

Volume 3: July
2014

University of Louisiana
System

Executive Editor:
David Yarbrough, Ph.D.

ISSN 2162-6685

JSLHE Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education

JSLHE in Higher Education Service-Learning Journal of

The Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education is an online, international, peer-reviewed journal for the dissemination of original research regarding effective institutional-community partnerships. Our primary emphasis is to provide an outlet for sharing the methodologies and pedagogical approaches that lead to effective community-identified outcomes. The Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education is a subscription-free journal with a review board made up of various academic disciplines of the member institutions of the University of Louisiana System as well as other nationally and internationally accredited colleges and universities and affiliated organizations.

Executive Editor

David Yarbrough

*Associate Professor of Child and Family Studies and Dean of Community Service;
University of Louisiana at Lafayette*

Section Editors

Morris Coats

Professor of Economics; Nicholls State University

Tena Golding

*Director of the Center for Faculty Excellence and Professor of Mathematics;
Southeastern Louisiana University*

Steven Gruesbeck

*Instructor of Psychology and Director of Service-Learning;
Northwestern State University*

Jackie Tisdell

Assistant Vice President of Communications; University of Louisiana System

Review Board

Rory Bedford

Director of Service-Learning; Grambling State University

Michael Buckles

*Head of the Department of Performing Arts and Associate Professor of Music;
McNeese State University*

Nancy Darland

Professor of Nursing; Louisiana Tech University

Marybeth Lima

*Director of the Center for Community Engagement, Learning, and Leadership;
Louisiana State University*

Mike McCullough

Director of the Institute for Civic Engagement; University of Tennessee at Martin

Michael Mizell-Nelson

Associate Professor of History at the University of New Orleans

Brad O'Hara

Vice-President, Academic & Provost, Langara College, Vancouver, British Columbia

Kenneth Reardon

*Director of the Graduate Program in City and Regional Planning;
University of Memphis*

Shirley Theriot

*Director of the Center for Community Service Learning;
University of Texas at Arlington*

Shannon O'Brien Wilder

Director of the Office of Service-Learning; University of Georgia

Table of Contents

Foreword

Karla Hughes, Executive Vice President and Provost, University of Louisiana System ...Page 4

Articles

Profile of a Residential Learning Community on Schwartz's Typology of Values

Michael J. Roszkowski, Robert J. Kinzler, and John Kane...Page 5

Transformation of, in, and by Learning in a Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program

Mary Cazzell, Shirley Theriot, Joan Blakey, and Melanie Sattler...Page 31

Building Recovery Capital in Recovering Substance Abusers Through a Service-Learning Partnership: A Qualitative Evaluation of a Communication Skills Training Program

Jenepher Lennox Terrion...Page 48

Spanish After Service-Learning: A Comparative Study

Laura Kanost...Page 65

A New Era for Service-Learning: Designing an Intentional High Impact Practice

Mandi McReynolds...Page 82

Foreword

*Karla Hughes, Executive Vice President and Provost
for the University of Louisiana System*

It is a privilege to prepare the opening remarks for the next issue of the *Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education* (JSLHE). While I am new to Louisiana and the University of Louisiana System, I am not new to the integration of service-learning into the curriculum. However, I was not prepared for the undergraduate research and service-learning work that I saw firsthand at the 2014 Academic Summit hosted by the University of Louisiana at Lafayette in April. That experience brought together the impact of application of knowledge to enrich lives and enhance our communities.

As you delve into the articles in this issue, I would ask you to reflect on the dual focus of service-learning: application of academic principles in the real world and development of future leaders. According to Robert K. Greenleaf as published in his 1970 essay, *The Servant as Leader*, Servant Leadership is “a philosophy and set of practices that enriches the lives of individuals, builds better organizations, and creates a more just and caring world.” The depth of the research, the dedicated collaborations among faculty and students, and the engagement of community in each of the projects clearly illustrates that this work is as much about applied learning as it is about leadership development.

As I have reviewed this issue of JSLHE, I continue to be impressed with the quality and range of the articles submitted. And, speaking of submissions, there have been 91 articles submitted from 16 states and three countries (USA, Philippines, and Canada) to date with an acceptance rate of almost 16 percent. This on-line journal has accumulated 5,705 views/downloads for the first two issues. And, we continue to evolve with the development of a special book review section that will be ready for a future edition.

In this edition you will find articles from diverse universities including Drake University (Iowa), University of Ottawa (Canada), and Kansas State University (Manhattan, KS). The content addresses a new era for service-learning in which multiple high impact practices including internships, learning communities, collaborative projects and common intellectual experiences are aligned with service-learning to deepen student learning as well as the transformation of a service learning faculty fellows program.

As you read, you will glean ideas as well as appreciate the multiple strategies used to integrate service-learning into higher education. I encourage each of you to spend time with this third volume of JSLHE...and then I challenge you to be part of the service-learning movement. Here is hoping that each of you has an article submitted for the fourth edition!



ABSTRACT

This paper describes the values orientation of a residential learning community dedicated to exploring the issues of faith and community through service learning. The Schwartz model of values, as measured by the 10-item scale used in the World Values Survey (WVS), was used to compare members of this residential learning community with peers in a different section of the same required core religion course. The section for the residential learning community cohort was taught as a service-learning course whereas the other section had a standard lecture and discussion format. The two groups showed somewhat similar profiles, scoring highest on Benevolence and lowest on Power, although the members of the residential learning community were nonetheless relatively lower on Power. However, the most notable difference between the two groups was the very low importance placed on Hedonism by the residential learning community members. Unexpectedly, Universalism (a prosocial value) was not one of the most important values, which we attribute to the inadequacy of the item meant to measure this value on the WVS.

Profile of a Residential Learning Community on Schwartz's Typology of Values

*Michael J. Roszkowski, Robert J. Kinzler,
and John Kane*

Much of the writing on service-learning is atheoretical (Eyler, 2002). Hrivnak and Kenworthy (2011) argue that in order to advance the theoretical foundation and understanding of service-learning, the field needs to explore the linkage between service-learning and the values model proposed by Shalom Schwartz. We take a step in that direction in this article. The first objective of our study was to describe in Schwartz's terms the value-orientation of students who volunteer to be involved in a faith-based residential community service-learning organization called Signum Fidei (Sign of Faith). Our second aim was to assess the adequacy of a 10-item scale for measuring the Schwartz value system, given that concerns have been raised about it.

We begin by describing the Schwartz model and how the values are measured. Since community service-learning is a form of prosocial behavior, we next review the research on the relationship between prosocial behavior and the Schwartz model of values. We then consider the literature on the relationship of religiosity to these values because the learning community has religious roots. Finally, we review the relatively limited literature on values and learning.

Review of the Literature

The Schwartz Model of Values

Over the course of the last several decades, there has occurred a strong revival in the study of values (Hitlin & Piliavin, 2004), which are the abstractions that motivate and guide behavior (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003; Maio & Olson, 1995). A very prominent and extensively validated model is the Schwartz value theory (Schwartz, 1994; Spini, 2003) which posits ten basic values that have a universal and integrated structure: Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-direction, Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, Conformity, and Security. In this model, values are a continuum of related motives, which permits a circular arrangement where the closer any two values are in either direction around the circle, the more similar is the underlying motivation. Conversely, the further away the values are from each other, the more antagonistic they are in terms of the motivation. This circular structure of relations among values has been demonstrated across countries and measurement instruments (Schwartz, 2006).

The brief definitions of these values are as follows (paraphrasing Schwartz, 1992). Most of the ten values are easily understood with just a presentation of the term itself, but the meaning of Benevolence and Universalism may not be so apparent.

- *Self-direction*: desire to be free from external control or constraints on one's thoughts or actions.
- *Stimulation*: seeking arousal by participating in exciting, new, and challenging activities.
- *Hedonism*: pursuing pleasurable experiences, especially sensual gratification.
- *Achievement*: wanting to be competent and to be recognized for one's accomplishments.
- *Power*: desire to exert control over people and resources.
- *Security*: desire to avoid danger or instability.
- *Conformity*: need to avoid violations of social norms and expectations.
- *Tradition*: accepting the established patterns of thought and behavior that reflect one's culture.
- *Benevolence*: desire to promote the welfare of people with whom one has frequent personal contact.
- *Universalism*: desire to promote the welfare of all people (including strangers) and a concern for the protection of nature.

The congruities and conflicts among these values form two higher-order bipolar dimensions (Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004): (a) Openness to Change vs. Conservation and (b) Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence. A given behavior entails trade-off between competing values. On the first dimension (Openness to Change vs. Conservation), Self-Direction and Stimulation (which emphasize independence and readiness to experience new situations) conflict with Security, Conformity and Tradition (which stress order, self-discipline, and preservation of the past). On the second dimension (Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence), power and achievement (which emphasize one's own self interest) conflict with Universalism and Benevolence (which involve concern about the welfare of others). Hedonism is a value that permeates both Openness to Change and Self-Enhancement. Some researchers have referred to these two dimensions as Individualism versus Conformism and Egoism versus Altruism (Held, Muller, Deutsch, Grzechnik, & Welzel, 2009).

Approaches to Measuring the 10 Values

The initial instrument assessing the 10 values consisted of a 56-item questionnaire referred to as the Schwartz Value Scale (SVS) (Schwartz, 1994), but it was soon complemented by a 40-item scale called the Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ). Under Schwartz's guidance, the latter survey was shortened to 21 items in the European Social Survey (ESS), which is used to periodically investigate the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors in European countries (<http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org>).

More recently, without Schwartz's advice or approval, the assessment process was further reduced to 10 items in the World Values Survey (WVS) (<http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp>), where only one item from the PVQ is used to measure each value. A different 10 item modification of the PVQ was pilot tested by the American National Election Studies (ANES) Institute (Hitlin & Kramer, 2007; McConochie & Dunn, 2006) and a 10-item version of the SVS has also been created (Lindeman & Verkasalo, 2005). However, questions have been raised about the adequacy of all the PVQ abbreviations: the 21-item version in the ESS (Davidov & Schmidt, 2007; Davidov, Schmidt, & Schwartz, 2008; Knoppen & Saris, 2009 a, b), the 10-item scale in the WVS (Rudnev, 2011), and the 10-item ANES abbreviation (McConochie & Dunn, 2006).

Table 1 presents the items from the WVS along with the value and second order dimension (domain) that each item is meant to capture. As on the PVQ and on the ESS, each item on the WVS presents a description of an individual and the respondent is then asked to indicate on a 6-point asymmetric bipolar categorical scale the degree to which the description also fits the respondent (not at all like me=1, not like me=2, a little like me=3, somewhat like me=4, like me=5, very much like me=6). The ESS version is based on the PVQ and the WVS adaptation, in turn, is a modification of the ESS in which only a subset of the ESS items were used. The items on the WVS were modified such that the item's wording is shorter and sex neutral (allowing for the same question to be used for males and females). For example, the following is the wording for an ESS item measuring Universalism on the male version: *"He strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to him."* On the WVS, that item became: *"Looking after the environment is important to this person; to care for nature."*

Table 1

Items from the WVS Meant to Assess the Values in the Schwartz Model

WVS Item	Value	Second Order Dimension
Looking after the environment is important to this person; to care for nature.	Universalism	Self-Transcendence
It is important to this person to help the people nearby; to care for their well-being	Benevolence	
It is important to this person to always behave properly; to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.	Conformity	
Tradition is important to this person; to follow the customs handed down by one's religion or family.	Tradition	Conservation
Living in secure surroundings is important to this person; to avoid anything that might be dangerous.	Security	
It is important to this person to be rich; to have a lot of money and expensive things.	Power	Self-Enhancement
Being very successful is important to this person; to have people recognize one's achievements.	Achievement	
It is important to this person to have a good time; to "spoil" oneself.	Hedonism	
Adventure and taking risks are important to this person; to have an exciting life.	Stimulation	Openness to Change
It is important to this person to think up new ideas and be creative; to do things one's own way.	Self Direction	

A comprehensive analysis of the measurement properties of the WVS version of the PVQ was conducted by Rudnev (2011) in which the results from the 2005-2007 administrations of the WVS (46 countries, 60,004 respondents) were contrasted with the results from the ESS. Compared to their ESS counterparts, the ratings on the WVS questions are consistently higher, suggesting greater respondent acquiescence on the WVS. According to Rudnev (2011), the potential reasons for the greater degree of agreement with each item on the WVS relative to the ESS include the changes in wording, the mode of administration (self-completion vs. face-to-face), the influence of other items present on the ESS but absent on the WVS, and the translations from the master questionnaire.

