused on utilitarian, technical, and vocational careers. This focus on advanced research and specialization further diminished the university’s role in dealing with ethical concerns and personal growth (Komives & Woodard, 2001).

From 1700 to 1900, only about 1 to 5 percent of Americans between ages of eighteen and twenty-two enrolled in college. Between World War I and II this figure increased to about 20 percent, rising to 33 percent in 1960 and dramatically increasing to 50 percent in the 1970s. These numbers define the transformation of American higher education from an activity once reserved for the elite to an opportunity open to the masses. According to one estimate, in 1990 over 14 million students enrolled in postsecondary education in the United States.

The influx in enrollment during the early 1900s changed the face of American higher education. Changes included increased diversity, growing federal presence, booming construction, and growing criticism about large lecture classes, crowding in student housing, and psychological distance between students and faculty. During the 1960s and 1970s, students were more concerned about values and relevancy than the acquisition of abstract knowledge, but as jobs became scarce the focus of higher education shifted back towards vocationally focused studies. According to many leading educators, the problem is that the balance has shifted too much, as students have become far more interested in their career advancement than the advancement of the public good (Komives & Woodard, 2001).
Few scholars can agree on the single overarching purpose of undergraduate education, but many agree that one main purpose is developing civically engaged citizens who can participate in a diverse democracy. Until the mid-20th century, universities were concerned with “education for citizenship” and “knowledge for society” (Checkoway, 2001). Prior to World War II, college students were a small elite group, and educators could safely assume they would take an active part in political and civic life (Bok, 2006). During the past several decades, there have been some important changes that cast serious doubt on this assumption. Now, the amount of information citizens need to make informed decisions has greatly increased. In addition, some researchers claim that levels of civic engagement among the generation of the undergraduate population have reached an all-time low. Finally, “education for citizenship” becomes more complex in a diverse democracy. “Education for citizenship” in a diverse democracy calls for students to understand their own identities, communicate with people who are different from themselves, and build bridges across cultural differences (Checkoway, 2001). According to Bok:

Civic education is arguably no longer simply a matter of conveying the knowledge and skills to help students make enlightened judgments about politics and public affairs; colleges must consider whether there is anything they can do to imbue undergraduates with a stronger commitment to fulfill their civic responsibilities. (Bok, 2006, p.73)

In other words, colleges need to adopt strategies to teach and motivate students to become active citizens.
The Problem

Since the 1940s, there has been a documented decline in political affiliations and voluntary association memberships in each generation (Putnam, 2000). According to the National Commission on Civic Renewal, social scientists have reported a decline in voting in elections, attendance at community meetings, and involvement in volunteer activities (1998). This decline has accelerated since 1985.

Some of this decline may be explained by the change in student attitudes. Astin (1992) showed that from 1970 to 1989 there was a shift among college freshmen towards a concern with private materialism and away from concern with the public interest. Astin (1992) reports that the percentage of freshmen whose goal is to develop a meaningful philosophy of life dropped from 83 percent to 39 percent between 1970 and 1989, while the percentage whose goal is to be financially well-off climbed from 40 to 75 percent during the same period. In addition, Astin demonstrates that during those twenty years, students lost interest in issues such as promoting racial understanding, equality, and community matters.

These attitudinal shifts are reflected in behavioral changes as well. Between 1945 and 1975, the proportion of bachelor's degrees that were awarded nation-wide in business increased from 11 to 14 percent. In 1987, the number of freshmen interested in pursuing a business major reached a record high of 27 percent (Astin, 1992). However, the opposite trend was occurring in education. Interest in an educational career hit its lowest level in 1982, when only 2 percent of the incoming freshmen indicated that they would be interest in an elementary teaching career and 4
percent indicated that they would be interested in a secondary teaching career (Astin, 1992). Similar behavioral changes were found in the number of engineering and computer science degrees, which have gradually increased between 1970 and 1989, while the number of social science and humanities degrees has gradually decreased (Astin, 1992).

The shifts in students' attitudes can be partially explained by the changes in the United States economy during those two decades. Beginning in 1973, the economic situation turned downward. For college students, this marked a historical time when college graduates could no longer choose which job to take. For universities, this was a historical time of budget cuts and shortfalls in revenue. There was concern that this generation might not have access to the same quality of education that students once enjoyed in the prosperous decades following World War II. Amidst the debate over the failures of modern education, questions remain about the continual decline in civic responsibility.

An attempt was made to find more current statistics on student interest in undergraduate majors, but more recent statistics could not be found. However, according to the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), in 2006 freshmen responses to questions regarding commitment to service and civic concerns were at the highest point in 10-12 years. In 2005, the HERI reported a significant increase in commitment to service among American freshmen – presumably due to the natural disasters such as Hurricane Katrina. In 2006, they reported that slight increases continued a trend in student interest in civic commitment and social responsibility.
Experts are concerned that the impact of a decline in civic engagement will be an eventual breakdown of democracy. According to Thomas Ehlrich (2000, n.p.), "Our democracy depends on an informed and engaged citizenry, one that acquires the knowledge and skills needed to become politically involved and then participates actively." In California, a further disparity in civic engagement may deepen the economic inequalities between the "haves" and the "have nots" (Ramakrishnan & Baldassare, 2004).

According to Thomas Ehlrich (2000), former executive committee chair for Campus Compact:

A morally and civically responsible individual recognizes himself or herself as a member of a larger social fabric and therefore considers social problems to be at least partly his or her own; such an individual is willing to see the moral and civic dimensions of issues, to make and justify informed moral and civic judgments, and to take action when appropriate (n.p.).

The issue of civic responsibility is also making an impact at both the federal and the state level. According to a study published by the Public Policy Institute of California, voter turnout in California was lower than in the rest of the United States (Ramakrishnan & Baldassare, 2004). California also fell behind other states in its rate of campaign contributions to state legislators and national officeholders. The principal finding was that there were sizeable differences in participation associated with race/ethnicity, immigration generation, and language use.
It is claimed that civic apathy has replaced civic responsibility and the concept of service to country has diminished (Barber and Battistoni, 1993). College students have expressed that their priorities are shifting and their time is limited. In a preliminary study conducted at Cal Poly in 2006, 78% of students who have not volunteered reported “time” as a barrier to volunteering. In spite of the benefits of community service, many students have limited freedom to add community service work to a crowded schedule that often includes classes, jobs, family responsibilities, commuting, and studying. Over 85% of today’s undergraduates commute and two thirds are employed, often working full time or working part-time at several different jobs (Jacoby, 1994). One way to enable large numbers of students to participate in community service is for colleges to establish service as a priority and an integral part of the curriculum. According to Jacoby (1994, p. B2), “If service is not fully integrated into the educational program, it is likely to be considered peripheral and thus be in constant danger of being cut or ignored.”

In order to address the issues around declining civic engagement, many scholars have turned to the pedagogy of service-learning. Service-learning is an opportunity to use community service and civic activity to enhance learning objectives. Service-learning is a powerful pedagogy consistent with the “learn by doing” philosophy of John Dewey through which some students learn more than they would from conventional classroom instruction. Dewey (1938) explains that experience alone is not what teaches, but rather it is the reflection about that experience from which the learning takes place. Although a link has been established
between civic engagement and service-learning, there have been few detailed studies on the effective components of service-learning. There are fewer studies on what components work best, which components result in particular student learning outcomes, and how these components influence student learning outcomes.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to determine if components of service-learning, such as interaction, can be linked to significant gains in civic responsibility and motivation to continue community service. And, this study examines self-efficacy as a catalyst for these increases. This study is significant because it could provide valuable information for future curriculum development of service-learning courses.

Service-learning is extremely powerful because the potential benefits include: increased interaction with faculty and peers (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997), greater relevance of coursework to career clarification (Keen & Keen, 1998; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000), motivation to be civically engaged (Astin & Sax, 1998; Gray, Ondaatje, & Zakaras, 1998; Markus, Howard, & King, 1993), improved ability to think critically about complex problems (Batchelder & Root, 1944; Eyler & Giles, 1999), improved learning (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1999), increased racial understanding and tolerance (Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000), and greater satisfaction with the learning experience (Gray et al., 1998).

This study will research one critical component for achieving an outcome of motivation to be civically engaged. Based on existing research, it appears the critical components to achieving this outcome are: placement quality - orientation
and supervision of the placement site can affect the service-learning experience (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Howard, 2001); duration of service - there is strong evidence to suggest that a higher number of service hours enhances student outcomes (Mabry, 1998); intensity - service-learning is more effective when students enjoy frequent contact with beneficiaries of their service (Mabry, 1998); reflection - students need to think critically about the issue and draw on their experience (Mabry, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1999); and feedback - receiving quality feedback from professors or clients has an impact on students' self reported learning (Greene & Diehm, 1995; Greene, 1996). This study will focus on manipulating the intensity component.

One critical dimension of the development of civic responsibility is the recognition that one has some choice or volition in dealing with social issues (Weber, Weber, Sleeper, & Schneider, 2004). Bandura (1977, 1986) developed a social cognitive theory in which cognitions are assumed to mediate the effects of the environment on human behavior. One powerful factor in Bandura’s theory is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a person’s judgment of his or her capability to perform a particular task. According to Bandura, there are four principal sources for self-efficacy judgments – physiological arousal, actual experience, vicarious experience, and social persuasion. These will be discussed in greater detail in the subsequent chapter. Figure 1 below demonstrates the link between the program components in the existing research and Bandura’s principal sources of self-efficacy.
Based on the components identified in the literature and Bandura’s self-efficacy theory, one possible model for explaining the necessary steps to learning, and ultimately behavior change, is: 1) student engages in a service experience 2) the components of the experience – placement quality, duration of service, intensity of interaction, reflection, and feedback – shape the physiological arousal, actual experience, vicarious experience, and social persuasion of the student 3) student has an increase in belief that he/she can have a positive impact and is able to help others 4) student experiences an increase in motivation to volunteer 5) student modifies his/her behavior. A visual representation of this model is presented in Figure 2.
This model will be used to examine one component of service-learning – intensity – and its effect on student outcomes. This will be done by infusing two instructional experiences into an experimental course and comparing the outcome with a control group. The study will compare two sets of students from one course at Cal Poly - ECON 303 (Economics of Poverty, Race, and Discrimination). Since the other components – placement quality, duration of service, reflection, and feedback – will not be manipulated a summative approach will be used to look for correlations between the outcomes and those factors. A visual representation of the experimental design is presented in Figure 3.
Several key components are necessary to achieve positive outcomes of service-learning, and the success of each outcome is influenced by a combination of factors. To date, little is known about what components work best, which components result in particular student learning outcomes, and how these components influence student learning outcomes. Many best practices models have been offered, but there is not enough research measuring the outcomes of these practices.