Furthermore, Rudnev's confirmatory factor analysis of the ten Schwartz value items on the WVS showed that the factor structure was not invariant across countries, as should be the case given the universality of the Schwartz model of values. An exploratory factor analysis of the 2006 WVS results from Germany, conducted by Held, Muller, Deutsch, Grzechnik, and Welzel (2009), also found that the factor structure of the WVS questionnaire does not fit the second order dimensions of Schwartz's model. In contrast to studies of the factor structure of the 40-item PVQ and the 56-item SVS, Held et al (2006) found that three factors best accounted for the pattern of correlations among the 10 items on the WVS variant of the PVQ. Held et al named the underlying factors: "Excitement", "Care-take", and "Security & Conformity." "Excitement" was defined by Stimulation, Achievement, Power, Hedonism, Self –Direction. "Care-take" was composed of Benevolence, Universalism, Tradition, and Self-Direction. "Security & Conformity" consisted of Security, Conformity, and Tradition.

Causes suggested by Rudnev (2011) for the lack of factorial invariance are the small number of items, the choice of non-optimal items to represent certain domains, the wording change mentioned previously, and the sampling procedures. The choice of the particular items to assess the values is a very likely cause for the differences in factor structure identified by both Rudnev (2011) and Held et al (2009). Rudnev reports that, based on a multidimensional scaling of the ESS, only 4 of the 10 items on the WVS are the best representatives of the respective value (Security, Self-Direction, Benevolence, Hedonism). For example, the best single ESS item to measure Universalism would have been: *"He thinks it is important that every person in the world should be treated equally. He believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life."* The Universalism item used on the WVS is instead based on the following ESS item: *"He strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to him."* Knoppen and Saris (2009 a) likewise report that the item focusing on the environment did not load on Universalism in a sample of German students.

Values and Prosocial Behavior

Prosocial behavior is any act that benefits another person and which does not directly reward the helper and may in fact entail a cost to the one offering the aid. Knafo, Israel, and Ebstein (2011), report that the predisposition to behave prosocially is a characteristic that is in part genetically determined. According to Schwartz (2007, 2008, 2010), prosocial behavior is driven by the values of Universalism, Benevolence, and Conformity. Benevolence is an internalized motive for voluntarily promoting the welfare of others, whereas Conformity is an external motive that promotes prosocial behavior in order to avoid negative consequences for failing to do it. In contrast, Power and Security values typically act to hinder prosocial behavior because they entail self-serving motives.

If, however, the prosocial behavior brings public recognition or acclaim, Power and Achievement values may promote volunteerism rather than hinder it. In other words, volunteering generally is driven by a prosocial motive, but it can also stem from more selfish reasons such as developing social contacts that can advance one's career or elevate one's status in some other way (Batson, 1987; Clary & Snyder 1999; Houle, Sagarin, & Kaplan, 2005). It is also worthwhile to consider a study of cooperative behavior in a game, reported by Schwartz (1996), which showed that cooperation was correlated positively with Benevolence ($r = .38$) and Universalism ($r = .32$) and negatively with Power ($r = -.37$), Achievement ($r = -.19$), and Hedonism ($r = -.18$). A study by Pepper, Jackson, and Uzzell (2009) of socially conscious purchasing in England is also worth mentioning. It found that socially conscious purchasing correlated positively with Universalism ($r = .37$) and Benevolence ($r = .19$) and negatively with Power ($r = -.20$) and Achievement ($r = -.17$).

Additional support for Schwartz's conclusions may be found in the work of Sprecher and Fehr (2005) with a measure of compassionate love. They report that the defining characteristic of people who volunteer is compassionate love for strangers rather than a compassionate love for close others. Compassionate love for close others is akin to Benevolence in the Schwartz model, whereas compassionate love for strangers is very similar to Schwartz's concept of Universalism.

Values and Religiosity

Religiosity is a term used by sociologists and psychologists to describe the degree to which an individual participates in religious activity. Studies conducted by Schwartz and his colleagues in ten countries with the SVS indicated that a high level of religiosity is associated positively with emphasis on the values of Conformity and Tradition and negatively associated with Hedonism, Self-Direction, and Stimulation (Roccas & Schwartz, 1997; Schwartz & Huismans, 1995). These conclusions were confirmed by Saroglou, Delpierre, and Dernelle (2004), who conducted a meta-analysis based on 21 samples from 15 countries (combined $n = 8,551$) on the relationship between religiosity and values using the Schwartz model. They too concluded that highly religious individuals place a strong priority on Tradition and Conformity and to a lesser extent, a priority on Security (all part of the Conservation dimension). Conversely, such persons strongly de-emphasize Stimulation, Self-Direction, and Hedonism (all of which comprise the Openness to Change dimension) and tend to mildly minimize the importance of Achievement and Power (the Self-Enhancement dimension). Lastly, religious persons tend to hold contradictory views on the importance of the two values that constitute Self-Transcendence, emphasizing Benevolence but not Universalism.

The last finding is surprising since from an evolutionary perspective, belief in supernatural forces is believed to have shifted our predecessors' concern from just the welfare of their immediate others (i.e. Benevolence) to include the welfare of society as a whole (i.e. Universalism) (Batson, 1983; Rosanno, 2007). The relationship between prosocial behavior and religiosity may be highly nuanced, however. Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis (1993) contend that the link between religiosity and prosocial behavior differs depending on the type of religious orientation: (a) Extrinsic (means to an end), (b) Intrinsic, or (c) Quest (challenging and re-examining one's beliefs). An extrinsic orientation is less likely to be positively related to prosocial behaviors than either an intrinsic or quest orientation. Support for this proposition can be found in a study by Bernt (1989) which reported that volunteering while in college was related to

an intrinsic orientation and that interest in serving in a volunteer organization after graduation from college was related to a quest orientation.

Values and Learning

In a number of studies, it has been documented that compared to better educated persons, the less educated assign greater importance to Security, Tradition, and Conformity (Steinmetz, Schmidt, Tina-Booh, Wieczorek, & Schwartz, 2009). Hofer, Kuhnle, Kilian, Marta Rizzi, and Fries (2011) showed that motivational conflict (interference) between doing school work and taking part in leisure activities is related to the values that Italian secondary school children ($n = 433$) hold. Namely, students placing a high value on Conformity experienced less dissonance than students with low Conformity scores. Conversely, students who prized Hedonism and Stimulation had more motivational conflict than students placing a low priority on these two values. However, in terms of grades, the Achievement value was the primary positive predictor of school grades.

Employing the PVQ, Lietz, and Matthews (2006) studied college students in Germany ($n = 228$) to determine the relationship between Schwartz's model of values and learning style. They too found that students who placed a higher emphasis on the value of Achievement did in fact obtain a better third-semester GPA, whereas students who prioritized Stimulation as a value did relatively poorly. Perhaps less intuitively obvious was their finding that students who prized the value of Self-Direction engaged in "deep learning" in which the motivation was to master the material rather than merely perform well on a test. In contrast, students who emphasized Hedonism engaged in "surface" learning (focusing on doing well on a test rather than mastering the subject matter).

Scope of Present Study

The primary aim of the present study was to profile the members of an undergraduate residential service-learning community called Signum Fidei (Sign of Faith) that stresses faith, service, and community in terms of the Schwartz model of values, using the 10-item scale that is part of the WVS. With the ever increasing emphasis on outcome assessment in today's universities, it is easy for students to suffer from "survey fatigue" (Porter, Whitcomb, & Weitzer, 2004). Therefore, the availability of a relatively short instrument to measure changes in values would be very beneficial. Based on prior research with longer scales meant to assess the values specified by Schwartz, one would expect members of Signum Fidei to show elements of both the prosocial personality and the religious individual, although the exact prioritization of the different values was an open question. Moreover, since differences in values as a function of education have been reported with the longer scales, it is also of interest to determine if the WVS version can pick up relevant patterns. The validity of the WVS version has been questioned, so if the expected relationships are observed, then it would lend some credence to the validity of the WVS abbreviation of the PVQ. If, however, the profile fails to conform to the expected patterns, then our study may further identify the limitations inherent to this scale and thereby provide some additional clues on how the WVS scale can be best used, especially in the context of service learning.

Method

Setting

In its fourth year at La Salle University, the Signum Fidei community includes freshmen and sophomore students who live on the same floor in a residence hall. Community members are required to perform service each week. Most do this through participation in one or more of the ongoing service initiatives offered through the Office of University Ministry and Service. Several past and current community members have become coordinators of a number of these service groups.

There is also a community expectation for members. They spend time together, formally and informally. They attend bi-weekly meetings that allow them to reflect on their faith, service, and community experiences. In their first semester, freshmen members of the community are all placed in the same section of a religion class, Exploring Christianity, which includes a service-learning component. While not formally part of Signum Fidei, a number of juniors and seniors have chosen to continue living together and most continue to be involved in service at the university.

Participants

The sample consisted of 32 members of Signum Fidei and 19 students who were not involved with Signum Fidei. All participants were students who completed a survey during the start of the Fall 2011 term. A majority of the Signum Fidei students ($n=28$) were Freshmen, but 4 sophomores who were continuing their service-learning from the prior year also participated in this survey. With the exception of two students who were in the Honors Program as well as in Signum Fidei, all other first-year Signum Fidei students ($n=26$) were enrolled in the same class (section) of a required core curriculum religion course (Exploring Christianity). Unlike other sections of this religion course, the section intended for members of Signum Fidei is taught as a service-learning class. The response rate for the Freshmen Signum Fidei students appears to be 100%. In order to allow for some benchmarks, students in one other section of the same course were invited to complete the same survey as the one that was undertaken by members of the Signum Fidei residential learning community. Of the 31 students enrolled in this other section, 19 participated, which translates to a response rate of 61.29%.

To minimize the social desirability effect observed in the assessment of values (see Schwartz, Verkasalo, Antonovsky, & Sagiv, 1997), the questionnaires were completed online (Survey Monkey) anonymously using the general link feature rather than an individualized link. However, in order to be able to match these surveys to ones to be completed in the future, we asked that the students provide answers to several questions that could be used to link surveys: (1) best friend's first name, (2) mother's last name before she got married, (3) number of sisters, (4) number of brothers, (5) first three digits of home telephone, and (6) favorite pet's name (if no pets, answer none). A check of the codes revealed that two students took the survey twice. Most likely, it was because they started but did not fully complete the first questionnaire. The option was to either randomly drop one of the two responses for each of these two students, or to average across the two administrations. We decided to go with the latter option since averaging generally increases reliability.

Due to the anonymous nature of the survey completion mode, it is not possible to present any demographic information on the respondents who were not members of Signum Fidei. However, it may be insightful to compare the demographics of the two sections of this course, realizing that they may not necessarily be the same as for the respondents. In terms of gender,

the Signum Fidei section consisted of 43.75% females, compared to 34.62% for the non-Signum Fidei section. The racial/ethnic distribution of the Signum Fidei section was as follows: 57.69% White, 26.92% Black, 7.69% Hispanic, 3.85% Native American, and 3.85% multiracial. Students in the non-Signum Fidei section had the following racial/ethnic distribution: 40.63% White, 21.88% Black, 18.75% unknown, 12.50% Hispanic, and 6.25% Asian. On the basis of credit hours completed, 96.15% of the Signum Fidei section and 53.13% of the other section were Freshman. The average course grade was 3.10 ($SD=1.33$) for the Signum section and 2.79 ($SD=1.05$) for the non-Signum section. Considering all courses taken that semester, the average term grades were 3.00 ($SD=.81$) and 2.74 ($SD=1.17$) for the Signum Fidei and non-Signum Fidei students, respectively.

Instrumentation

To study the values as modeled by Schwartz, we utilized the 10-item scale from the World Values Survey (WVS). This questionnaire was embedded in a larger survey. The decision to use an abbreviated version of the PVQ rather than the 40-item scale itself was based on the rationale that the longer scale would overburden students, which may lead to lower response rates.

Approaches to Data Analysis

Analysis was conducted at both the 10 value (item) level and on the second-order dimensions (domains) computed by averaging the appropriate items into the four domains of: Openness to Change, Conservation, Self-Enhancement, and Self-Transcendence. Hedonism was placed under Openness to Change. One problem with comparing the raw ratings of values is response style; some people do not differentiate sufficiently between the various values in their ratings. In order to control for this potential problem, it is common practice to subtract each value rating from the person's mean rating over all ten values (Fischer, 2004). The resultant deviation scores indicate how much each value is prized relative to the others. Therefore, we analyzed the data in terms of deviation scores as well as raw scores.

The answers to the items on the PVQ and its 21-item and 10-item abbreviations are given on a Likert scale. The issue of using parametric statistics versus non-parametric statistics on Likert scales has been a matter of contention. Although the PVQ items are ordinal in nature, they are typically treated as interval level (Carifio & Perla, 2008; Lee & Soutar, 2010). Our position is that there exists ample evidence to support the application of parametric statistical procedures to ordinal data (see Carifio & Perla, 2008; Lee & Soutar, 2010; Norman, 2010), but we nonetheless decided to use both classes of methods to examine the data for statistical significance in order to avoid potential criticism from supporters of the opposing point of view in this debate (Jamieson, 2004).

In terms of a parametric procedures, the data can be conceptualized as either 10 multiple measures across two groups -- a MANOVA model -- or a 2 x 10 measures ANOVA with repeated measures on the second factor of value (Huberty & Morris, 1989). Both procedures need to be run on just the cases without any missing values (30 Signum Fidei and 18 non-Signum Fidei). It is also possible to analyze these data for statistically significant differences employing 10 multiple univariate comparisons (either parametric t-tests, parametric F-tests, or non-parametric Mann-Whitney U tests), which allows for pair-wise deletions for missing data rather than having to do it list-wise. We decided to employ all these approaches to the analysis for reasons that should be obvious after we review the limitations of each of each approach in the paragraph

below. Hopefully, applying the concept of “methodological triangulation” (Risjord, Moloney, & Dunbar 2001) will permit us to best understand the data.

MANOVA and the repeated measures ANOVA and provide an omnibus test. One justification for conducting overall testing is that it controls for family-wise error, but this rationale has been questioned, especially in the case of MANOVA (Grayson, 2004). As Smolkowski (2009, page 1, paragraph 5) observes: “Researchers also frequently lean on MANOVA to protect the Type I error rate against multiple tests. In most cases, however, the researchers then examine the individual tests due to the ambiguity of the omnibus test. If the omnibus test is significant, they (or journal reviewers) want to know which of the measures contributed to the effect.”

According to some authorities, if the main concern is to guard against making Type I errors, it is preferable to apply a Bonferroni adjustment to the 10 multiple univariate ANOVAs (or t-tests), particularly when the sample size is small to begin with and which would shrink even further due to elimination of cases with some missing variables. The primary purpose of a MANOVA should be to determine whether groups differ significantly on an optimally weighted linear combination (canonical variate) of multiple dependent variables. Unfortunately, the meaning of this composite is not obvious (Grayson, 2004). Repeated measure ANOVA is also not without its critics. Most frequently, the restrictive assumption of sphericity is pointed out (e.g. Gueorguieva & Krystal, 2004). However, one can apply corrective procedures (e.g. the Greenhouse-Geiser) to make the analysis more conservative when this assumption is not met.

To determine if the instrument measures the values in line with Schwartz’s theory, we examined the inter-relationship between the values using both the Pearson (parametric) and the Spearman (non-parametric) correlation procedures. We also performed a principal components factor analysis on the combined sample of Signum Fidei and the comparison group. This gave us a sample 48 with no missing data, which is about the 50 that is typically viewed as the bare minimum for even attempting a factor analysis. Although our sample size would generally be considered to be inadequate for a factor analysis, one can find some justification for conducting an exploratory factor analysis with a sample size of 48 and 10 variables in the work of Preacher and MacCallum (2002) and de Winter, Dodou, and Wieringa (2009).

Results

Raw Scores

Descriptive analysis. The mean rating for each value on the 6-point Likert scale and the corresponding standard deviation are shown in Table 2. On the basis of these averages, the value orientation of the Signum Fidei students from highest to lowest value is: (1) Benevolence, (2) Self-Direction, (3) Achievement, (4) Tradition (5) Stimulation, (6) Universalism, (7) Conformity, (8) Security, (9) Hedonism, and (10) Power. The rank ordering of the values based on mean ratings for the non-Signum Fidei is: (1) Benevolence, (2) Achievement, (3) Self-direction, (4) Security, (5) Conformity, (6) Tradition, (7) Stimulation, (8) Hedonism, (9) Universalism, and (10) Power. Most notably, for both groups, the highest value was Benevolence whereas the lowest was Power. Based on the group means, the double-entry intraclass correlation index of profile similarity (Furr, 2010) was .55, which indicates that there was a moderate degree of congruence between the profiles of the service-learning community members and the non-members.

ANOVA. On the repeated measures ANOVA, the Greenhouse-Geiser correction for lack of sphericity (Mauchly’s $W=.041$, $X^2(44) = 136.50$, $p=.000$) was applied. The differences in the

ratings over the 10 values were statistically significant [$F(4.9, 226.31) = 14.01, p = .000$, partial $\eta^2 = .23$] but the between subjects factor was not [$F(1,46) = 2.19, p = .146$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$]. However, the interaction term (values x group) was significant [$F(4.92, 226.31) = 3.17, p = .009$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$].

Univariate analyses. At the level of individual values, as shown in Table 2, statistically significant differences between the two groups occurred on Hedonism [$t(48) = -3.19, p = .003, \eta^2 = .17$] and Power [$t(49) = -2.18, p = .034, \eta^2 = .09$]. Two additional differences bordered on statistical significance: Security [$t(49) = -1.95, p = .057, \eta^2 = .07$] and Self-Direction [$t(49) = 1.86, p = .069, \eta^2 = .07$]. Univariate non parametric testing with the Mann-Whitney procedure also revealed significant differences between the two groups on Hedonism ($U = 152.00, p = .005$) and Power ($U = 201.00, p = .036$), with borderline significance on Security ($U = 211.00, p = .065$) and Self-Direction ($U = 216.50, p = .074$). Even on the basis of a Bonferonni protection, the difference in Hedonism remains statistically significant.

MANOVA. On the MANOVA, the overall difference between the two groups on the composite of the 10 values had a fairly low probability of just being due to chance, but it failed to reach statistical significance [Hotelling's Trace = .47, $F(10,37) = 1.74, p = .107$]. Although some statisticians would advise against looking further because of the non-significance of the overall test, we consider it noteworthy that on the test of between subjects effects on the MANOVA, the differences in Hedonism [$F(1, 46) = 9.80, p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .18$] and Power were again significant [$F(1, 46) = 4.25, p = .045$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$].

Table 2

Mean Ratings and Mean Ranks on Values as a Function of Residential Learning Community Membership

Value	Member					Non-member				
	Ratings			Ranks Across Groups	Ranks Within Group (n=30)	Ratings			Ranks Across Groups	Ranks Within Group (n=18)
	n	M	SD	M	M	n	M	SD	M	M
Self-Direction	32	5.00	.92	28.73	7.28	19	4.47	1.07	21.39	5.53
Power	32	2.77	1.21	22.78	2.50	19	3.61	1.51	31.42	3.72
Security	32	3.67	1.25	23.09	4.65	20	4.45	1.55	30.89	5.89
Hedonism	32	2.94	1.08	21.25	2.80	18	4.17	1.65	33.06	5.36
Benevolence	32	5.22	.71	24.67	7.98	19	5.37	.76	28.24	7.78
Achievement	32	4.84	1.25	23.66	6.28	19	5.00	1.20	29.95	6.97
Stimulation	32	4.38	1.13	26.67	5.50	19	4.21	1.27	24.87	5.14
Conformity	32	4.16	1.25	25.36	5.83	19	4.34	1.35	27.08	5.36
Universalism	32	4.37	1.07	26.70	5.73	19	3.92	1.27	22.32	4.22
Tradition	32	4.58	1.23	27.44	6.43	19	4.24	1.36	23.58	5.03

Note: ranks, as computed in SPSS in NPAR procedures, are such that the lowest rating is assigned to the lowest rank and highest rating is assigned the highest rank.

Deviations

Although not statistically significant, descriptively there was a slight difference in the average rating over the 10 values between the two groups (Signum Fidei= 4.15 vs. non-Signum= 4.37; Cohen's $d = .37$). Table 3 provides details on the differences between the Signum and non-Signum students on the deviations of value ratings from the individual's average rating across the 10 values. Positive deviations indicate that the value was rated more important than average, whereas negative numbers indicate that the value was rated below average for that person.

In terms of average deviations from the intra-person mean, six values have positive signs for the Signum Fidei cohort: Benevolence (1.06), Self-Direction (.85), Tradition (.42), Achievement (.33), Stimulation (.22), Universalism (.21). The three values with a negative sign are: Power (-1.36), Hedonism (-1.21), and Security (-.46). The deviation score for Conformity is neither positive nor negative since it falls exactly at zero.

For the non-Signum Fidei students, the corresponding hierarchy based on deviations from each person's mean rating over the 10 values produced four values with positive and six values with negative signs. The values exhibiting positive signs are: Benevolence (.99), Achievement (.62), Security (.07), Self-Direction (.01); the values with negative signs are: Power (-.77), Universalism (-.45), Hedonism (-.25), Tradition (-.14), Stimulation (-.16), and Conformity (-.03). The repeated measures ANOVA on deviations produced the same results as the one on raw scores, so it is unnecessary to report the details again. Also, as with the raw scores, the profiles of the two groups on deviation scores were similar based on the double entry intraclass correlation (.61).

Table 3
Mean Deviations by Residential Learning Community Members and Non-members

Value	Member		Non-member	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Self-Direction	.85	.86	.01	.98
Power	-1.36	1.05	-.77	1.14
Security	-.48	1.15	.07	1.21
Hedonism	-1.22	.92	-.25	1.24
Benevolence	1.06	.66	.99	.88
Achievement	.33	1.00	.62	.97
Stimulation	.22	1.00	-.16	1.20
Conformity	.00	1.08	-.03	1.04
Universalism	.21	.89	-.45	1.30
Tradition	.42	1.14	-.14	1.23

Note: $n = 32$ for Signum Fidei. For non-Signum Fidei, $n = 19$ with the exception of Hedonism, where $n = 18$.

Domain Scores

Table 4 presents the mean scores on the four domains computed as an average of the values constituting them. Descriptively, compared to the non-Signum Fidei students, the ones who belong to Signum Fidei scored markedly higher on Self-Transcendence, whereas their scores on the remaining three domains were somewhat higher relative to the students not in Signum Fidei. A 2 by 4 repeated measures ANOVA with a Greenhouse-Geiser correction detected significant differences among the domain scores [$F(2.53, 123.89) = 7.50, p = .000$], and although the interaction (domains x groups) had a low probability level, it was below the conventional level required for statistical significance. But the observed power of the interaction was low (.50). The MANOVA failed to reach statistical significance [Hotelling's Trace = .11, $F(4, 46) = 1.22, p = .314$]; the Box M test was non-significant. However, examining the data in a univariate manner, at the second-order domain level the difference in Self-Enhancement reached conventional statistical significance [$t(49) = -2.17, p = .035, \eta^2 = .09$].

Table 4

Means Domain Scores as a Function of Residential Learning Community Membership

Value	Member		Non-member	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Openness to Change	4.10	.79	4.28	.92
Conservation	4.13	.93	4.34	1.00
Self-Transcendence	4.81	.72	4.64	.83
Self-Enhancement	3.63	1.03	4.30	1.16

Correlations Between Values

Intercorrelations. Our second aim was to assess the adequacy of the 10-item scale from the WVS for measuring the Schwartz value system. Specifically, we sought to determine if the expected correlations between values could be observed. For this analysis, we aggregated across the two groups. Both Pearson and Spearman correlations were computed (see Table 5), showing very similar results. A high correlation (Pearson $r = .73$, Spearman $\rho = .69$) occurred between Power and Hedonism, a relationship that is in line with Schwartz's model. As should also be the case, a high positive correlation characterized the association between Security and Conformity (Pearson $r = .53$, Spearman $\rho = .52$). Likewise, the degree of correlation between Stimulation and Self-Direction was sizeable (Pearson $r = .46$, Spearman $\rho = .49$). But the correlation between Conformity and Tradition was meager (Pearson $r = .18$, Spearman $\rho = .14$), contrary to the theory. Moreover, the correlations between opposing values, while negative, were rather low compared to the positive correlations between congruent values. The highest negative correlation was between Self-Direction and Security (Pearson $r = -.35$, Spearman $\rho = -.30$).