The service experience for this study is 12-hours at a local overnight homeless shelter. The students volunteer in pairs and alternate shifts. They are responsible for welcoming the clients, closing the doors, assisting in the case of an
emergency, and overseeing the morning chores. In the community where this study took place, the overnight shelters rely on university student volunteers to remain open year round. Without the student volunteers, the shelters would not be able to serve the homeless every night.

The intervention component of this study, the panel, was designed to ensure that students interacted with members of the homeless community. During the overnight service, students are not required to interact with the clients. It was hoped that students would take initiative during their overnight service; however, there are limited opportunities to talk with clients because many times the clients are preparing for bed and caring for their children. In order to influence perceived self-efficacy of students, panel presenters were instructed to share stories about how their interactions with volunteers and staff in the homeless shelter improved their experiences. The intervention was intended to expose students to individuals different from themselves and to increase their belief that they can make a difference in the lives of others.

**Research Questions**

The following guiding research questions are used for the purpose of this study.

1. Is there a significant difference in overall motivation as represented by the Volunteer Functions Inventory post-test scores between students who received an additional in-class interaction with
members of the homeless community and those students in the control group?

2. Which aspects of motivation are affected by the in-class interaction with members of the homeless community as represented by the subscales of the Volunteer Functions Inventory post-test scores between students in the experimental and control groups?

3. How do students respond to service-learning and interactions with members of the homeless community?

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were developed based on existing research and the guiding questions for this study.

1. The students in the experimental service-learning class, who receive an increased level of interaction, will show larger increases in motivation to be civically engaged than students in the control service-learning classes.

2. The students in the experimental group will demonstrate higher levels of self-efficacy towards service than the students in the control group.

3. The students in the experimental group will demonstrate more positive responses related to the service-learning course than the control group.

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions are used in this manner for the purpose of this study.
Civic Engagement: The interaction of citizens with their society and their government. Civic engagement activities in higher education include objectives such as “developing civic skills, inspiring engaged citizenship, promoting a civic society, and building a commonwealth” (O’Meara & Kilmer, 1999, n.p.).

Civic Mission: The responsibility of the university to the public sector (Checkoway, 2001).

Civic Responsibility: Active participation in the public life of a community in an informed, committed, and constructive manner, with a focus on the common good (Integrating Civic Responsibility into the Curriculum, 2006).

Service-Learning: A course-based, credit-bearing, educational experience that involves reflection on that service to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000).

Community Service: A voluntary service provided to address a community need.

Self-Efficacy Towards Service (SETS): The belief that one can have an impact on his or her community (Weber, et al., 2004).

Volunteerism: Volunteerism is the decision to choose to act in recognition of a need, with an attitude of social responsibility and without concern from monetary profit, going beyond one’s basic obligations (Ellis & Noyes, 1990, p.4). Volunteerism is a different concept than service-learning – it does not necessarily involve intentional learning.
Significance of the Study

Service-learning is gaining popularity among educators who believe in the civic mission of higher education. Several research universities have established serious service-learning programs that have won widespread recognition. Campus Compact is a coalition of more than 500 colleges and university presidents committed to service-learning. The American Association of Higher Education is publishing more than twenty books on service-learning in academic disciplines, and the American Council on Education, Association of American Colleges and Universities, American Association of Universities, and other national higher education associations have held conferences on the subject (Checkoway, 2001).

There is a growing body of evidence to support the positive outcomes of service-learning, including stronger commitment to social responsibility and future volunteering. The results of this study are important to higher education administrators, professors, student affairs professionals, and community members as they work together to develop effective service-learning courses. The outcomes from this study can help shape best practices for enhancing community responsibility and addressing social justice issues. All data collected provides insight into how students internalize the service-learning experience and their outward demonstration of learning. The data is available for use in the development of future service-learning programs, which could result in more effective, comprehensive approaches to curricular objectives and developing civic responsibility.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

History of Service-learning in Higher Education

Universities serve academic, social and cultural purposes. Education for a democratic society has been a long-standing ideal for public higher education. American universities and colleges in the 17th and 18th centuries were first founded around the idea of service and citizenship—service to the church, community, and the emerging nation (Spring, 2001). By the 19th century, American universities were viewed as the panacea to society’s problems. The idea was to use schools as an instrument of government policy, to train the population, and to provide leaders and a responsible citizenry. Educators hoped schools would enhance society by improving economic conditions, providing equality of opportunity, eliminating crime, and maintaining political and social order.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Woodrow Wilson stated the following:

As a nation we are becoming civically illiterate. Unless we find better ways to educate ourselves as citizens, we run the risk of drifting unwittingly into a new kind of Dark Age—a time when small cadres of specialists will control knowledge and thus control the decision-making process. (Barber, 1992, p. 247)

During World War II, the demands of global conflict led university students to participate in the national war effort. Universities were faced with the charge of producing civic-minded, patriotic, young Americans who understood the meaning of
democracy. After 1945, the federal government poured funds into higher education to educate veterans, fund medical research, and support service programs (Spring, 2001).

Prior to the mid-century, traditional universities were closed-systems. Institutions of higher education were viewed as places where knowledge was authoritatively disseminated. Universities were viewed as "storehouses of knowledge" (Barr & Tagg, 1995; Lounsbury & Pollack, 2001). Since mid-century, traditional perspectives have been challenged.

Social movements in the 1960s challenged the relevance of university practices and traditional teaching methods. Experiential kinds of learning, such as community service and internships, gained prominence. This led to a new open-system logic in which student learning became the primary focus of the field. Instead of predominately using lecture methods, the learning-centered logic encouraged faculty to become more innovative in creating their learning environments (Lounsbury & Pollack, 2001).

During the 1960s, civil rights and poverty were national concerns and the federal government made education part of a national campaign against poverty. The call to service came from President John F. Kennedy, who developed programs such as the Peace Corps that continues today. Thousands of Peace Corps volunteers traveled to the poorest countries to build homes and schools, teach farmers about agriculture, and help villages access clean drinking water. Other programs born out
of the 1960s include Head Start, Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), and the Retired Senior Volunteer Corps (RSVP).

By the late 1970s and early 1980s college and university community service programs had experienced a declined. Budget cuts, combined with a general societal disengagement with community needs, created a lack of support for service programs. Federally funded programs in all areas were being rolled-back, service programs were defunded, and education took a “back to the basics” approach. Many service programs were not seen as rigorous or academic by faculty, especially considering the pressures academics faced to address the concerns brought about by the *A Nation at Risk* report. Many students did not associate community service with career success, material rewards, or securing jobs (Mintz & Liu, 1994).

In the late 1980’s, the service-learning movement grew from the demand for academic rigor. Service-learning became the link for academic courses and service. Educators began to use service to meet academic learning objectives and enhance learning outcomes. The movement was propelled by the passage of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, which created hundreds of federally funded service-learning programs across the country. And, in 1993, President Clinton signed the National and Community Service Trust Act and created the Corporation for National and Community Service.

Simultaneously with the expansion of service-learning, institutions of higher education began examining broad questions about the role of “universities as citizens” (Kecskes, 2006). In 1985, Campus Compact was formed to support civic
education, community building, and campus engagement in higher education. Campus Compact has become a leader in building civic engagement into campus and academic life. In 2005, it had grown to a coalition of over 950 college and university presidents – representing some 5 million students – who were committed to fulfilling the public purposes of higher education. In 2006, Kevin Kecskes, director of Community-University Partnerships at Portland State University, wrote, “The service-learning and civic engagement movement stands at a crossroads between marginal success and the transformation of academic culture” (p. xviii).

*The Effects of Service-Learning on Students: Research on Service-learning and Civic Responsibility*

Studies show that the interest of entering undergraduate students in civic activities is at an all-time low (Checkoway, 2001; National Commission on Civic Renewal, 1998; Putnam, 2000; Young, 2003). According to Eugene M. Lang, a retired businessman and entrepreneur who challenged ten college presidents to improve their colleges’ efforts in civic engagement through Project Pericles, college students feel that a few hours of community service are an adequate replacement for other civic involvement (Young, 2003). With renewed national attention on the civic mission of education, colleges and universities are interested in the long-term effects of such programs.

A review of the literature reveals several studies which suggest that volunteerism during the undergraduate years does increase students’ personal values and social responsibility. Astin, Sax, and Avalos (1999) conducted a longitudinal
multi-institutional study examining the effects of service participation after controlling for students’ pre-college propensity to engage in service. They found that undergraduate service participation continues to have direct effects at least through the first five years following the completion of college. Participating in volunteer service during college is associated with attending graduate school, earning higher degrees, socializing with persons from different racial/ethnic groups, and participating in volunteer/community service work in the years after college. Furthermore, volunteering in college is positively associated with five value measures in the post-college years: helping others in difficulty, participating in community action programs, participating in environmental cleanup programs, promoting racial understanding, and developing a meaningful philosophy of life.