Table 5
Intercorrelations among the Values

	SD	P	Se	H	B	A	St	C	U	T
Self-Direction (SD)		-.03	-.35	.06	.16	-.02	.47	-.04	.47	.36
Power (P)	-.05		.53	.72	-.06	.45	.05	.31	-.12	-.19
Security (Se)	-.30	.49		.40	.07	.28	-.19	.53	-.12	.15
Hedonism (H)	.06	.69	.37		.02	.47	.19	.22	-.16	-.21
Benevolence (B)	.19	-.10	.03	-.02		.20	.18	.20	.29	.25
Achievement (A)	.03	.44	.32	.48	.19		.24	.45	-.08	-.05
Stimulation (S)	.49	.02	-.15	.20	.19	.25		-.14	.35	.02
Conformity (C)	-.01	.28	.52	.21	.19	.49	-.10		-.04	.18
Universalism (U)	.48	-.15	-.09	-.14	.33	-.06	.34	.01		.43
Tradition (T)	.42	-.20	.13	-.22	.30	-.02	.10	.14	.45	

Note: Pearson *r* reported above the diagonal and Spearman rho below the diagonal. Pairwise deletions were used.

Factor analysis. Using principal components extraction and Varimax rotation of factors with eigen values greater than 1, we found three factors to underlie the data. The first factor was defined by the following values (loading shown in parentheses): Power (.85), Hedonism (.83), Achievement (.74), Security (.61), and Conformity (.56). It seems to be measuring a combined Openness to Change & Self-Transcendence dimension. On the second factor, positive loadings occurred on Stimulation (.80), Self-Direction (.69), and Universalism (.45); this factor was also defined by negative loadings on Security (-.58) and Conformity (-.45). Based on these loadings, it is a measure of Conservation & Self-Indulgence. The values loading on the third factor were Tradition (.83), Universalism (.68), Benevolence (.54), Self-Direction (.43) and Conformity (.40); its meaning is unclear. The percentage of variance that each of the three rotated components explained was 27.67%, 19.00%, and 18.98%, respectively.

Differences on factor scores. As a final step, the Signum Fidei students ($n=30$) and the non-Signum Fidei students ($n=18$) were compared on the factor scores on these three factors, which are reported in Table 6. Descriptively, the Signum Fidei students were lower than the non-Signum Fidei students on factor 1, but higher on factor 2 and factor 3. The corresponding eta-squared measures of effect size are factor 1=.13, factor 2=.01, and factor 3=.01. Clearly, the major difference is on factor 1, and it reached statistical significance [$t(46) = -2.64, p = .011$]. Members of Signum-Fidei are more open to change and self-transcendence.

Table 6
Means Factor Scores as a Function of Residential Learning Community Membership

Value	Member		Non-member	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Factor 1	-.28	.81	.46	1.14
Factor 2	.09	1.06	-.14	.90
Factor 3	.07	.98	-.12	1.06

Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to profile the members of a faith-based residential learning community embracing service-learning on Schwartz's model of human values. It is obvious that the value hierarchy is very similar when one ranks the values based on either the mean raw scores or the mean deviations. On raw scores, the prioritization of their values from most important to least important is: (1) Benevolence, (2) Self-Direction, (3) Tradition, (4) Achievement, (5) Stimulation, (6) Universalism, (7) Conformity, (8) Security, (9) Hedonism, and (10) Power. On the basis of deviations from the intraperson mean, the first seven values were rated at or above average in importance by the Signum Fidei cohort, whereas the last three values (i.e. Security, Hedonism, and Power) received ratings that fell below the below average importance.

The first question that comes to mind is whether this profile differs from the one of similar students who are not members of this residential learning community. The double entry intra-class correlation coefficient of profile similarity was substantial, suggesting considerable overlap in the average profile of the two groups. For both groups, Benevolence was the value that carried the highest importance whereas Power was the one with the least importance. Despite this similarity, Power was rated significantly lower by the Signum Fidei students compared to the other respondents. It should be recognized that since only a portion of the students who were not members of the residential learning community heeded our request to participate in the study, these respondents are therefore in essence also exhibiting pro-social behaviors. As such, perhaps few differences between them and the residential learning community ought to be expected.

Our results with the short 10-item scale conform with findings bases on longer instruments that pro-social behavior is driven by high Benevolence and low Power, as suggested by Schwartz (2010). For both the Signum Fidei participants and the non-Signum Fidei students who volunteered to take part in this study, these two values constitute the extremes in their value hierarchy. However, contrary to expectation, the value of Universalism was not in the upper half of the hierarchy for either group. Although the mid-level placement of Universalism in the value hierarchy does fit with the profile of religiosity (Saroglou, Delpliere, & Dernelle, 2004), we believe that this occurred because the item measuring this characteristic in the WVS questionnaire is suspect.

Universalism is defined by Schwartz as "understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature" (Schwartz, 1992, p.12). The 40 - item PVQ contains six items dealing with Universalism and the 21- item ESS abbreviation of the PVQ has three items meant to assess it. With multiple items, one can address a respondent's concern about both humans and nature, but the single item measuring this dimension in the abbreviated 10-item instrument in the WVS focuses just on environmental issues and not people. We have to wonder if the place of Universalism in the value hierarchy of the Signum Fidei members would have been higher had the WVS adaptation of the PVQ employed the following human-oriented PVQ item instead as its single measure of Universalism: "*He thinks it is important that every person in the world should be treated equally.*" However, any single item addressing either human or environmental welfare may be insufficient given that the value of Universalism is composed of two distinct concepts: concern for other humans and a concern for nature. As such, at the very least, one would need two items to fully capture this value (one item focusing on human welfare and the other on nature).

Schwartz (1992, p.39) provides the following justification for treating these rather two distinct values as one: *"The three values related to nature (unity with nature, protecting the environment, a world of beauty) emerged together in the universalism region (cf. Fig. 2) with great consistency. This confirms the idea that concern for nature is closely linked to concern for the welfare of all humankind. The joint emergence of nature, universal welfare, and understanding (broad-minded, wisdom) values in a single region supports the derivation of the motivational goal of universalism that was suggested in the introduction. This goal is presumed to arise with the realization that failure to protect the natural environment or to understand people who are different, and to treat them justly, will lead to strife and to destruction of the resources on which life depends."*

Nonetheless, Lee and her colleagues (Lee, Soutar, & Louviere, 2008; Lee, Soutar, Daly, & Louviere, 2011) split universalism into two components "uni-social and "uni-nature" because they may represent two distinct concerns (humans and environment). We see this as a good practice. Although ordinarily these concerns may be correlated highly, which would allow for their collapse into a single value of Universalism on a purely psychometric basis, conceptually these two concerns are different. One can easily think of scenarios where a concern for nature may conflict with a concern for human welfare. Even Schwartz seems to implicitly acknowledge that environmentalism is not the central notion of Universalism; in an article on Universalism (Schwartz, 2007, p. 714), he wrote: *"The four key universalism value items—equality, social justice, broadmindedness, and world at peace—are all located in a distinct universalism region."* Thus, it is inadvisable to focus on environmental issues when only one item is to be used to measure the Universalism value.

As noted earlier, we found that the residential learning community members attached lower importance to Hedonism and Power relative to the students who were not members of this learning community. Although based on data reported by Lee, Soutar, Daly, and Louviere (2011), a high emphasis on Benevolence and a low emphasis on Power may characterize young adults in the U.S. population at large, the high priority given to Tradition is rather atypical, as is the low emphasis placed on Hedonism. (The largest difference between the service organization members and non-members occurred on Hedonism.)

The relatively high priority assigned to Tradition and extremely low priority given to Hedonism is not typical of a prosocial profile either, but it is consistent with religiosity (Saroglou, Delpierre, & Dernelle, 2004). The existence of this pattern among the Signum Fidei students most likely reflects the fact that this residential learning community was faith oriented. In other words, the Signum Fidei value profile has elements of both the prosocial personality and the religious individual. The value of Achievement ranked fairly high in both groups, which should not be surprising since they were persons interested in pursuing higher education (see Hofer et al, 2011).

However, pro-social tendencies should not be seen as being orthogonal to religiousness. Although all religions advocate prosocial behavior, the empirical literature suggests that there is greater altruism among religious individuals towards people who are known to them and are like them (Benevolence) than towards strangers (Universalism), especially if the strangers differ from them. Apparently, the relationship of Universalism to religiosity is moderated by whether one's religious orientation is extrinsic, intrinsic, or quest (Bernt, 1989). It is unfortunate that we do not have a direct measure of the religious orientation of the members of Signum Fidei. Although it is merely conjecture on our part, it seems likely given the research findings reported by Bernt (1989) on college students who volunteer that the members of our service-learning community most likely have either an intrinsic or a quest orientation towards religion.

It may be informative to place the value hierarchy of the Signum Fidei learning community into a broader context by comparing their profile to ones published for other groups, such as different occupations. According to Holland (1985), six "themes" represent the characteristics of the work environment and the interests of people who work therein: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising and Conventional. Knafo and Sagiv (2004) related values, as measured with the PVQ, to Holland's work themes by studying people in different occupations. Their results show that Enterprising occupations (e.g. salesperson) were negatively correlated with Universalism while Artistic occupations (e.g. musician) correlated negatively with Conformity. Social occupations, which represent the helping professions (e. g. social worker), are associated negatively with Power and with Achievement but positively with Benevolence and Universalism.

Two studies of professional counselors, who were assessed by means of the SVS (Busacca, Beebe, & Toman, 2010; Kelly, 1995) conform to the results reported by Knafo and Sagiv (2004). In both studies, counselors place high importance on the values of Benevolence, Self-Direction, Universalism, and Achievement while minimizing Conformity, Stimulation, Tradition, and Power. Other than the high emphasis on Tradition and only moderate emphasis on Universalism (which is probably a quirk do the nature of this latter item), the value hierarchy for the helping professions is similar to the one for Signum Fidei members. One has to wonder if these individuals will eventually be employed in the Social occupations, or at least be happiest in such environments.

Our second purpose was to determine the adequacy of the 10-item version of the PVQ used in the WVS. As noted earlier, Universalism was not a highly rated value for the members of the residential learning community, yet it should have been in view of the nature of this group. The question tapping Universalism is not the best one to use, especially if only a single item is to be used to measure this value. Although the Universalism item is the most troublesome, there may be problems with other items as well. According to Schwartz and Sagiv (1995), "*the meaning of a value is reflected in its pattern of intercorrelations with other values*" (p. 101), and our data did not show some of the expected simple associations between the items (values).

The results of our factor analysis were not entirely consistent with the Schwartz model either, but they do make sense. We derived three factors. The first factor seems to be a combination of Conservation and Self-Enhancement, which are complimentary domains according to Schwartz. The second factor appears to combine Self-Transcendence and Openness to Change, which are also complimentary domains. The emergence of this pattern is understandable given the moderately high positive correlations in our data between complimentary values, but only low negative correlations (i.e. .35 or under) between theoretically opposed values. In other words, the factor analysis picked up the expected complimentary relationships but not the expected conflicting relationships between values.

The third factor is most puzzling, since it loads somewhat on both Self-Direction and Conformity, which are opposing values according to Schwartz's model. However, it is consistent with what one would expect to see in a prosocial person who has a religious orientation. Descriptively, the Signum Fidei students were lower than the non-Signum Fidei students on factor 1, but higher on factor 2 and factor 3. But the major difference, which reached statistical significance, was on factor 1 rather than factor 3, which somewhat tempers this explanation.

While the failure of our factor analysis to conform fully to the factor structure of the Schwartz model could be attributed to the idiosyncrasies inherent in a small sample size, it is worth noting that the study by Held et al (2009), employing the German respondents to the 2006 World Values Survey (which was more than adequate in terms of size) also failed to come up

with the higher order dimensions proposed by Schwartz. Rather, they too detected three factors, but these factors did not match ours. However it is noteworthy that Karp (1996), using the SSV rather the WVS scale, found four factors that included a combined Self-Enhancement/Conservation factor and a combined Self-Transcendence/Openness to Change factor (as did we with the WVS version).

The fear of overburdening respondents and thereby lowering response rates is real (Porter, et al, 2004; Roszkowski & Bean, 1990) and the search for economical means of assessment is understandable. However, single item-scales are generally not as reliable as scales composed of multiple items. Considering our results along with those reported by Held et al (2009) and Rudnev (2011), one must conclude that there are limitations in the use of the WVS 10-item scale (or perhaps any short scale) to fully capture the constructs in the Schwartz model of values. Even with the most appropriate 10 items, the scale may not be sensitive enough to pick up any changes in values resulting from some intervention; it seems best suited for “ball park” estimates. Consequently, we would recommend that if a shorter version of the PVQ is needed for practical reasons, the 21-item abbreviation in the ESS is preferable. The tradeoff between practicality and reliability and validity may not be worth it with the WVS approach to measuring Schwartz’s value system.

Limitations

The surveys were collected anonymously. While this promoted candid responding, it prevents us from comparing the demographic characteristics, such as sex, of the Signum Fidei and the non-Signum Fidei groups. Compared to women, men place greater importance on Power, Stimulation, Hedonism, Achievement, and Self-direction. Conversely, women place greater emphasis on Benevolence, Universalism, and Security (Schwartz & Rubel, 2005). Any difference in the distribution of critical demographic variables, such as sex, between the two samples makes it possible that this is the cause for any observed differences. We also fully acknowledge the limitations of a factor analysis on a sample of our size, and did it mainly out of curiosity. The results of this analysis, while suggestive, can be questioned given the sample size.

Suggestions for Further Research

It should be productive to determine if members of other religiously-based residential learning organizations share the profile identified here. It may also be worthwhile to determine how different are the profiles based on the WVS (10 items) vs. the ESS (21 items) vs. the PVQ (40 items), particularly on Universalism. Comparing the importance of Universalism among service-learning students with the extrinsic, intrinsic and quest orientations to religion would be extremely informative.

References

- Bardi, A. & Schwartz, S.H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 1207-1220.
- Batson, C. D. (1983). Sociobiology and the role of religion in promoting prosocial behavior: An alternative view. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 45, 1380-1385.
- Batson, C. D. (1987). Prosocial motivation: Is it ever truly altruistic? In L.Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology Vol. 20* (pp. 65–122). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). *Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bernt, F. M. (1989). Being religious and being altruistic: A study of college service volunteers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10, 663-669.
- Busacca, L. A., Beebe, R. S, & Toman, S. M. (2010). Life and work values of counselor trainees: A national survey. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 59, 2-18.
- Carifio, J., & Perla, R. (2008). Resolving the 50-year debate around using and misusing Likert scales. *Medical Education*, 42, 1150-1152.
- Clary, E. G, & Snyder, M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 156–159.
- Davidov, E. & Schmidt, P. (2007). Are values in the Benelux comparable? In G. Loosveldt, M. Swyngedouw, & B. Cambré (Eds.), *Measuring meaningful data in social research* (pp. 373-386). Leuven, Belgium: Acco.
- Davidov, E., Schmidt, P. & Schwartz, S.H.(2008). Bringing values back in: The adequacy of the European Social Survey to measure values in 20 countries. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72, 420-445.
- de Winter, J. C. F., Dodou, D., & Wieringa, P. A. (2009). Exploratory factor analysis with small sample sizes. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 44, 147–181.
- Eyler, J. (2002). Stretching to meet the challenge: Improving the quality of research to improve the quality of service-learning. In S.H Billing & A. Furco (Eds.), *Service learning through a multidisciplinary lens* (pp.3-13). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Fischer, R. (2004). Standardization to account for cross-cultural response bias. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 263-284.
- Furr, R.M. (2010). The double-entry intraclass correlation as an index of profile similarity: Meaning, limitations, and alternatives. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 92, 1-15.

- Grayson, D. (2004). Some myths and legends in quantitative psychology. *Understanding Statistics*, 3, 101-134.
- Gueorguieva, R., & Krystal, J. H. (2004). Move over ANOVA: Progress in analyzing repeated-measures data and its reflection in papers published in the archives of general psychiatry. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 61, 310-317.
- Held, M., Muller, J., Deutsch, F., Grzechnik, E., & Welzel, C. (2009). Values structure and dimensions: Empirical evidence from the German World Values Survey. *World Values Research*, 2 (3), 55-76.
- Hitlin, S. & Kramer, K. (2007). *Value-dimensions in America: Report to the National Election Studies Board based on the 2006 ANES pilot study (March 1, 2007)*. Ames, IA: Department of Sociology, University of Iowa. Retrieved from <http://www.electionstudies.org/resources/papers/Pilot2006/nes011893>
- Hitlin S, & Piliavin, J.A. (2004). Values: Reviving a dormant concept. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 359-393.
- Hofer, M., Kuhnle, S., Kilian, B., Marta Rizzi, E., & Fries, S. (2011). Motivational interference in School-leisure conflict and learning outcomes: The differential effects of two value conceptions. *Learning and Instruction*, 21, 301-316.
- Holland, J.L. (1985). Making vocational choices: A theory of careers. *Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall*.
- Houle, B.J., Sagarin, B.J., & Kaplan, M.F. (2005). A functional approach to volunteerism: do volunteer motives predict task preference? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 337-344.
- Hrivnak, G. & Kenworthy, A. (2011, November). Explicating the how of service-learning: A proposal for the use of Schwartz's value theory. Paper presented at the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement 2011 Annual Conference, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from http://iarslceproceedings.wikispaces.com/file/view/Hrivnak_Explicating+the+how+of+service-learning-A+proposal+for+the+use+of+Schwartz's+value+theory.pdf
- Huberty, C. J., & Morris, J. D. (1989). Multivariate analysis versus multiple univariate analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105, 302-308.
- Jamieson, S. (2004). Likert scales: How to (ab)use them. *Medical Education*, 38, 1217-1218.
- Karp, D.G. (1996). Values and their effect on pro-environmental behavior. *Environment and Behavior*, 28, 111-133.

- Kelly, E. W., Jr. (1995). Counselor values: A national survey. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 73, 648-653.
- Knafo, A., & Sagiv, L. (2004). Values and work environment: Mapping 32 occupations. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 19, 255-273.
- Knafo, A., Israel, S., & Ebstein, R.P. (2011). *Heritability of children's prosocial behavior and differential susceptibility to parenting by variation in the dopamine receptor D4 gene*. *Development and Psychopathology*, 23, 53-67
- Knoppen, D. & Saris, W. (2009a, June 11-12). Evaluation of the Portrait Values Questionnaire using SEM: A new ESS proposal. Paper presented at the QMSS2 Seminar, Bozen, Italy.
- Knoppen, D. & Saris, W. (2009b). Do we have to combine values in the Schwartz' Human Values Scale? A Comment on the Davidov studies. *Survey Research Methods*, 3, 91-103.
- Lee, J.A., Soutar, G.N., & Louviere, J.J. (2008). *The best–worst scaling approach: An alternative to Schwartz's values survey*. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 90, 335- 347.
- Lee, J.A., & Soutar, G.N. (2010). Is Schwartz's Value Survey an interval scale, and does it really matter? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 41, 76-86.
- Lee, J.A., Soutar, G.N., Daly, T.M., & Louviere, J.J. (2011). Schwartz Values Clusters in the United States and China. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42, 234-252.
- Lietz, P., & Matthews, B. (2006, November 29-December 3). *Are values more important than learning approaches? Factors influencing student performance at an international university*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE), Adelaide, Australia.
- Lindeman, M. & Verkasalo, M. (2005). Measuring values with the Short Schwartz's Value Survey. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 85, 170-178.
- Maio, G.R. & Olson, J.M. (1995). Relations between values, attitudes, and behavioral intentions: The moderating role of attitude function. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 31, 266-285.
- McConochie, W.A. & Dunn, K. (2006). *Ten values for predicting political voting and behavior: ANES 2006 Pilot Study/2004 Study*. Retrieved from <http://www.electionstudies.org/resources/papers/Pilot2006/nes012030.pdf>
- Norman, G. (2010). Likert scales, levels of measurement and the “laws” of statistics. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 15, 625-632.

- Pepper, M., Jackson, T., & Uzzell, D. (2009). An examination of the values that motivate socially conscious and frugal consumer behaviours. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33, 126–136.
- Porter, S.R., Whitcomb, M.E., & Weitzer, W.H. (2004). Multiple surveys of students and survey fatigue. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 121, 63-73
- Preacher, K. J., & MacCallum, R. C. (2002). Exploratory factor analysis in behavior genetics research: Factor recovery with small sample sizes. *Behavior Genetics*, 32, 153-161.
- Risjord, M., Moloney, M., & Dunbar, S. (2001). Methodological triangulation in nursing research. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 31, 40-59.
- Roccas, S., & Schwartz, S.H. (1997). Church-state relations and the association of religiosity with values: A study of Catholics in six countries. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 31, 356-375.
- Rossano, M.J. (2007). Supernaturalizing social life: Religion and the evolution of human cooperation. *Human Nature* 18, 272-294.
- Roszkowski, M.J., & Bean, A. G. (1990). Believe it or not! Longer questionnaires have lower response rates. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 4, 495-509.
- Rudnev, M. (2011, July 18-22). *The constraints and opportunities of 10 Schwartz value items in World Values Survey*. Paper presented at The Fourth Conference of the European Survey Research Association (ESRA), Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Saroglou, V., Delpierre, V., & Dernelle, R. (2004). Values and religiosity: A meta-analysis of studies using Schwartz's model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 721-734.
- Schwartz, S. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.
- Schwartz, S. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50 (4), 19-45.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1996). Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In C. Seligman, J.M. Olson, & M.P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario Symposium*, Vol. 8 (pp.1-24). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2006). Basic human values: Theory, measurement, and applications. *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 47, 929-968.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Universalism values and the inclusiveness of our moral universe. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38, 711-728.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2008). Erratum of Universalism values and the inclusiveness of our moral universe. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39, 123-124.

- Schwartz, S. (2010). Basic values: How they motivate and inhibit prosocial behavior. In M. Mikulincer & P.R. Shaver (Eds.), *Prosocial motives, emotions, and behavior: The better angels of our nature* (pp. 221-241). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Schwartz, S.H. & Boehnke, K. (2004). Evaluating the structure of human values with confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38, 230-255.
- Schwartz, S.H., & Huismans, S. (1995). Value priorities and religiosity in four Western religions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58, 88-107.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Rubel, T. (2005). Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 1010-1028.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 92-116.
- Schwartz, S.H., Verkasalo, M., Antonovsky, A., & Sagiv, L.(1997). Value priorities and social desirability: Much substance, some style. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 3-18.
- Smolkowski, K. (2009). *MANOVA & repeated measures*. Eugene, OR: Oregon Research Institute. Retrieved from http://www.ori.org/~keiths/Files/Tips/Stats_MANOVA.html
- Spini, D. (2003). Measurement equivalence of 10 value types from the Schwartz Value Survey across 21 countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34, 3-23.
- Sprecher, S. & Fehr, B. (2005). Compassionate love for close others and humanity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22, 629-652.
- Steinmetz, H., Schmidt, P., Tina-Booh, A., Wieczorek, S., & Schwartz, S.H. (2009). Testing measurement invariance using multigroup CFA: differences between educational groups in human values measurement. *Quality & Quantity*, 43, 599-616.

Authors

MICHAEL J. ROSZKOWSKI, (roszkows@lasalle.edu), Assistant Provost for Evaluation Services and Institutional Research, La Salle University

ROBERT J. KINZLER, Director of University Ministry and Service, La Salle University

JOHN KANE, Professor Emeritus, Business Administration, La Salle University

Transformation of, in, and by Learning in a Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program

*Mary Cazzell, Shirley Theriot, Joan Blakey,
and Melanie Sattler*

Transformative learning is the core outcome most desired in adult education (Mezirow, 1997). Transformative learning is defined as “learning that transforms problematic frames of reference—sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindsets)—to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change” (Mezirow, 2003, pp. 58-59). Marbury (1996) firmly believes that of all the teaching strategies for educational transformation, service-learning offers one of the most unique tools to provoke student engagement, motivation, and academic achievement. As a powerful form of experiential learning, service-learning integrates community engagement with academic coursework through the essential requirement of critical reflection (Deeley, 2010; Mezirow, 1990).

Palmer (1998) observed that a teacher is recognized as effective when engagement with the course goes beyond technique and knowledge transmission. In service-learning, educators, students, and communities have a stake in the expansive outcomes of their teaching and learning (Freire, 1998); thus, students can become agents of change in the educator’s own learning (Foster, 2007). Faculty who create, develop, and implement service-learning may experience transformation of learning in their students, transformation in their own learning about service-learning pedagogy, as well as transformation by

ABSTRACT

Transformative learning is the most desired core outcome in adult education. The qualitative study examined critical reflections for professional transformation related to development and implementation of service-learning courses or projects from four university faculty members during enrollment in a Service-Learning Faculty Fellows program and post-service-learning implementation. Reflective questions related to faculty perceptions of student learning, service-learning as pedagogy, and their own learning—transformation of, in, and by learning, respectively. Content analyses of faculty reflections resulted in three categories of transformation based on three pre-service-learning and three post-service-learning descriptive themes: (1) transformation of student learning from anticipatory integration to conflicts between expectation and reality; (2) transformation in learning about service-learning transitioned from constant search for clarification to searching for relevance in service-learning; and (3) transformation by learning about themselves as educators was described initially as a move from “me” to “we” and afterward to a deconstruction of their professional selves. Critical self-reflection and mentoring throughout the Faculty Fellows program and after at least one service-learning course or project are important elements toward the success of faculty who choose to engage in service-learning.

learning about themselves during and after service-learning implementation. These types of learning transformations in faculty are supported by the theory of human learning. According to Jarvis (2006), four elements are needed for learning to occur: (1) the person, (2) a social situation in which to engage, (3) an experience that occurs, and (4) transformative process. This current study used critical reflections by university faculty to assess professional transformations related to creation, development, and implementation of service-learning courses or projects.