Giles and Eyler (1994) also found an increase in social responsibility and personal values associated with community service. They surveyed 72 undergraduate students enrolled in a one unit “community service laboratory” as one of the requirements of their interdisciplinary major courses. Students showed a significant increase in their belief that people can make a difference, that they should be involved in community service and particularly in leadership and political influence, and in their commitment to perform volunteer service the following semester. They also became less likely to blame social service clients for their misfortunes and more likely to stress a need for equal opportunity.

Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, and Kerrigan (1996) had similar findings. These researchers used a comprehensive case study model of service-learning assessment at
Portland State University. They identified multiple variables, indicators, and measures to examine the hypothesis that participation in service-learning would have a positive impact on four constituencies: faculty, students, community, and institution. They used in-person assessments (interviews, focus groups, and classroom observation), independent reflection measures (journals and surveys), and reviews of existing documentation (syllabus analysis, review of vitae, existing reports, and activity/contact logs). Preliminary findings from student interview data show that service-learning affected students in their awareness and involvement in the community, personal development, academic achievement, and sensitivity to diversity.

Fenzel and Leary (1997) had mixed findings. They conducted two studies at a parochial college to address the benefits to students who performed service as part of their curricular study. In the first study, they compared students in a service-learning course with students in a course without service-learning. The dependent variables were social responsibility and moral development, and the data sources used to assess them were interviews, course evaluations, the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (SPRS) and the Defining Issues Test (DIT). In the second study, 134 students in six service-learning classes completed questionnaires that rated their service experiences, the extent and quality of the training they received, whether service contributed to learning their course materials, and the likelihood of their continuing service. The researchers found that service-learning students did not show greater gains in attitudes toward personal and social responsibility, or in moral
judgment; however, content analysis of interviews revealed that students felt more compassion toward the disadvantaged, were more committed to community work, and held a greater belief that they could make a difference. Analysis also suggested that courses which include reflection as a central feature had an effect on students’ plans about postgraduate school and work.

Finally, Keen and Keen (1998) conducted a descriptive study of 929 students in the Bonners Scholars Program. They used self-report surveys, focus groups and interviews to examine students who were already active in service. Students reported that service-learning positively impacted their motivation to be civically engaged others, their sense of personal efficacy and leadership effectiveness, and enhanced their career development process.

Based on these studies, and others not included in this literature review, a conclusion can be made that service-learning has a positive effect on student personal development such as sense of self-efficacy, personal identity, and moral development. It can also be concluded that service-learning has a positive effect on sense of social responsibility, citizenship skills, and motivation to be civically engaged.

*The Effects of Particular Service-learning Components on Students*

There is another body of literature which examines the effectiveness of various service-learning program components. These studies examine the effectiveness of components such as placement quality, duration of service, intensity of interaction, reflection, and feedback. Eyler and Giles (1999) conducted a pre/post
quasi-experimental study of 2462 students using self-report surveys, problem solving interviews, attitude measurement scales, and interviews. Their dependent variables were citizenship skills and attitudes, personal development outcomes, learning, problem analysis, critical thinking, and cognitive development. Among several analyses, they examined the impact of program characteristics on outcomes using only the service-learning sample of 1100 students. They found that program characteristics such as placement quality, link between the academic subject matter and service, written and oral reflection, diversity, and community voice have a positive impact on many student personal and interpersonal outcomes.

Mabry (1998) had similar findings. Mabry found that placement quality and duration and intensity of service have an impact on student outcomes. Mabry used a self-report study to examine civic attitudes and personal social values of 232 students in 23 different service-learning courses. This study assessed how student attitudes and values were affected by the amount and type of contact with service beneficiaries, and the frequency and types of reflection required. Mabry found that service-learning was more effective when students had at least 15-20 hours of service, enjoyed frequent contact with beneficiaries of their service, engaged in weekly in-class reflection, wrote ongoing and summative reflections and had discussions about their service experiences with both instructors and site supervisors.

Gray, Ondaatje, and Zakaras (1998) also found a correlation between duration of service and academic and personal outcomes. They conducted a large study for the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program (LSAHE), a
program administered by the Corporation for National Service, which examined data from 930 LSAHE institutions over three years (1995-1997); 847 community organizations, and 3492 students. They found that students who volunteered more than 20 hours per semester, applied course principles to their service experiences, and discussed these experiences in class, reaped the greatest gains on academic and life-skills outcomes.

Another component of service-learning that has been examined is quality feedback from professors and clients. Greene and Diehm (1995) found that receiving quality feedback from professors or clients has an impact on students' self reported learning, use of skills taught in courses, and commitment to service. They used a between-group design to study 40 students in a course with a service-learning component. Twenty-four students elected to participate in the service-learning component. These students were randomly assigned weekly journal writing with written feedback (n=11); the other group was assigned weekly journal writing with feedback only given as a check mark (n=13). Sixteen students with no service-learning were the control group. An analysis of variance indicated that there was a significant difference between service-learning groups who received different types of feedback on their journals. The students receiving written feedback had a significantly greater awareness of the contribution the clients made to their learning than those who received only a check mark for completion.

Greene (1996) found further evidence that supported Greene & Diehm's findings. This study investigated the effect of service-learning on students' moral and
psychological development. Greene examined four professional health programs – two incorporated service-learning and two did not (n=98). All students responded to the following pre- and post-surveys; the Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI), the Sociomoral Reflection Measure (SRM), and the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SCQ). Analysis of the three surveys indicated that compared to the non-service students, there was significant developmental and psychosocial changes in both service-learning student groups. However, service-learning did not significantly impact students' moral reasoning abilities or their development of mature relationships. Analysis of reflective journals revealed that: 1) students in the service-learning groups attached an ever-increasing importance to their service-learning experience; 2) there was an awareness of reciprocity between student groups and their service recipients; 3) service-learning students affirmed the educational value of their experiences; and 4) service-learning students increased their awareness of diversity and quality of life issues for service recipients.

These studies indicate that independent components of service-learning can affect student outcomes. Factors such as placement quality, duration of service, intensity of interaction, reflection, and feedback play a critical role in the outcomes of service-learning programs. However, previous research has not been designed to examine how interaction affects outcomes.

*Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory*

A growing body of research demonstrates the connection between service-learning and the development of citizenship. In a study of 100 individuals who
demonstrated sustained work on behalf of a common good (Parks Daloz, Keen, Keen, and Daloz Parks, 1996) the single most important patterned evidenced in those leading lives of commitment was “a constructive, enlarging engagement with the other” (63). This engagement “jolted their idea of who they were and where they stood in the world, challenging their previously held assumptions about who was ‘one of us’ and who was not” and “challenging some earlier boundary and opened the way to a larger sense of self and the world” (pp. 65-66).

In the field of education, McCarthy (1996) argues that without interactions with diverse others, “students’ perceptions about social problems are less likely to change, little learning occurs, and expectations for continued active involvement are limited” (116). Interactions with diverse others is a key mediator of positive outcomes. It also provides an interesting conceptualization of the service-learning experience and opens the door for the application of a number of social psychological theories to the study of service-learning and behavioral change. Early theorists relied heavily on extrinsic factors, such as reinforcements and punishments, to explain motivation and behavioral change. But in the last few decades, reinforcement theory has been modified to include intrinsic motivational factors.

Bandura (1977, 1986) developed a social cognitive theory in which cognitions (thoughts, beliefs) are assumed to mediate the effects of the environment on human behavior. Bandura’s social cognitive theory focuses specifically on people’s beliefs about the consequences of a behavior (Stipek, 2002). People’s beliefs are filtered through personal memory, interpretation, and biases. Service-
learning courses provide opportunities for students to interpret events and re-evaluate biases. A central element of Bandura’s social cognitive theory is self-efficacy – a person’s judgment of his or her capability to perform a particular task. Self-efficacy is a powerful factor in Bandura’s theory, and, according to Bandura, there are four principal sources of information for self-efficacy judgments – actual experience, vicarious experience, social persuasion, and physiological arousal.

This study is based on the premise that when a service-learning student has an actual experience that is successful and positive the student gains self-efficacy. Service-learning courses place students in contact with people and communities very different from their own. These opportunities promote self-reflection and personal awareness. However, the success will not contribute to the perceptions of efficacy if the student believes the task was easy or that he/she did not make a difference. For example, a student asked to stuff envelopes may not feel challenged or feel he/she did not make a significant contribution and therefore have a negative experience.

Service-learning also provides an opportunity for vicarious experiences. For example, meeting a single mom in a women’s shelter provides an opportunity to see the world from the perspective of the other. The inclusion of the other in the self allows an individual to benefit from the other’s resources and identities.

Social persuasion has the potential to be an effective tool in service-learning courses. Teachers, staff members, and clients can persuade students that they can make a difference. Social persuasion is more effective when it is reinforced by real successes. Derek Bok (2006), former Harvard President, says, “By merely speaking
out periodically about the importance of service and giving seed money to initiate new programs, presidents and deans can substantially increase the number of student participants” (p.168).

Physiological arousal is the somatic and emotional state the student is in during the service-learning experience. It is necessary to reduce people’s stress reactions and alter their negative emotional tendency in order to increase their self-efficacy. For example, research has shown that orientation and supervision at the placement site have both been found to influence the quality of the students’ service-learning experience (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Although students may feel uncertainty about volunteering, the interpretation of that emotion can be influenced by a site supervisor who normalizes the feeling.

Perceived efficacy can affect people’s behavior, thoughts, and emotional reactions. People don’t seek out or enjoy doing things that they believe they can’t do very well or don’t make a difference. If service-learning can enhance the self-efficacy of students, it can motivate them to continue a life of service and social responsibility. Therefore, this study seeks to determine whether students who gain self-efficacy through service-learning will demonstrate motivation to be civically engaged.
Chapter 3

Research Methodology

Service-learning brings curriculum and community service together in a collaborative effort in which students incorporate course content into addressing a community need. Curriculum-based service-learning is a fairly new process for many universities and colleges, unlike community service, which has been a traditional co-curricular activity for decades. Studies to determine the benefits and preferred components of service-learning are critical if service-learning is to be an accepted pedagogical approach.

Previous studies have suggested that certain aspects of service-learning can be linked to student outcomes. The most common components that affect student outcomes are placement quality, duration of service, intensity of interaction, reflection, and feedback. In order to add to the existing literature, this study focused on service-learning and the effect of interaction on civic responsibility and motivation to be civically engaged.

Methodology

The basic design for this study was a pre/post-test quasi-experimental design since subjects were chosen from existing classes. The independent program variable was the intensity component of the service-learning process – a panel presentation by members of the homeless community. In order to determine whether the independent variable had an impact on civic responsibility the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) survey, known to measure motivations to volunteer, was administered to
students enrolled in two sections of a course involving service-learning with an intense interaction (experimental group) and two sections of the same service-learning course without an intense interaction (control group). Five items from Weber et al.'s Self-Efficacy Towards Service (SETs) Survey Instrument (2004) were interspersed in the VFI. Other multiple measures used were a sign-up sheet to indicate interest in volunteering, follow-up interviews, and a survey to measure other course components (i.e. placement quality, duration of service, reflection, and feedback).

The course ECON 303 (Economics of Poverty, Race and Discrimination) was used for this research. There were five sections of the course taught by two professors. The control group was made up of three sections, with at least one section from each professor, and the experimental group was made up of two sections, with one section from each professor. The survey was administered to students during the first week of Winter 2008 (pre-test) and the last week of Winter 2008 (post-test).

Procedures

In January 2008, 97 students from the experimental group and 141 students from the control group were administered the VFI survey on a voluntary basis. Each of the students in both the control and experimental groups were asked to volunteer for this study by the researcher and received a consent form that explained the study and assured confidentiality. The pre-test scores were tabulated and compared to
assure that both groups were "equal." Demographic data was collected on both groups, including gender, racial background, college, and class level.

Both groups received instructional information related to service-learning and representatives from local homeless community service agencies made class presentations during the second class session of Week One of the quarter. All students were required to sign up for 12 hours of service, unless they chose to complete the alternative assignment – a research paper. Community service agencies were El Camino Homeless Shelter, Prado Day Center, and the Overflow Homeless Shelter. During Week Eight of the quarter, all students attended an in-class reflection.

The intervention took place during Week Eight. During the class session before the panel, the researcher prepared the students in the experimental group for the panel by reminding them to respect the visitors, explaining what to expect during the panel, and providing appropriate types of questions (see Appendix J). Students in the experimental group had a two-hour in-class session during which they interacted with clients from the homeless shelter. These sessions were shaped based on the theoretical framework presented in earlier chapters. According to previous research, a critical common component among individuals who demonstrate sustained work on behalf of a common good is a “constructive, enlarging engagement with the other” (p. 63, Parks et al., 1996). Such an engagement ought to, “jolt their idea of who they [are] and where they [stand] in the world, challenging their previously held
assumptions about who [is] ‘one of us’ and who [is] ‘not’” (p. 65-66, Parks et al., 1996).

During the intervention, four members of the homeless community presented their story to each class. Each homeless speaker shared his/her story for about 10-15 minutes. Then, students were invited to ask questions of the speakers. The purpose of this interaction was to expose students to different perspectives, especially about social problems, and to help students understand how they can make a difference.

Three of the panel members were Caucasian and one panel member was Latino. The panel was made up of two males and two females. Two panel members became homeless because of a series of events following a work-related injury. One panel member became homeless because she left her husband and moved to a women’s shelter. The fourth panel member was born just outside the county and was part of a gang. He became homeless when he left his gang and moved to the homeless shelter. He was the oldest in his family, and his mother was 13 years old when she became pregnant.

Panel members were instructed to share their stories but also to address benefits they thought they had derived from having volunteers at their shelter. This instruction was designed to have a direct influence on students’ perceptions of self-efficacy. For example, the former gang member talked about his experience with the staff at the homeless shelter and the help he received from one staff member in particular. All four panel members thanked the students for their volunteer time and for making it possible to keep the overnight shelters open.
Participants were eliminated from the larger pool if they did not complete both surveys, were absent during the homeless panel or reflection, chose the research paper option, or switched sections. Eighty six (86) students from three sections of the course Economics of Poverty, Race, and Discrimination formed the control group and 55 students from two sections of the course Economics of Poverty, Race, and Discrimination formed the experimental group. Both groups completed 12 hours of community service, and the experimental group also received an in-class presentation from members of the homeless community.

The control group consisted of 45 males (52% of the control group) and 41 females (48% of the control group). Thirteen members of the control group were freshmen (15%), 52 members of the control group were sophomores (61%), 16 members of the control group were juniors (19%), 5 members of the control group were seniors or above (6%). The experimental group consisted of 29 males (53% of the experimental group) and 26 females (47% of the experimental group). Four members of the experimental group were freshmen (7%), 26 members of the experimental group were sophomores (47%), 17 members of the experimental group were juniors (31%), 8 members of the experimental group were seniors or above (15%). See Table 1 for more detailed demographic data.
Table 1

Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment Conditions</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Participants</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science and Math</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrument

Volunteer Functions Inventory

The primary instrument for this study was the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) developed by Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, and Miene (1998). Clary et al. identified six independent motivational factors influencing individuals to engage in service: (a) values, (b) understanding, (c) career, (d) social, (e) protective, and (f) self-esteem. Service meets the values function by allowing individuals to express their beliefs through action. The second motivation, understanding, is the need for individuals to learn about themselves and others through experience. Individuals may also participate in service to acquire training and skills necessary to achieve future career aspirations. The social function allows individuals to adhere to the social norms of valued groups with whom they identify. The protective motivation for service allows individuals to address personal issues and protect themselves from recognizing potentially negative aspects of their selves. Finally, the self-esteem function allows individuals participating in service activities to focus on their personal growth and develop feelings of esteem and worth.

Each subscale consists of five items that assess the individual’s degree of that motivation in making decisions to volunteer. Answers are recorded on a 7-point response scale anchored with not at all important/accurate to extremely important/accurate. Subscale scores are obtained by calculating the mean score across the five items in each subscale, with a higher score indicating a greater sense of importance associated with the motivation.
An existing scale was chosen because of the advantages of using an existing scale over modifying scales or developing original scales. The existing scale was prepared by researchers who have professional expertise and has a known record of psychometric qualities. Reliability of the VFI was determined by three different factors, temporal consistency, internal consistency, and factor structure. Clary et al. (1998) reported 4-week test-retest reliability of .78 (values), .77 (understanding and self-esteem), .68 (social and career), and .64 (protective). Across three studies, Clary et al. (1998) reported all subscales demonstrated coefficient alphas greater than .80. Factor analysis of the scale produced good factor structures indicating that the items are measuring distinct types of motives for volunteering. Furthermore, the factor structure demonstrates consistency across studies (Clary, et al., 1998).

Validity of the VFI was also determined by three different factors, known groups, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. First, significant correlation (-.53) was found for age of volunteers and careers scores on the VFI (Clary, Snyder, & Ridge, 1992). This finding indicates that older volunteers were not motivated to volunteer for a career, presumably because they were already settled in careers or retired. Second, Clary et al. (1998) created six advertisements targeting the six psychological functions measured by the VFI. With the exception of the social advertisement, each of the advertisements was strongly correlated with responses to the corresponding subscale of the VFI. In addition, they found that volunteers who reported receiving benefits from their participation in community service that corresponded to their strong motive were more satisfied with their service and
intended to continue to volunteer in the short and long term, when compared with those who did not receive functionally relevant benefits. Third, the VFI was compared with Jackson’s (1974) Personality Research Form (PRF). Generally, VFI subscales did not correlate with PRF scales. Furthermore, most VFI subscales were found to be better predictors than the PRF scale of advertisement designed to appeal to various motives to volunteer.

Gender differences have been found using the VFI. Switzer, Switzer, Stukas, and Baker (1999) reported that female respondents scored significantly higher on the Values subscale than male respondents. Switzer et al. stated that women tended to score higher than men on all the subscales of the VFI, and the small sample size may account for the inability to detect statistical significant differences between men and women.

The VFI scale is a psychometrically sound scale that has tremendous potential to relate motives to student recruitment, service experiences, reflection strategies, learning outcomes, and, for the purpose of this study, critical components of service-learning. Clary, Snyder, and Stukas (1998), discussed motivational factors that sustain volunteering. They speculated that volunteers who are balanced across the six motivational factors are more likely to persist than those for whom the motive base is strong for one motive and weaker for all others.

In addition to the VFI, the pre/post-test collected demographic data on the participants, including racial background, age, gender, major, class level, name of
service-learning course, course number, and name of community partner where service was performed.

*Supplemental Self-Efficacy Towards Service subscale.* Interspersed in the VFI were five items taken from Weber et al.'s (2004) Self-Efficacy Towards Service (SETS) Survey Instrument. Three items comprising the SETS construct were generated from survey items developed by Andrew Furco, Director of the Service-Learning Center at the University of California-Berkeley. The mission of the Center is to promote student awareness of and motivation for social involvement through the pedagogy of service-learning projects. The other items were developed by Weber and the other authors during group deliberations in consultation with experts in the field of business ethics and the development of student social responsibility and moral judgment. Weber et al. calculated a Cronbach's alpha of .8042 for the SETS.

*Additional Measures.* Four other multiple measures were performed during this study. First, in addition to the questions in the pre-test, the post-test included a series of questions intended to describe students' perspectives and attitudes on issues related to their experience in the service-learning course was included in the post-test. The questions were taken from a curriculum guide from a national service-learning project of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) funded by the Corporation for National and Community Service. The guide was the result of two years of work by faculty, staff, and administrators at six community colleges (Gottlieb & Robinson, 2002). The survey is based on a four point Likert scale where students report their level of agreement regarding their service-learning
experience. The scale range includes “strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “agree,” and “strongly agree.”