Significance

More published research focuses on the impact of service-learning and community engagement on student transformation than on faculty (see Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray, 2001 for overview). It is well known that student successes from service-learning, as a teaching strategy, have translated to higher graduation rates, stronger academic performances, and improvements in social, emotional, personal, and moral development with increased commitment to sustained civic engagement (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler, 2010; Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Sax & Astin, 1997). Meyers (2008) found that through written reflections, undergraduates working with at-risk children in the community had increased personal growth in compassion for others and self-awareness. He states: “students can use this experience to discover who they are capable of being and what they are capable of doing” (p. 380).

Being engaged in service-learning outside their usual environment may initially unleash uncomfortable or conflicting beliefs or behaviors; this dissonance has been identified as an impetus to improved critical thinking and problem-solving (Deeley, 2010; Kiely, 2004; Warner & Esposito, 2009). It is in experiencing challenging interactions and experiences that “students develop new theories about what works, what doesn’t, and what to do next; then they test through further experience” (Beal, 1996, p. 23).

Bamber and Hankin (2011) explored forms of transformation exhibited by students in British secondary schools after participating in a year-long service-learning course. These students prepared, delivered, and evaluated a workshop on global citizenship to other secondary-level peers in other area schools. Researchers examined students’ written self-reflections and found a “complexity of identifying transformative learning” (p. 190) in the forms of political, moral, intellectual, cultural, and personal transformation. Due to a cross-sectional research design, Bamber and Hankin (2011) admit the difficulty of reporting these findings as empirical transformative evidence. It is quite difficult to claim students have transformed their worldview or challenged stereotypes (perspective transformation) based on one reflection that states one “simply considers something they have not thought of before” (p. 199). More rigorous longitudinal studies have revealed student perspective transformation before, during, and after participation in international service-learning (Bamber, 2008; Kiely, 2004). Deeley (2010) asserts, however, that the main gap in service learning literature is *how* student transformation occurs since the outcome of transformation is difficult to measure and cannot be predicted.

When transformation is discussed for faculty, significance is typically given to motivations to implement service-learning, changes in teaching styles, perception of student learning processes, and definition of sites of learning (Ayers & Ray, 1996). Using a small sample, Stanton (1994) found that a successful service-learning course is associated with intrinsic faculty motivation, knowledge of learning theory, and perception that institution places value on service-learning. Pribbenow (2005) interviewed 35 university faculty with a wide range of experience in service-learning and found six themes that relate to their professional

transformation: (1) more meaningful engagement in and commitment to teaching, (2) deeper connections and relationship with students as learners and individuals, (3) enhanced knowledge of student learning processes and outcomes, (4) increased use of constructivist teaching and learning approaches, (5) improved communication of theoretical concepts, and (6) greater involvement in a community of teachers and learners. Overall, faculty were motivated to use service-learning pedagogy because they were meaningfully engaged and committed to teaching (Pribbenow, 2005). Because of the heterogeneity of the researcher's sample based on experience with service-learning, it is not known if all of transformative themes were relevant for experienced teachers or which themes were associated with novice implementers of service-learning. The current study utilized a homogenous group of novice faculty with similar service-learning experience.

For transformation to be relevant, professional learning is important if it "is rooted in the human need to feel a sense of belonging and of making a contribution to a community where experience and knowledge function as part of community property" (Lieberman & Pointer Mace, 2008, p. 227). The aim of this study was to explore the professional and transformational effects of university faculty involvement in ten three-hour seminars during a Service-Learning Faculty Fellows program, both pre- and post-implementation of their service-learning course or project. The reflective questions related to faculty perceptions of student learning, service-learning as pedagogy, and their own learning—transformation *of*, *in*, and *by* learning, respectively.

Methodology

A qualitative research design was used to collect and analyze written group and self-reflections from university faculty obtained over a 12-month period (September 2010 – August 2011) during participation in the Service-Learning Faculty Fellows program and again during the Fall 2011 semester, one year after service-learning implementation. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained from a large public university in the southwestern United States.

The Faculty Fellows Program at this southwest comprehensive research, teaching, and public service institution provides interested faculty with an avenue for development, resources, and mentoring of the service-learning pedagogy. The program was initially funded in 1995 by the Corporation for National and Community Service under the Learn and Serve America: Higher Education program area to broadly integrate community engagement in all aspects of faculty work (Bringle, Games, Ludlum, Osgood, & Osborne, 2000). Supported by the University and facilitated by the Director of Service-Learning, the program seeks to follow the national model by providing opportunities for faculty to develop service-learning courses, conduct research within faculty and community partner interests, and engage in meaningful community partnerships.

The University's Director of Service-Learning facilitates ten collaborative seminars each year which include interdisciplinary collaboration, guided instruction, selected readings, and reflection during ten three-hour seminars. Seminar discussions and outside readings include such topics as *service-learning theory, research, and practice; reflection as a critical piece in service-learning; strength of interdisciplinary collaboration; building meaningful community partnerships; and an introduction to community-based research.*

An outgrowth of the program is growing numbers of faculty and students, who engage in service-learning, build stronger ties with the community, enhance greater faculty and student

understanding with ownership of local issues, and expand faculty fellow scholarship and research opportunities. Following the year of intensive service-learning collaboration and discussion, faculty are expected to provide leadership in their respective departments across campus encouraging others to develop service-learning courses and engage with the community.

Three tenure-track faculty members from Nursing, Education, and School of Urban and Public Affairs (SUPA) as well as one tenured faculty from Engineering attended the Fall 2010 ten-week Service-Learning Faculty Fellows program. Qualitative data during the ten seminars were collected as weekly written self-reflections and group reflective discussions transcribed verbatim by the secretary of the Center for Community Service-Learning (CCSL). The reflections related to faculty perceptions of weekly seminar themes in preparation for implementation of a service-learning course or project. The planning included: literacy project in an elementary school, graduate-level environmental engineering service-learning course, and pediatric medication administration service-learning project. During the Fall 2011 semester, the Director of the CCSL and three faculty members returned to reflect on their perceptions of service-learning implementation in their courses. Two of the Fall 2010 Faculty Fellows who returned were from Nursing and Engineering. The third Faculty Fellow was from Social Work, had completed the Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program during the Spring 2011 semester, and had implemented one service-learning course (development of a model that helps children and families impacted by trauma). Post-implementation data included email discussions initiated by the Director's reflection questions. All Faculty Fellows who participated in this study were females.

Using content analyses, emails, written reflections, and group discussion transcripts were first separated into the time periods of Pre-Service-Learning (SL) and Post-Service-Learning (SL) Implementation and then scrutinized line-by-line for identification of repeated ideas, words, or phrases. The initial coding was done by one member of the research team but identification of key themes, based on initial coding, occurred in collaboration with the CCSL Director. All study participants were given direct access to data analyses, defined as member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and all verified the key themes and supporting narratives. The three main themes in the Pre-SL Implementation phase were anticipatory integration, constant search for clarification, and move from "me" to "we." Three key themes were found in the Post-SL Implementation phase: conflict between expectation and reality, searching for relevance in service-learning, and deconstruction of professional self.

Results

Pre-Service-Learning Implementation Phase

Anticipatory integration. Throughout the ten service-learning seminars, all participants acknowledged that changing their present course to a service-learning course or adding a service learning project would involve allowing the "unfamiliar" to question the "familiar" (Bamber & Hankin, 2011), integrating past and present ways of thinking, acting, and feeling into a new set of approaches. The Nursing faculty member discovered that the:

strong connection between long-held Jesuit values of lifelong commitment to service, civic responsibility, and purposeful action in societal issues blend well with service-learning. I see that I need to "reframe" my course, don't really need to change or add any new teaching strategies—maybe it won't be so difficult.

Three Faculty Fellows-in-training acknowledged that their service-learning goals as faculty would be more thoughtful, possibly more expansive:

- (1) *stimulate student interest in math and science careers through role modeling and build relationships between the university and the community* (Engineering);
- (2) *provide educational community with helpful resources, build relationships, whatever helps the partner* (Education); and (3) *develop “deliverables” that actively sustain community relationships* (SUPA).

In reflections about reframing their courses, faculty also discussed potential ambiguities and dilemmas that could arise when implementing their service-learning courses.

How do I find creative ways to meet learning needs that need to address student acceptance, their innate egocentrism, and their peer-centeredness? What if my service-learning project is not well accepted by students and my teaching evaluations are affected?

Another faculty member summarized the majority of “opening-night” implementation jitters at the end of the seminars:

When we plan for service-learning, we plan for the perfect community experiences. I sense that we all feel uncertain, scared, nervous, and vulnerable. We do not know all of the answers and need to admit this.

Constant search for clarification. While enrolled in the Faculty Fellows program, all faculty members echoed similar needs to discern, first, a clear and concrete definition of service-learning and next, the process of developing and implementing a service-learning course or project. In seeking to define service-learning, the Nursing faculty member initially thought that all nursing clinical courses were service-learning courses:

Everyone always tells me that nursing is a natural fit for service learning, but I’ll need to change the misconception that all clinical hours involve service learning. There are no structured reflection activities and students gain more benefit than the community partners during their clinical experiences.

The Engineering faculty defined service-learning as linkages between *theory and practice and between community involvement, service to the profession, and professional development*. All participants reflected that service-learning is an enhanced teaching strategy with broader student learning goals where the *“rubber hits the road” and course information is now practically used in a real world setting*. In the search for a personal definition, the faculty wrote definitions of service-learning in their reflections taken directly from their Faculty Fellows workbook, *Introduction to Service-Learning Toolkit* (Campus Compact, 2003); most utilized the definition from Bringle and Hatcher (1995).

The Faculty Fellows curriculum included development of a proposed service-learning course or project using a Service-Learning Course Development template which included an assignment and outcomes planner. Seeking clarification on development and implementation came in the form of multiple questions:

What is meant by “deliverables” that the community partner will receive from us? How do I get my team to “buy-in” to service learning? Do I need to come up with all of my own ideas for what students will do outside the classroom? What is the

role of the community partner in service learning? Help, I don't even know how to begin!!

Though many of the participants expressed early uncertainty completing this assignment, the Nursing faculty member realized that *my course and student clinicals will need to be evaluated in a different way; I have to find a relevant way to tie course readings with clinical experiences.*

Move from “me” to “we.” The Faculty Fellows realized that service-learning as pedagogy was strongly focused on student and community outcomes rather than primarily teacher ability to teach a course. Faculty from SUPA, Nursing, and Education shared that student outcomes must reflect *caring, professionalism, accountability, communication, and ability to digest and discuss ethical dilemmas. I have to find more holistic experiences for students so I can develop the “whole” student.* The Nursing faculty member discussed the need to *let go, be a collaborative teacher, and a co-learner.* But this same faculty also saw community partners included in the “we.” The Education faculty member projected that her curriculum and instruction will need to focus beyond students, with a *focus on families, relationships, and communication using constructivist learning.*

Another way to assess student learning outcomes was discussed in the critical role that reflection plays in service-learning. Since all Faculty Fellows were required to send in weekly reflections after each seminar, they all agreed on the value of structured or guided reflections in their projected courses. *Reflection offers students a chance to be honest with themselves, to look beyond themselves and start to test out their higher-order critical thinking skills in a safe venue.* Even though all were excited about the prospects of looking at their course from a new perspective and observing student advancement from concrete to critical thinkers, all anticipated a higher workload and wondered if this focus on “we” could qualify for higher workload compensation as well as be relevant during tenure-track review.

Post-Service-Learning Implementation Phase

Conflict between expectation and reality. The anticipated “ambiguities” and “dilemmas” from the pre-implementation phase did occur with implementation of their service-learning courses or projects. The faculty member from Nursing found that what a potential community partner requested would only serve the partner’s needs without addressing student engagement or learning. In addition, she also found that her colleagues were:

not so open to hearing the differences between service-learning and service. Some believe service-learning is already embedded in the Nursing curriculum. Faculty buy-in is a very slow process and I had to change my idea of converting my existing course to a service-learning course. Instead, I changed to a service-learning project.