Second, a validation measure was taken in the control and experimental groups. A sign-up sheet was passed around during the first session and the last session asking for students to sign up if they were interested in being put on a distribution list for upcoming volunteer opportunities. The increased response from the control group and the experimental group were compared. The sign-up list was also to be used to better understand the final pre/post-test results.

Third, focus groups were attempted with select members of the control and experimental groups. The focus groups were conducted during spring quarter, after the reflection and post-test had been administered. Students were asked what they thought they contributed through their service, what they gained from their experiences, whether their experiences were positive or negative, and how the service affected their motivation to be civically engaged.

Fourth, evaluations were collected from the experimental group to gain feedback on the intervention. The evaluations asked for an overall rating of the panel, value of the information and discussion, and overall facilitator rating, as well as open comments.

Data Analysis

The pre-test and post-test scores of the VFI, including the seven subscales (Self-efficacy, Self-esteem, Understanding, Protective, Social, Values, Career), for the control and experimental groups were tabulated and recorded immediately
following the administering of the surveys. Analysis of the pre-test scores was performed to determine that the two groups were “equal.” The analysis looked at the means and standard deviations for the pre-test measures of the experimental and control groups. Seven indicators were created by averaging the items for each subscale: Social (Items 2, 5, 7, 20, 26); Values (Items 4, 9, 19, 22, 25); Career (Items 1, 12, 17, 24, 32); Understanding (Items 14, 16, 21, 28, 35); Esteem (Items 6, 15, 30, 31, 33); Protective (Items 8, 11, 13, 23, 27); and Self-Efficacy (3, 10, 18, 29, 34). A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine that there were no significant differences between the pre-test measures of the experimental and control groups.

An analysis was conducted for the pre- and post-test scores to determine the degree to which the seven dependent variables were correlated. Several dependent variables were highly correlated which indicated that the sub-scales were not orthogonal – there was overlap in the dependent measures. Therefore, a multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between groups when looking at all seven dependent measures and the way they relate to each other. A two-way repeated measures analysis of variance (two treatment conditions x two times of measurement) was conducted for each dependent measure.

There are relative risks associated with any statistical analysis. A parametric procedure treats the ordinal data as if it were interval or continuous data. However,
this is a widely acceptable approach. Since the data was treated in this way, there is an assumption of normal distribution.

A one-way analysis of variance was administered to determine whether there were differences in gender. The sample population lacked the necessary diversity to test for significant differences in racial background, age, college, and class-level. The service-learning questions from the post-test were analyzed for statistically significant differences between the experimental and control group for each response. The lack of response on the sign-up sheets and focus groups prevented further analysis of those two measures.
Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine if components of service-learning, such as interaction with members of the homeless community, can be linked to significant gains in civic responsibility and motivation to continue community service. This study examined Self-efficacy, as well as six other components of motivation (Understanding, Social, Values, Career, Protective, and Self-esteem) from the Volunteer Functions Inventory, as a catalyst for these increases in motivation. This chapter will present the descriptive data followed by the results which address each of the research questions.

Descriptive Data

Means and Standard Deviations. Pre-and post-test scores were obtained for the experimental and control groups for each of the subscales. Each subscale score is equal to the average of five questions on the Volunteer Functions Inventory, with the highest possible score being 7. A higher score indicates a greater sense of importance association with the motivation. The results are included in Table 2 followed by a discussion.
Table 2

*Means and Standard Deviations for Pre and Post-test Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experimental Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Deviation</strong></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest means for the experimental and control groups were for the Values and Self-efficacy subscales. An example of a Self-efficacy statement is, “I can have a positive impact on social problems.” An example of a Value’s statement is, “I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.” The smallest means for the experimental and control groups were for the Protective and Social subscales. An example of a Protective statement is, “Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others” An example of a Social statement is, “People I know share an interest in community service.” The greatest change in the pre- and post-test scores for the experimental group was for the Protective subscale (decrease of .25). The greatest change in the pre- and post-test scores for the control group was for the Self-esteem subscale (decrease of .26). The means for the pre- and post-test scores indicate that almost every subscale score decreased. A further discussion of these results is presented in the next chapter.

*Gender Differences.* Based on Switzer et al.’s findings that gender differences have been found using the VFI, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted on the pre- and post-test scores by gender. The means and standard
deviations are presented in Table 3 followed by the ANOVA results for pre- and post-test scores in Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 3

*Means and Standard Deviations for Pre and Post-test Scores By Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Pre-Test</th>
<th>Male Post-Test</th>
<th>Female Pre-Test</th>
<th>Female Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Analysis of Variance for Pre-test Scores by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dep. Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Analysis of Variance for Post-test Scores by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dep. Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were significant differences in the pre-test scores between males and females for Self-efficacy (p = .023), Self-esteem (p = .043), Understanding (p = .002), Value (p = .000), and Total Score (p = .033). Females had higher mean scores than males with few exceptions. There were significant differences in the post-test scores between males and females for Self-efficacy (p = .036), Values (p=.016), and Total Score (p=.037). Overall, males showed a greater decrease between their pre- and post-test scores than females.
Correlations

In order to determine which test would be most appropriate for the data, a correlations analysis was conducted. The results are included in Table 6 and Table 7 followed by a discussion.

The correlations analysis for the pre- and post-scores indicates the degree to which the seven dependent variables relate to one another. Several dependent variables were highly correlated which indicated that the subscales were not orthogonal – there was overlap in the dependent measures. In the pre-score correlations, Self-efficacy was highly correlated with Understanding (Pearson's correlation = .72) and Values (Pearson's correlation = .74), and Self-efficacy accounted for 65% of the total score. The post-score correlations were similar to the pre-score correlations.
Table 6

*Correlations of Pre-test Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Esteem</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Protective</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.717**</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td>.676**</td>
<td>.372**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.743**</td>
<td>.299**</td>
<td>.669**</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.801**</td>
<td>.768**</td>
<td>.688**</td>
<td>.626**</td>
<td>.656**</td>
<td>.593**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**, Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
N = 141
Table 7

*Correlations of Post-Test Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Esteem</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Protective</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.679**</td>
<td>.596**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.766**</td>
<td>.468**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.367*</td>
<td>.406**</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.845**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.636**</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>.656**</td>
<td>.457**</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.338**</td>
<td>.239**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.711**</td>
<td>.821**</td>
<td>.813**</td>
<td>.741**</td>
<td>.673**</td>
<td>.673**</td>
<td>.717**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
N = 141
Research Questions

The following research questions were presented in Chapter 1. The following results address each of the questions.

Differences in Overall Motivation. The first research question asks if there is a significant difference in overall motivation as represented by the Volunteer Functions Inventory post-test scores between students who received an additional in-class interaction with members of the homeless community and those students in the control group. To answer the first question, a multivariate analysis of variance was used to compare the differences in the pre- and post-test scores of the experimental group with those of the control group. A multivariate analysis of variance was used because the sub-measures of the Volunteer Functions Inventory were correlated. The total score of the VFI represents the sum of the seven subscales. The results of the MANOVA are included in Table 8 followed by a discussion.

Table 8

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Difference in Total Motivation Score Between Experimental vs. Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hyp. df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Sq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling’s Trace</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s Largest Root</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of the differences between the pre- and post-test scores between students who received additional interaction with the members of the homeless community and those students in the control group indicates there is a significant difference (p= .007) between the two groups when accounting for the way the subscales relate to one another. The partial eta squared indicates that 13% of the difference between the groups can be explained by all seven subscales. Further analysis was conducted in order to discover how the two groups were significantly different and to answer the second research question.

Differences in Aspects of Motivation. The second research question asks which aspects of motivation are affected by the in-class interaction with members of the homeless community as represented by the subscales of the Volunteer Functions Inventory post-test scores between students in the experimental and control groups. To answer the second question, further examination of the multivariate analysis of variance was conducted. The results of the difference in subscales scores between the experimental and control groups are included in Table 9 followed by a discussion.

The analysis indicates a difference in the Career subscale (p = .048) in the pre- and post-test scores between students who received additional interaction with the members of the homeless community and those students in the control group. In addition to the multivariate analysis of variance, which examined the difference between the pre- and post-test scores for the experimental and control groups, a two-way repeated measures analysis of variance (two treatment conditions x two times of measurement) was conducted for each subscale.
### Table 9

**Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Difference in Subscales Scores Between Experimental vs. Control Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dep. Variable</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Sq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.2.49</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.1.27</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were many pre-post effects but without interactions with treatment group. This means that pre/post-test scores were significantly different for the whole group, but there were no significant differences between treatment groups.

*Student Responses.* The third research question asks how students respond to service-learning and interactions with members of the homeless community. A further investigation of the additional measures was conducted in order to answer this question. First, the means and standard deviations were compiled for the service-learning survey questions intended to describe students’ perspectives and attitudes on issues related to the service-learning course in the post-test. Answers were recorded
on a 4-point response scale anchored with *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*, with a higher score indicating strongly agree.

Table 10

*Means and Standard Deviations for Service-Learning Survey Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a good understanding of the needs and problems facing the community in which I live.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If everyone works together, many of society’s problems can be solved.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have a responsibility to serve my community.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I probably will not volunteer or participate in the community after this course ends</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The idea of combining course work with service to the community should be practiced in more courses in this college.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I plan to enroll in more courses that offer service learning.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The service I did through this course was not at all beneficial to the community.</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. The service aspect of this course made me aware of some of my own biases or prejudices.
Mean
N
Standard Deviation
3.09 2.99
54 81
.76 .83

9. The service aspect of this course showed me how I can become more involved in my community.
Mean
N
Standard Deviation
3.17 3.11
53 83
.55 .68

10. The service aspect of this course helped me to understand better the lectures and readings required for this course.
Mean
N
Standard Deviation
2.71 2.49
52 83
.80 .87

11. As a result of my service learning experience, I have a better understanding of my role as a citizen.
Mean
N
Standard Deviation
2.83 2.72
52 83
.73 .74

12. As a result of my service learning experience, I would encourage other students to take courses that offer service-learning.
Mean
N
Standard Deviation
3.17 2.93
53 83
.87 .87

The scores indicate that the students in the experimental and control groups generally agreed with most statements. The experimental group and control group gave the highest scores (3.26 and 3.2 respectively) for question #2, “If everyone works together, many of society’s problems can be solved.” Lower scores were given for questions #4 and #7, which were negative statements about the service-learning experience. The experimental and control groups also gave lower scores (2.40 and 2.19 respectively) for question #6, “I plan to enroll in more courses that offer service-learning.” With the exception of questions #4, #6, and #7, scores ranged from 2.49 to 3.26.
The only statistically significant difference ($p = .04$) found between the two groups was the response to Question 3 – *I have a responsibility to serve my community*. The experimental group had a mean of 3.07 and the control group had a mean of 2.93. This could be a chance finding because there were multiple analysis conducted. However, the experimental group had more positive scores than the control group, when the negative statements were taken into consideration, for the majority of the questions.

Second, the evaluations of the homeless panel collected from the experimental group were analyzed for central themes. There were 45 comments from the experimental group. A qualitative analysis was conducted to reveal similarities and variations across participants’ responses. The comments were first analyzed using open coding to identify emerging themes. Then, themes were grouped into core categories. The final categories in assessing student responses to the homeless panel were “affirming,” “informative,” “constructive”, and “motivating.” Approximately 10% of responses fell into more than one category.

Of the four categories, the greatest number of responses (51%) was in the affirming category. A typical response in the affirming category was, “Great job of breaking stereotypes.” Other noteworthy comments were, “Best two hours of my four years at Cal Poly,” and “The panel was great and has changed my views forever.”

The next highest number of responses (33%) was in the informative category. A typical response in the informative category was, “I think having the panel is a great idea – it was very informative and helpful to be able to hear these people’s
stories and ask them questions.” Other noteworthy comments were, “I thought it was very enlightening to hear their stories and where they came from and how they got here,” and “Very informative and entertaining.”

Approximately 20% of responses were in the constructive category. Examples of response in the constructive category are, “Next time remind panelists not to interrupt each other,” “It would have been nice to see a more diverse panel ethnically,” and “I think the panel should be more structured.” Finally, 7% of the responses were in the motivating category. A typical response in the motivating category was, “They really opened my eyes and made me want to volunteer more of my own time.”
Chapter 5

Discussion

Previous studies have suggested that certain components of service-learning can improve students’ motivation to perform community service and increase civic engagement. In an effort to measure the impact of one such component, *intense interaction with members of the homeless community*, the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) was administered to students who interacted with a panel of individuals from the homeless community in addition to a service-learning component of their economics course at the beginning and end of the academic term. The VFI was also administered to a control group of economics students which had the same service-learning component but did not interact with a panel of individuals from the homeless community at the beginning and end of the same academic term.

In this study, both groups were less motivated to perform community service at the end of the study. In particular, the experimental group, in contrast to the control group, showed a greater decrease in motivation to do community service. Specifically, the experimental group described themselves as less likely to do community service to help them further their career. These finding were unexpected and were not hypothesized and they will be discussed in more detail below.

Comparison to Extant Literature

The design of this study was slightly different from the comparable studies that were reviewed in Chapter 2. Previous studies have used correlative research design or compared service-learning experiences with non-service-learning
experiences. In this study, both the control and experimental groups received the service-learning experience and reflection. This study was explicitly designed to study one component of service-learning. In this case, the experimental variable was the interaction with a panel of individuals from the homeless community.

Although the design of this study was more focused than previous studies, the results of this study were surprisingly different from the other studies that have examined the effects of service-learning (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Mabry, 1998; Gray et al., 1998). Whereas in previous studies findings demonstrated a positive impact on students’ motivation to do community service, findings in this study indicated a decrease in motivation. Previous studies suggest that program components such as placement quality, duration of service, intensity of interaction, reflection, and feedback can enhance motivation. Typically, quality of placement is determined by the type of orientation and instruction that takes place at the service site. Although placement quality was not directly assessed in this study, only minimal orientation and instruction occurred at the placement sites. Also, previous studies have indicated that motivation increases with students who perform 15-20 hours of community service. However, in the present study students only served for 10 hours. Finally, in previous studies written and oral reflection occurred frequently throughout the quarter. In the present study, students only had one two-hour oral reflection and one written reflection. In summary, although this study exposed the experimental and control groups to the service-learning experience the overall components of the service-learning experience may have been too weak to create effects on motivation.
The findings of this study were consistent, however, with Fenzel and Leary’s (1997) findings in which students’ attitudes did not change with the service-learning experience. Fenzel and Leary’s research design lacked a reflection component, which they acknowledged as a possible reason for the lack of differences found in their study. Although neither Fenzel and Leary nor this study found significant differences in the quantitative analysis, in both studies students indicated in their open comments that their views and beliefs had been changed by the intervention. For example, in this study one student commented, “The panel was great and changed my views forever.”

In addition to the possible effects of the service-learning components, there may also be a problem with the way the change was measured. Fenzel and Leary’s explanation for their findings was the difficulty in quantifying changes in students’ attitudes. They claimed their results underscored the need to develop better pencil-and-paper measures of moral development and changes in social and personal responsibility (for example, motivation). The VFI used in the present study was not used in the other studies reviewed. Therefore, perhaps the VFI was not an adequate instrument for measuring positive changes in motivation to be civically engaged.

*Methodological Limitations of the Study*

It is possible that one of several methodological limitations might explain the pre- to post-test decrease in motivation to be civically engaged. This study was based on the premise that when a student has a successful, positive service-learning experience the student’s motivation to continue community service will increase.
Design. First, there were several design issues that may have individually or collectively interfered with the ability to detect treatment effects (service-learning and interaction with a panel of individuals from the homeless community). It may be the case that the treatments were not powerful enough to create a detectable change in motivation. The treatments may have been too brief, lacked intensity, or been lacking in other ways described earlier. The experimental treatment - interaction with a panel of individuals from the homeless community - took place during one two-hour class period. The common treatment - the service-learning component - consisted of one night at a homeless shelter. This brevity of treatment is a likely reason why detectable changes in motivation did not occur.

It is possible that exposure to members of the homeless community truly has no effect. On the other hand, it may have been the composition of the panel that caused exposure to have a negative effect on motivation. In this study, exposure was not achieved by additional time spent at the homeless shelter; it was achieved by bringing certain members of the homeless community to the classroom. The experimental treatment may have been limited by the individuals who presented on the panel. The only characteristic that is the same about members of the homeless community is their homelessness. It was hypothesized that exposure to diverse others would increase motivation to be civically engaged. If the panel did not provide exposure to individuals who were diverse, then the exposure to the individuals on the panel may not have been sufficient to create a change in motivation.
The panel was comprised of two women and two men who were between the ages of 40-60 years old. Three individuals were Caucasian and one individual was Latino. The homeless community is diverse (for example, mental health, transience, age, ethnicity) and the panel may not have been sufficiently diverse. One of the challenges that arose during the study was the recruitment of individuals who served on the panel. Several of the individuals approached by the researcher left the homeless shelter before the panel presentation took place. Many foster youth expressed interest in being on the panel but did not follow through with their commitment. As a result, the panel members were individuals who were self-selected and willing/able to present their stories at the university. The challenges faced by the researcher are inherent to using a panel to provide students to exposure to members of the homeless community. The individuals who may have had the greatest impact on students’ motivation may have been eliminated from the panel during the selection process. However, the positive responses given by the students’ regarding the panel suggest that the stories were powerful and inspiring. Therefore, this is an unlikely reason why positive changes in motivation did not occur.

There are ways the treatment could have been more powerful. The intervention may have been more powerful if there had been a greater number of interactions with the homeless community, if the interaction had been more intense, or perhaps if the panel was coupled with another program component such as reflection or journaling or been more heavily integrated into the course as suggest by
Fenzel and Leary (1997). The power of the treatment effect is one of the most plausible causes of the lack of significant differences.

Another limitation of the design was that students in both the experimental and control groups had the option of spending the night in one of two shelters. Random assignment did not occur. The common treatment – service-learning – created an additional variable. This was probably not a critical factor because there were no significant differences found. The inability to randomly assign students may have influenced the groups to be different; however, the compelling finding in this study was not that these groups were different, but rather they both had negative changes in motivation.

Another issue inherent in the design was the risk associated with cross contamination between courses, instructor bias, and class time of day. The course used for the study was conducted by two instructors and was offered in the afternoon and morning. This risk was minimized by selecting one control group and one experimental group from each instructor. Also, the control and experimental groups each contained a morning and afternoon section. Therefore, it is unlikely these issues affected the outcomes of the study.

**Sampling.** Second, there are limitations associated with the sampling methods in this study. The control and experimental groups were restricted to students enrolled in an economics class at a specific university and were limited to the willingness and ability of students to participate. Is it possible that students enrolled in this course or who come to this university feel more negatively towards community service or the
homeless? Yes, but it is highly unlikely. It would be more likely that students who self-selected the service-learning course would have more positive attitudes towards service. Logically, it is not likely that self-selection could explain this finding. However, as a cohort, this particular year may have been different from other cohorts. Typically, 95% of students choose service. During this academic term, 80% of students chose the service-learning option. In addition to yielding a smaller sample population, there was virtually no response to attempts to conduct focus groups. The researcher attempted to meet with students after the quarter ended and only two students were able to meet. The researcher then attempted to meet with students one-on-one and no one responded. Although this limited the overall sampling population, it was not a serious threat to the outcomes of the study. There is no reason to believe these classes were any different than previous classes or that students at this university are different from students at any other public university.