The Engineering Faculty Fellow stated that:

service-learning doesn't always go as planned—it is uncertain and messy. First go-round is survival with unpredictable surprises. Imperfect service-learning is preferable to “perfect” non-service-learning. We need to remind ourselves that traditional pedagogy is far from perfect.

All Faculty Fellows agreed that the CCSL Director has a role to play in addressing these conflicts:

It would be great if she could make a list of ways faculty feel when implementing service-learning, basically predicting how each will feel. It would help faculty work through challenges and confusion and realize the benefits as worthwhile.

Searching for relevance in service-learning. One year after completion of their Service-Learning Faculty Fellowship, the returning faculty members expressed continued motivation for implementing service-learning, still voiced many questions, but did find clarity toward a working definition of service-learning.

I had to change my initial idea of implementing a service-learning course; I created a service learning project instead but I have a strong motivation to be creative for the good of student learning. I will continue to refine my course with consideration of reward incentives for students. However, my gut feel is that it takes a certain breed to develop and implement service-learning (Nursing faculty).

In evaluating the engineering service-learning course:

I found that service-learning helped engineering students think in grays, rather than black and white. Rather than a faculty "memory dump," this service-learning course helped the students develop application skills, judgment, and critical thinking, necessary for a job. The world is messy and complex and service-learning deals with the messy world. Students have to deal with this mess in an environment of constructive feedback.

While the Faculty Fellows expressed personal motivation to continue service-learning implementation, reflections and group discussions illuminated more questions.

Is there a service-learning continuum with service on one end and service-learning on the other end? Regardless of project size, what pushes a project into the service-learning area? Is it reflection? Is it the give-back piece? Are there essential elements that must be present no matter how big or small a service-learning project? How do we encourage new ways of teaching and engaging students by service-learning? Do we ever reach the total threshold of service-learning? Do we encourage colleagues to do something rather than nothing? Should we be satisfied one classroom, one school, on family at a time? Are there times we should be focusing on "service" rather than "service-learning"?

Though the faculty had many questions, they also found that after gaining experience in the implementation of their service-learning course or project, they could unanimously agree upon a working definition of service-learning.

Service-learning includes a trifecta of requirements: (1) increased student learning as a result of their involvement with a community partner, (2) a need that community partners express as important to be addressed by students, and (3) written reflections that follow the What, So What, and Now What format with feedback given to the students.

Deconstruction of professional self. After implementing at least one service-learning course or project, the Faculty Fellows had an opportunity to separate and examine the components of being a teacher in higher education:

I realized that creativity is a large part of this job—especially when courses are not overtly geared to community participation (Nursing). Being involved in service-learning is freeing; the pressure to know everything is off. We admit we are learning with our students and we give importance to the idea of uncertainty (Engineering). Service-learning is the answer to shifting the paradigm. Shame on the professors who stand up and demand attention because they know they are the experts. How many miss out on creating a broader picture of their world? (Social Work).

Discussion

Transformation of Learning

The faculty were concerned with not only the quality of the service-learning course they were planning to implement; they also considered the effects of service-learning and community engagement on the transformation of student learning—moving from anticipatory integration to conflicts between expectation and reality. Pre-implementation, faculty intended to stimulate student learning through service-learning by developing more expansive learning goals that included students, community, and reflection. They also addressed concerns about being creative enough to meet not only student learning needs but student acceptance.

Their reflections closely parallel Mezirow's (1997) concepts of changing our "frame of reference" to set a "line of action;" moving from "habits of mind" to a newly shaped "point of view" (p. 5). Normally, our existing foundation of actions, feelings, perceptions, and cognition (*frame of reference*) directly influence the actions we take (*line of action*) based on cultural assimilation, life experiences, and family influences. Mezirow (1997) divides the frame of reference into *habits of mind* and *point of view*. When faculty discussed concerns about student acceptance and course evaluations, they were focusing on the student's *habit of mind*, how and what the student has previously learned and their predispositions, value judgments, and attitudes about learning in a course. What faculty hoped for was an opportunity to shape a new *point of view*. "Points of view are subject to continuing change as we reflect on either the content or process by which we solve problems and identify the need to modify assumptions" (Mezirow, 1997, p. 6). Faculty's early feelings of "implementation jitters", fear, and uncertainty are well supported since Mezirow (1997) posits that "habits of mind are more durable than points of view" (p. 6). Bamber and Hankin (2011) designed their service-learning project on global education to purposely contradict students' habits of mind, challenge stereotypes, and through critical reflection, set the familiar aside and develop their own meanings.

Faculty also shared that they "plan for the perfect community experience." It makes sense why faculty were scared and vulnerable in planning for service-learning implementation: in his transformational learning theory, Mezirow (1997) states that "the nature of adult learning implies a set of ideal conditions for its full realization" (p. 11). Marbury (1996), however, correlates outstanding (not perfect) service-learning programs with faculty who exemplify determination and courage. The ten-week Faculty Fellows Program offered faculty information, guidance, and mentoring in the process of developing and implementing a service-learning course or project, but the faculty wanted "a list of ways faculty feel when implementing service learning...It would help faculty work through the challenges and confusion and realize the benefits as worthwhile." The faculty were willing to work hard, but it is important to note that they wanted more from the Director in terms of "emotional" information during the seminars.

Post-implementation, faculty discussed that their first attempts at service learning “did not go as planned,” “first go-round is survival with unpredictable surprises.” Several authors have discussed the “dark side” of service learning, when students may not benefit from community engagement: (1) student resistance due to inability to make logical connections between their community service and classroom learning and (2) student frustration because they may not be developmentally or cognitively ready to demonstrate higher-order thinking in self-reflections (Jones, 2002; Jones, Gilbride-Brown, & Gasiorski, 2005). When students display negativity toward service-learning, it could be that students are “facing their own demons,” that unanticipated negative feelings or emotions by students are actually “symptoms” of transformation (Deeley, 2010; Felten, Gilchrist, & Darby, 2006). In support, Mezirow (1991) describes these negative feelings in students as “disorienting dilemmas” which, though disturbing for faculty, can promote personal and intellectual development. Teachers in a university divinity school expressed acceptance of students who were “disarranged,” “taken aback,” and open to surprises” (Foster, 2007, p. 38). Marbury (1996) stresses that “faculty transformers” of student learning and/or curriculum must not be afraid to fail and learn to face indifference and opposition.

Transformation *in* Learning

Through involvement in the Faculty Fellows program and implementation of service-learning, faculty reflected on their transformation in learning about service-learning—transitioning from a constant search for clarification to searching for relevance in service-learning. The need for faculty to first settle on a definition of service-learning is extremely important and well supported in the literature. Marbury (1996) emphasizes that the “first and foremost obstacle to be overcome within an institutional setting is the attainment of an authentic definition of the term service-learning” (p. 8). Faculty reflections on a service-learning definition included the components of linkages “between theory and practice, community involvement, service to the profession, and professional development.” By using “concrete and “down-to-earth terminology,” the faculty have overcome another Marbury (1996) obstacle: not understanding the meaning of the definition of service-learning (p. 14). While Herrmann (2011) states there is no consensual service learning definition, the faculty chose the Bringle and Hatcher (1995) service-learning definition as their guide during their program. Currently in service-learning literature, the most cited operational definition is an updated version:

Service-learning is a course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility (Bringle, Hatcher, & McIntosh, 2006, p. 12).

It is interesting to note that post-implementation, faculty developed their own working definition in their search of relevance in service-learning.

The faculty, however, asked many questions during the development and implementation phases of their service-learning course or project. Deeley (2010) supports the faculty’s queries, adding her own questions: What makes service-learning unique? Is service-learning a pedagogy? A teaching or learning philosophy? A program? Or is it just an experience for students and teachers alike? Many educators believe service-learning is high-impact engaged

pedagogy related to its strong emphases on reflection, experiential approaches to teaching, and development of contextual and social learning communities (Carrington & Selva, 2010; Felten & Clayton, 2011; Rice, 2003). Others believe that service-learning can be considered a tool for social justice or a process for community engagement (Felten & Clayton, 2011; Meyers, 2009). It is understandable that faculty asked, “Help, I don’t even know how to begin!!”, when service-learning literature describes its implementation as “counternormative,” moving beyond a traditional teaching model to remaking a classroom with shared responsibility for teaching and learning (Howard, 1998, Felten & Clayton, 2011).

In their search for post-implementation relevance, faculty posed more questions about service-learning. Literature supports the transformative and motivational potential for both faculty and students in service learning when unexpected questions or ideas occur (Baldwin, Buchanan, & Rudisill, 2007; Kiely, 2004). King (2004) suggests that there is a continuum of service-learning; service-learning can be charitable on one end (reinforces current attitudes and prejudices) and transformative on the other (confronts and disrupts previously-held understandings). In addition, others have discussed the balance on the pendulum between volunteerism and service-learning where student volunteers do interact in the community but students and community partners mutually derive benefits in service-learning (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; Furco, 1996). Critical self-reflections by students should expose students’ placement on the continuum. Marbury (1996) purports that until systemic change in curriculum redesign is achieved, faculty will always have many questions and obstacles in revising courses or adding projects with service-learning components. In framing the faculty’s many questions for relevance, Tennant (2012) identifies this as the development of the socially constructed self: “we become driven by a sense of incompleteness, that there is always something more to be discovered or invented both in the external world and in ourselves” (p. 74).

Transformation *by* Learning

Faculty experienced transformation by learning about themselves as educators—as a move from “me” to “we” and afterward to a deconstruction of their professional selves. Even in the pre-implementation phase, faculty voiced a “we” need for “more holistic experiences for students,” to “be a collaborative teacher, and a co-learner.” Freire (1972) envisioned the “me” teacher perspective as oppressive and authoritarian inclusive of passive student roles and learners viewed as empty receptacles to fill with a teacher-centered curriculum. Freire’s answer is teacher-student and students-teachers in education. “The teacher is no longer merely the one who teaches, but one who is himself taught in the dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach” (Freire, 1972, p. 53). Tennant (2012) adds that “the teacher must become a student of the learner’s knowledge in order to be effective” (p.72). The faculty also embraced a service-learning challenge presented by Felten and Clayton (2011): to be not only knowledge producers but knowledge consumers.

Faculty agreed on the value of critical and structured reflections, not only to see their own growth in the Faculty Fellows program but also as a way to assess student learning outcomes. Mezirow (1990) links reflection to higher-order critical thinking used to challenge or validate previous learning and problem solve more effectively. While faculty found their “we” perspective, they also wanted students to find their “we” as well: “to be honest with themselves, to look beyond themselves.” Meyers (2009) used student reflection exercises in higher education to allow students to “reach in” through critical introspection, link service-learning to community interaction, and analyze resulting personal attitudes, values, history, and presuppositions.

After service-learning implementation, faculty realized that their role required creativity, uncertainty, and less pressure to know everything. The actions of deconstructing their professional selves are supported by Palmer (1998):

My ability to connect with my students, and to connect them with the subject, depends less on the methods I use than on the degree to which I know and trust my selfhood—and am willing to make it available and vulnerable in the service of learning (p. 10).

The post-implementation faculty reflections outlined needs to be adaptable, flexible, creative, and willing to make personal changes, identified as authentic self by Tennant (2012) and resulting from lifelong learning (Selkrig, 2011). These findings of faculty transformation by learning support Marbury's (1996) premise that service-learning empowers teachers.

Limitations

Qualitative data were collected on four faculty members from four different disciplines; the small sample size may be a limiting factor in the depth of faculty reflections obtained during the pre- and post-service-learning implementation phases. Many common themes, however, were found within the multiple types of reflective data collected (emails, written reflections, and group discussion transcripts). Even with the small sample size, this was a homogeneous sample based on newly-acquired service-learning experience and the data reflects their common experiences.

Conclusion

The Faculty Fellows, from learning about service-learning through implementation of their first service-learning course or project, demonstrated three significant forms of transformation. First, faculty demonstrated transformation *of* learning by revealing how they were working to improve student learning and community engagement—from anticipatory integration to the reality of conflicts between expectation and reality. Second, a transformation *in* learning occurred as faculty gained more service-learning knowledge from the Faculty Fellow seminars through service-learning implementation—from searching for clarification then ultimately, for relevance. Third, faculty exhibited transformation *by* learning, realizing their new role as co-learners, and moving from “me” to “we” to a deconstruction of their professional self post-implementation. Critical self-reflection and mentoring throughout the Faculty Fellows program and after at least one service-learning course or project are important elements toward the success of faculty who choose to engage in service-learning. Beal (1996) answers one of the faculty's burning questions (“Should we be satisfied one classroom, one school, on family at a time?”) by responding: “Social change occurs person by person, as each individual changes behaviors and influences other to do the same” (p. 23).