Another sampling limitation was that data was collected from one college within the university. All the participants were enrolled in a section of the course ECON 303 – Economics of Poverty, Race, and Discrimination. The majority of the participants (85%) were students in the College of Business. There has been a steady increase in the number of bachelor’s degrees awarded in business over the past several decades. Between 1945 and 1987, the proportion of bachelor’s degrees awarded nation-wide in business increased from 11% to 27%. This coincided with a decrease in degrees awarded in education and humanities. This shift has been attributed to changes in students’ attitudes towards private materialism and away
from public interest. The previous studies that showed positive effects were conducted 10 years ago and primarily in the humanities. This may explain why the findings of this study differ from previous studies. Therefore, this sample of students may not be representative of students who have responded positively to service-learning in the past. Also, these students may have different values than students in other majors. This may at least be a plausible consideration in explaining the lack of changes in positive motivation, but does not explain why change occurred in the negative direction.

Measurement. Third, the VFI may not have been adequate. For example, Fenzel and Leary (1997) believe the lack of differences in their study was attributable to the measurement. In this study, the VFI was selected because of its reliability and validity but it may not have been adequate for measuring change in motivation in these students under these circumstances. The validity of the VFI was determined by several different correlation studies on a variety of volunteers. The VFI has not previously been used to detect change. It could be that by applying the VFI under different conditions it was not a valid measure of change for this study. The VFI may not have had the kind of items necessary to detect change.

The VFI did not detect statistically significant difference but there was a general downward trend between the pre- and post-test. This may have reflected a regression to the mean. At the beginning of the quarter, students seemed idealistic and optimistic about the service-learning component of the course. At the end of the quarter, especially during finals week when the post-test was administered, students
were generally more tired and under more stress. Therefore, the test condition may have affected the outcome. This means that rather than having a negative effect, it is more likely that the treatment had no effect at all.

In summary, when weighing the possible implications of the limitations it appears that the most likely explanation for the pre- to post-test decrease in motivation to be civically engaged was the brevity of the treatment. If the results of the study are to be believed, we have to have greater placement quality, duration of service, intensity of interaction, reflection, and feedback. Another plausible explanation for the findings is the limitation of the instrument utilized to the measure change.

Recommendations for Theory and Practice

Despite the limitations, this study makes significant contributions to the theory and practice of service-learning. This study began by discussing how undergraduate education has faced heavy criticism and young adults are increasingly concerned with private materialism. In order to address these issues, many scholars have turned to the pedagogy of service-learning.

Theory. If these results accurately reflect the impact of an interaction component, then service does not mean much on its own. Despite the service-learning experience and the interaction component, the VFI factors for motivation failed to significantly improve. This is a powerful finding because it implies that in order for service-learning to be effective the experience must be carefully constructed. Previous research has suggested that the most common components that affect
student outcomes are placement quality, duration of service, intensity of interaction, reflection, and feedback.

This study underscores the importance of the reflection component of service-learning. Increasing information and exposure alone does not motivate students to be civically engaged. For the purpose of this study, Bandura's self-efficacy model was used to examine the effect of interaction with members of the homeless community on students' motivation to continue community service. Bandura's theory assumes that one critical dimension in the development of civic responsibility is the recognition that one has some choice or volition in dealing with social issues. Early theorists relied heavily on extrinsic factors to explain motivational changes, but theorists such as Bandura modified these models to include intrinsic motivational factors. Bandura's social cognitive theory focuses on people's beliefs about the outcomes of their behaviors.

Reflecting on Bandura's self-efficacy theory, a revised model is presented to demonstrate how learning and behavior change occurs: 1) student engages in a service experience 2) the experience is shaped by components such as placement quality, duration of service, intensity of interaction, reflection, and feedback 3) student processes the experience through feedback and reflection 4) student has an increase or decrease in the belief that he/she can have a positive impact and is able to help others 5) student experiences an increase or decrease in motivation to volunteer 6) student modifies his/her behavior based on the belief.
Without the processing step, the experience alone has the potential of lowering a student's self-efficacy as this study has demonstrated. Students who experience an intense, quality, interaction with a diverse other may walk away feeling helpless and powerless. The processing component is key to student empowerment and understanding.

**Practice.** The practice of service-learning falls primarily on faculty. The faculty who participated in this study attempted to bring the service dimension of higher education into their teaching. Faculty’s role in linking service to the curriculum is critical in order to ensure that students learn from the experience and become civically engaged. As they set the research and teaching agenda, faculty are in the strategic position to increase the quality of the service experience and promote service-learning.
This study provides some helpful conclusions for practitioners. Students responded positively to service-learning and their feedback suggests that they feel they have a good understanding of the needs and problems facing their communities. They responded positively to evaluation questions about the course and its effectiveness in showing them how they can become involved in their community. This positive feedback affirms that students are receiving important information from the experience and that faculty should continue using service-learning to engage students in civic activity.

The lack of statistically significant results in the changes in motivation suggests that faculty need to carefully construct the service-learning component of their courses to promote civic engagement. They have to be committed to achieving positive change. Adding program components to the service-learning experience does not necessarily affect student outcomes. If a desired outcome of service-learning is continued civic engagement, then more explicit processing components need to be incorporated into the ongoing dialogue of the course.

Existing literature tells us there is a decrease in student interest in humanities and education. This decline coincides with a general decrease in civic engagement. If higher education has a civic mission, then it needs to be incorporated in the curriculum. In order to develop that curriculum it is important to know what components are linked to positive changes in motivation. Therefore, future research is needed in this area of service-learning.
Directions for Further Research

This study was unique because it created an intervention explicitly designed to study one component of service-learning. One of the shortcomings in the literature around service-learning is the lack of experimental design and heavy reliance on descriptive and correlational data. Many studies on service-learning have surveyed students and faculty only after the implementation of a program to assess the success of service-learning. Another common research design in the literature is to compare outcomes from a service-learning course with a non-service-learning course. More studies that utilize experimental design within service-learning courses are needed in order to test the effectiveness of various program components of service-learning.

It is also recommended that researchers use other theories of motivation to guide future studies. This study utilized self-efficacy as a factor to examine changes in motivation. There are many other motivational factors and theories associated with motivation. Since this study focused on students in an economics course, it may be fruitful for future studies to examine how students in different majors are motivated by career or values. In this study, career motivation was a factor measured by the VFI, but the intervention was not specifically attempt to increase this motivational factor.

Finally, the methodological limitations of this study should be addressed in future studies. In order to obtain more generalizable results, more research needs to take place with different instructional designs and students in different areas of study. More intervention models should be used that expose students to individuals who are
different from the students. Future research should utilize mixed methods that would allow researchers to obtain more detailed information about the ways service-learning and different program components affect students, such as interviews and observation.

In summary, the future research should focus on more experimental designs that use intervention and more methods of measuring change in motivation. The field of service-learning continues to require much attention in the area of service-learning course design. The benefits of service-learning have been well documented, but little is known about the components necessary to make a program successful. It is not enough to develop courses intuitively with the hope that students will develop civic responsibility in addition to achieving academic outcomes.
Appendix A: Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT APPLICATION OF THEORY</th>
<th>LEARNING OUTCOME</th>
<th>HOW DID I INSTRUCT STUDENTS?</th>
<th>HOW DID I MEASURE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with a diverse other</td>
<td>The activity for this component was guided by a vicarious experience intended to boost self-efficacy.</td>
<td>Recognize the humanity of others. Experience self-reflection and personal awareness. Feel that they can make a difference.</td>
<td>A panel of clients and service providers shared their personal stories with the students. Students had the opportunity to ask questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 1 (class session #2)</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validation measure (sign-up)</td>
<td>Validation Measure (sign-up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement Fair</td>
<td>Placement Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 1-8</td>
<td>Students engage in required service</td>
<td>Students engage in required service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 4 (class session #1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 1 – Increase Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 4 (class session #2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 2 – Increase Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 8 (class session #1)</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 9 (class session #1)</td>
<td>Post-survey</td>
<td>Post-survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validation Measure (sign-up)</td>
<td>Validation Measure (sign-up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 10</td>
<td>Follow-up interviews</td>
<td>Follow-up interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 a.m. – 10 a.m.</td>
<td>Control (Sec 03)</td>
<td>Experimental (Sec 01)</td>
<td>Experimental (Sec 01)/Control (Sec 03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 p.m. – 2 p.m.</td>
<td>Experimental (Sec 04)</td>
<td>Control (Sec 02)</td>
<td>Control (Sec 02)/Experimental (Sec 04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructors**

Villegas = Experimental (Sec 01) & Control (Sec 02)

Battista = Control (Sec 03) & Experimental (Sec 04)
Appendix D: Introduction

Hi, my name is Joy Pedersen Harkins, and I am a doctoral student at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Your instructor has allowed me to come to your class to conduct a study on the components of service-learning. As you know, you have the option of participating in community service as part of your course requirement, or to write a research paper. If you choose the service option, I would like to invite you to participate in my study. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to complete two surveys, one today and one at the end of the quarter. You will also have the opportunity to submit a short writing sample and/or participate in a focus group in exchange for a $5 gift card to Julian's.

For those of you who choose to participate, the following survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. You may withdraw from the survey at any time, or skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. You are asked to write your name on the survey, but all names and identity will be kept confidential. The surveys will only be viewed by me, and I will keep them in a locked filing cabinet in my office. After the data has been tabulated, your name will be removed and there will be no way to link your identity to your survey. No names or identifying factors will appear in any publications or written reports.

Thank you in advance for choosing to participate! Your responses will help improve the service-learning experiences of future students and faculty.
Appendix E: Pre-Survey

Name: _____________________________________________________________

Section 1.
Demographic Data

A. What is your racial background?
   ___ Caucasian/White  ___ African American  ___ Asian/Asian American
   ___ Hispanic  ___ Native American  ___ Other

B. What is your age group?
   ___ Under 18  ___ 18-21  ___ 21-25  ___ 25-34  ___ 35-54  ___ Over 55

C. What is your gender?  ___ Male  ___ Female

D. Indicate your college:
   ___ College of Engineering  ___ College of Agriculture  ___ College of Business
   ___ College of Education  ___ College of Science and Math
   ___ College of Liberal Arts  ___ College of Architecture and Environmental Design

E. What is your class level?
   ___ Freshmen  ___ Sophomore  ___ Junior  ___ Senior  ___ 5th year  ___ Other

F. Name of service-learning course: ______________________________________

G. Course number: _____________________________________________________
Section 2.

Directions: If you have done volunteer work before or are currently doing volunteer work, then, using the 7-point scale below, please indicate how important or accurate each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is for you. If you have not been a volunteer before, then, using the 7-point scale below, please indicate how important or accurate each of the following reasons for volunteering would be for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My friends volunteer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I can have a positive impact on social problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>People I’m close to want me to volunteer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Volunteering makes me feel important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>People I know share an interest in community service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No matter how bad I’ve been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can help people with handicaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>By volunteering, I feel less lonely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Volunteering increases my self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. I have confidence in my ability to help others.
19. I feel compassion toward people in need.
20. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
21. Volunteering lets me learn through direct “hands on” experience.
22. I feel it is important to help others.
23. Volunteering helps me work through my personal problems.
24. Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession.
25. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.
26. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.
27. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.
28. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
29. I can make a difference in my community.
30. Volunteering makes me feel needed.
31. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
32. Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.
33. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.
34. Each of us can make a difference in the lives of the less fortunate.
35. I can explore my own strengths.

Thank you!
Appendix F: Post-Survey

Name: ____________________________________________________________

Agency where service was performed: __________________________________

Section 1.
Directions: If you have done volunteer work before or are currently doing volunteer work, then, using the 7-point scale below, please indicate how important or accurate each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is for you.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all important/accurate
for you
Extremely important/accurate
for you

Rating Reason

___ 1. Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.
___ 3. I can have a positive impact on social problems.
___ 4. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.
___ 5. People I’m close to want me to volunteer.
___ 6. Volunteering makes me feel important.
___ 7. People I know share an interest in community service.
___ 8. No matter how bad I’ve been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.
___ 9. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.
___ 10. I can help people with handicaps.
___ 11. By volunteering, I feel less lonely.
___ 12. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.
___ 13. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.
___ 14. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.
___ 15. Volunteering increases my self-esteem.
___ 16. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.
17. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.
18. I have confidence in my ability to help others.
19. I feel compassion toward people in need.
20. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
21. Volunteering lets me learn through direct "hands on" experience.
22. I feel it is important to help others.
23. Volunteering helps me work through my personal problems.
24. Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession.
25. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.
26. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.
27. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.
28. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
29. I can make a difference in my community.
30. Volunteering makes me feel needed.
31. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
32. Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.
33. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.
34. Each of us can make a difference in the lives of the less fortunate.
35. I can explore my own strengths.

Section 2.
4-Strongly Agree  3-Agree  2-Disagree  1-Strongly Disagree  N/A

1. I have a good understanding of the needs and problems facing the community in which I live.
2. If everyone works together, many of society's problems can be solved.
3. I have a responsibility to serve my community.
4. I probably will not volunteer or participate in the community after this course ends.
5. The idea of combining course work with service to the community should be practiced in more courses at this college.
6. I plan to enroll in more courses that offer service-learning.

7. The service I did through this course was not at all beneficial to the community.

8. The service aspect of this course made me aware of some of my own biases or prejudices.

9. The service aspect of this course showed me how I can become more involved in my community.

10. The service aspect of this course helped me to understand better the lectures and readings required for this course.

11. As a result of my service-learning experience, I have a better understanding of my role as a citizen.

12. As a result of my service-learning experience, I would encourage other students to take courses that offer service-learning.

Section 3.

I will continue to collect data for this study during the next two weeks. A maximum of five focus groups will be conducted for students interested in sharing their experiences regarding the service-learning course. Each focus group will be made up of up to four students and last approximately 60-minutes. Participants will receive a $5 gift card to Julian’s.

Would you like to participate in a follow-up interview in a small group with other students moderated by Joy Pedersen Harkins?

___ Yes  ___ Maybe  ___ No

Thank you!
Appendix G: Interview Questions

1. Tell me about your service-learning experience, including where you served and what type of activity you did.
2. What did you enjoy about your experience? What could have made it better?
3. How do you think you have changed since participating in the service-learning experience?
4. Tell me about an interaction you had while at the agency.
5. Do you think your experience changed your motivation to do service in the future? How? Why? Or Why not?
6. What advice would you have for other students who choose the service-learning option?
Appendix H: Consent Form for Survey

A research project on service-learning is being conducted by Joy Pedersen Harkins, a graduate student in the School of Education at UCSB. The purpose of the study is to examine the effectiveness of various components of the service-learning course.

You are being asked to take part in this study by completing a survey. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

If you agree to participate in the follow-up interview, you will be interviewed in a group setting with up to three other students. The discussion questions will focus on your feelings, attitudes, and beliefs regarding civic participation/community service, and your experiences in the course. I will moderate the discussion, which will last approximately 60 minutes.

If you volunteer to participate in both the survey and the follow-up interview, your total commitment would be 75 minutes.

If you volunteer to participate in a follow-up interview, you will receive a $5 Julian’s gift certificate. You may withdraw participation in this study at any time with no negative consequences and you will still receive the $5 gift certificate. You also have the right to refuse to answer any question that you may not wish to answer without any negative consequences.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. In addition, a decision whether or not to participate in the research study will not affect your grade or be included in any other records. All information collected from this study will be confidential and will be used solely for research purposes. The data obtained from the focus groups will be published; however, neither your name nor identifying factors will be included. Only Joy Pedersen Harkins will have access to the raw data.

Your confidentiality will be protected. The identity of the participants will be linked to survey data collected by the use of indirect numeric codes. The list of codes will be kept in a locked filing cabinet that will only be accessible to the investigator. The interviews will be audio recorded. As the researcher, Joy Pedersen Harkins will be the only person to listen to the digital recording, and it will be deleted after the study is complete.

There are no foreseen risks associated with participation in this study. If you should experience any negative response, please be aware that you may contact the campus Health Center at 805-756-1211. Potential benefits associate with the study include the opportunity to reflect on your service-learning experience and contribute to the future of service-learning courses at Cal Poly and other institutions.

You may withdraw participation in this study at any time with no negative consequences. You also have the right to refuse to answer any question that you may not wish to answer without any negative consequences.
If you have any questions or comments regarding this study, please contact Joy Pedersen Harkins, by mail at the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, 93106-9490, or by email at jharkins@calpoly.edu. Joy Pedersen Harkins will answer any questions that you may have at any time concerning this study.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant or would like to be informed of the results when the study is completed, contact the UCSB Human Subjects Committee located in the Office of Research at University of California, Santa Barbara, 805-893-3807, or contact Steve Davis, Chair of the Cal Poly Human Subjects Committee at 805-756-2754, sdavis@calpoly.edu, or Susan Opava, Dean of Research and Graduate Programs at 805-756-1508, sopava@calpoly.edu.

If you agree to voluntarily participate in this research project as described, please indicate your agreement by signing below. You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

__________________________
Date  Participant’s Signature

__________________________
Date  Investigator’s Signature (Joy Pedersen Harkins)
Appendix I: Confirmation Email for Focus Group

Greetings! Thank you for indicating on the research survey that you would like to volunteer for a follow-up interview regarding your service-learning experience. Research participation is separate from any communication with your professor and will not be linked to your class performance.

The follow-up interview will take place in a small group format. The discussion questions will focus on your feelings, attitudes, and beliefs regarding civic participation/community service, and your experiences in the course. Up to four participants will discuss issues together. I will moderate the discussion, which will last approximately 60 minutes. Each participant will receive a $5 gift card for Julian’s.

I would like to meet with you at [date, time, location, directions].

If you have changed your mind about participating in this research study, please kindly email me at jharkins@calpoly.edu or call me at (805) 756-6749 in order for me to remove you from the volunteer list. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions for concerns. I look forward to meeting you soon.

Sincerely,

Joy Pedersen Harkins
Gevirtz Graduate School of Education
University of California, Santa Barbara
jharkins@calpoly.edu
Appendix J: Homeless Panel Guidelines

Respect – Give undivided attention to the person who has the floor.
Confidentiality – The information shared in the classroom should remain within the
group.
Questions - The main goal of the panel is to share information. While it is ok to ask
challenging questions, the purpose is not to engage in a debate. There are no stupid
questions.

Things to think about before the homeless panel...
- Why is homelessness so hard to understand?
- Why is there not more of an outcry?
- We know there is a problem, why isn’t more being done?
- Who do you think is homeless and in danger of becoming homeless?
- What are some of the experiences you have had with homeless people?

Possible Interview Questions

1. How long have you lived in San Luis Obispo County?
2. When did you become homeless?
3. What was the primary reason you lost your previous permanent housing?
4. What was your life like before becoming homeless?
5. What was/is your life like being homeless?
6. What do you do on an average day?
7. What brought you out of homelessness? Or, what would have to happen in
   order to bring you out of homelessness?
8. What are your hopes for the future?
9. What are the solutions to homelessness?
10. How can one person make a difference – either affecting the system or
    affecting an individual in the homeless community?
11. Have you ever experienced discrimination because you were homeless? What
    happened?
12. What is your relationship like with your family? Do you have children?
    Sisters or brothers?
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