Further qualitative ethnographic research would be valuable in examining the transformations that occur simultaneously across students, faculty, and community partners during a service-learning experience. Encouraging community partner participation in relevant reflection activities would further elaborate on faculty and student transformations during

service-learning implementation. Future research could compare service-learning and non-service-learning faculty experiences during a year-long period incorporating reflection of both faculty groups.

References

- Astin, A. W. & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39, 251-263. Retrieved from <http://www.jcsdonline.org/>
- Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *Review of Higher Education*, 22, 187-202. Retrieved from http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/review_of_higher_education/
- Ayers, G. E. & Ray, D. B. (1996). *Service learning: Listening to different voices*. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Baldwin, S., Buchanan, A. M., & Rudisill, M. E. (2007). What teacher candidates learned about diversity, social justice, and themselves from service-learning experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(4), 315-327. [doi:10.1177/0022487107305259](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107305259)
- Bamber, P. (2008). Transforming perspectives through international service-learning. *Pedagogical Research in Maximising Education*, 3(1), 43-56.
- Bamber, P. & Hankin, L. (2011). Transformative learning through service learning: No passport required. *Education + Training*, 53(2), 190-206. doi: 10.1108/00400911111115726
- Beal, D. (1996). Prelude: Student participation. In G. E. Ayers & D. B. Ray (Eds.), *Service learning: Listening to different voices* (pp. 21-31). New York: Ford Foundation.
- Bringle, R. G., Games, R., Ludlum, C., Osgood, R., & Osborne, R. (2000). Faculty fellows program: Enhancing integrated professional development through community service. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(5), 882-894. [doi:10.1177/00027640021955531](https://doi.org/10.1177/00027640021955531)
- Bringle, R. & Hatcher, J. (1995). A service learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2(1), 112-122. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcs/!about>
- Bringle, R., Hatcher, J., & McIntosh, R. (2006). Analyzing Morton's typology of service paradigms and integrity. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13, 5-15. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcs/!about>
- Campus Compact. (2003). *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (2nd ed.). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Carrington, S. & Selva, G. (2010). Critical social theory and transformative learning: Evidence in pre-service teachers' service-learning reflection logs. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(1), 45-57. [doi:10.1080/07294360903421384](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360903421384)

- Deeley, S. J. (2010). Service-learning: Thinking outside the box. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(1), 43-53. doi: 10.1177/1469787409355870
- Eyler, J. (2010). What international service learning research can learn from research on service learning. In R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G. Jones (eds.), *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research* (Volume 2, pp. 225-242). IUPUI Series on Service Learning Research, Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Eyler, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., & Braxton, J. (1997). The impact of service learning on college students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 5-15. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcsl/about>
- Eyler, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., Stenson, C. M., & Gray, C. J. (2001). *At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions, and communities, 1993-2000* (3rd ed.). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Felten, P., Gilchrist, L. Z., & Darby, A. (2006). Emotion and learning: Feeling our way toward a new theory of reflection in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12, 28-46. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcsl/about>.
- Foster, C. R. (2007). Teaching and learning in the service of transformation. *Change*, 38-42. Retrieved at <http://www.changemag.org>
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Penguin Books.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham: MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. In B. Taylor (Ed.), *Expanding boundaries: Serving and learning* (pp. 2-6). Washington DC: Corporation for National Service.
- Herrmann, S. L. (2011). Holding on to transformation: Reflections on global service-learning. In B. J. Porfilio & H. Hickman (Eds.), *Critical service learning as a revolutionary pedagogy: A project of student agency in action* (pp. 273-295). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Howard, J. P. F. (1998). Academic service learning: A counternormative pedagogy. In R. A. Rhoads & J. P. F. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 21-30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jarvis, P. (2006). *Towards a comprehensive theory of human learning*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, S. R. (2002). The underside of service learning. *About Campus*, 7(4), 10-15. Retrieved from <http://www2.myacpa.org/publications/about-campus>

- Jones, S., Gilbride-Brown, J., & Gasiorski, A. (2005). Getting inside the “underside” of service-learning: Student resistance and possibilities. In D. W. Butin (ed.) *Service-learning in higher education: Critical issues and directions* (pp. 3-24). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kiely, R. (2004). A chameleon with a complex: Searching for transformation in international service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(2), 5-20. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcs/!about>
- King, J. (2004). Service-learning as a site for critical pedagogy: A case of collaboration, caring, and defamiliarisation across borders. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 26(3), 121-137. Retrieved from <http://www.aee.org/publications/jee>
- Lieberman, A. & Pointer Mace, D. H. (2008). Teacher learning: The key to educational reform. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(3), 226-234. [doi:10.1177/0022487108317020](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108317020)
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Marbury, C. H. (1996). Curriculum transformation and service-learning. In G. E. Ayers & D. B. Ray (Eds.), *Service learning: Listening to different voices* (pp. 7-18). New York: Ford Foundation.
- Meyers, S. A. (2009). Service learning as an opportunity for personal and social transformation. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 21(3), 373-381. Retrieved from <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>
- Mezirow, J. (1990). How critical reflection triggers transformative learning. In J. Mezirow, *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipator learning* (pp. 1-6). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 74, 5-12. [doi:10.1002/ace.7401](https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.7401)
- Mezirow, J. (2003). Transformative learning as discourse. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 1(1), 58-63. [doi:10.1177/1541344603252172](https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344603252172)
- Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Pribbenow, D. A. (2005). The impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11(2) 25-38. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcs/!about>
- Rice, R. E. (2003, Fall). Rethinking scholarship and engagement: The struggle for new meaning. *Campus Compact Reader*, 1-9. Retrieved from <http://www.compact.org/publication/>

- Sax, L. J. & Astin, A. W. (1997). The benefits of service: Evidence from undergraduates. *Educational Record*, 78, 25-33. Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net/publicliterature.PublicLiterature.search.html>
- Selkrig, M. (2011). Learning about ourselves from others: Transformation of artists' identities through community-based arts practice. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 30(5), 577-589. doi:10.1080/02601370.2011.570875
- Stanton, T. K. (1994). The experience of faculty participants in an instructional development seminar on service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service*, 1(1), 7-20. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcs/about>
- Tennant, M. (2012). *The learning self: Understanding the potential for transformation*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Warner, B. & Esposito, J. (2009). What's not in the syllabus: Faculty transformation, role modeling and role conflict in immersion service-learning courses. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(3), 510-517. Retrieved from <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>

Authors

MARY CAZZELL, (mary.cazzell@cookchildrens.org), Director of Nursing Research and Evidence-Based Practice, Cook Children's Medical Center

SHIRLEY THERIOT, (theriot@uta.edu), Director, Center for Community Service Learning, University of Texas at Arlington

JOAN BLAKEY, (blakey@uwm.edu), Assistant Professor of Social Work, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

MELANIE SATTLER, Associate Professor, Civil Engineering, Environmental and Earth Sciences Program, College of Engineering, University of Texas at Arlington

ABSTRACT

Given the importance of communication skills and positive relationships to addiction recovery, a series of communication skills workshops for residents of a long-term drug and alcohol residential treatment centre was designed and delivered by students in an undergraduate communication class within the university's Community Service Learning program. The purpose of this study was to gauge the impact of these workshops on the participants' communication skills, relationships and recovery program. Thematic analysis of qualitative interviews with the participants was conducted and five themes emerged. This paper discusses the significance of these themes and the role of training in developing communication skills and creating recovery capital as critical aspects of addiction treatment. It also highlights the contribution that students can make to these processes through service-learning.

Building Recovery Capital in Recovering Substance Abusers Through a Service-Learning Partnership: A Qualitative Evaluation of a Communication Skills Training Program

Jenepher Lennox Terrion

The relationships of many people recovering from substance dependencies have been damaged because of past behaviors that are associated with substance abuse, including deception, crime, broken promises, self-harm, erratic mood swings and so on (De Civita et al., 2000; Hoffman & Froemke, 2007). As a result, educational opportunities that contribute to the repair of existing relationships and the development of new ones are an aspect of treatment that has been regarded with interest by both treatment providers and those in treatment.

Literature Review

A lack of positive relationships can have negative impacts on recovery, and in particular for those in treatment, because a stable social support system – or network of positive relationships – has been identified as important to the effectiveness of addiction treatment (Booth et al., 1992). Furthermore, improvements in personal relationships during treatment appear to be related to positive outcomes such as reduced drug use and greater program compliance (Biernacki, 1986; De Civita et al. 2000).

Building supportive and healthy relationships requires effective communication skills. Previous research has shown that social skills deficits are one of the risk factors for substance abuse in youth (Gaffney et al., 1998; Hover & Gaffney, 1991; Wekerle et al., 2009; Werner, 1986). It is likely, therefore, that those in treatment for substance abuse can attribute some of the cause of their difficulties with drugs, alcohol or other substances, at least in part, to a deficit in communication skills.

In addition to the role of communication skills in building positive relationships, research shows that these skills play a role in recovery from addiction. For example, in their research into the importance of social networks and alcoholism recovery programs, Gordon and Zrull (1991) conclude that improving communication skills is an important objective for treatment programs because of the importance to recovery of the ability to elicit and receive support. This conclusion has also been supported by several other studies (Anderson & Gilbert, 1989; Bartholomew, Hiller, Knight, Nucatola, & Simpson, 2000; Fals Stewart, O'Farrell, & Birchler, 2001; McLellan et al., 1993; Miller, 1992; and Simpson, Joe, Rowan-Szal, & Greener, 1997), who argue that having better interpersonal skills improves overall efficiency in recovery programs and post-recovery outcomes. Developing these skills, and enhancing relationships with family, friends, and professionals, such as teachers and counselors, should, therefore, be an important part of treatment. Building on previous research, this study uses recovery capital theory (Granfield & Cloud, 1999) as a framework to evaluate the experience of treatment program residents who participated in a series of communication skills workshops offered by university students within a service-learning program.

Theoretical Framework

Granfield and Cloud (1999) refer to the value of interpersonal relationships to recovery as *recovery capital*, which they define as the quantity and quality of internal and external resources that a person can bring to bear on the initiation and maintenance of recovery (Cloud & Granfield, 2008; Granfield & Cloud, 2001; White & Kurtz, 2005). Recovery capital is based on social capital theory (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988, Putnam, 2000), a framework that has been used to study the value of relationships and social networks.

Cloud and Granfield argue that “much of a person’s ability to extract himself/herself from substance misuse is related to the environmental context in which that person is situated, the personal characteristics s/he possesses, and a range of perceptible and imperceptible resources available to that individual” (2008, p. 1972). More specifically, White and Cloud (2008) argue that there are three forms of recovery capital and that each contributes value to recovery. First is *Personal* recovery capital, which includes both physical and human capital. Physical capital includes physical health, safe shelter, medical care, food and transportation. Human capital includes personal values and beliefs, education and credentials, self-efficacy, self-esteem, hope, and interpersonal skills. Second is *Family/Social* recovery capital, which includes

friends and family members and other social relationships that are supportive of recovery efforts such as those with teachers, counsellors and therapists. Finally, White and Cloud refer to *Community* recovery capital as the community programs, attitudes, policies and resources related to addiction and recovery that promote the resolution of substance problems.

While the three forms of recovery capital identified by White and Cloud (2008) are critical to the initiation and maintenance of recovery, White (2002) argues that “most people with addictive disorders entering treatment have never had much recovery capital or have dramatically depleted such capital by the time they seek help” (p. 30). A program that increases recovery capital may therefore be effective in developing assets that are used in recovery. Using in-depth, semi-structured interviews, the current study sought to qualitatively explore the impact of a communication skills training program on the development of both communication skills and recovery capital of residents in a treatment centre called Harvest House.

Context

Harvest House (HH) is a long term drug and alcohol rehabilitation and residential centre as well as being a Community Service Learning (CSL) partner of the University of Ottawa. Since its incorporation in 1979, the centre has treated over 2000 men. In addition to dealing with their chemical dependencies, the organization aims to help residents by building a sense of community and reintegrating them into society. Specifically, HH functions as a “therapeutic community” (De Leon, 2000) which works to foster individual change and positive growth in its residents. Emphasis is placed on counselling, vocational skill development, relapse prevention training, GED attainment (high school equivalency), running and fitness programs, university bridging programs (pre-university preparation courses) and peer mentoring as aspects of a holistic approach to treatment.

Residents are all males between the ages of 15 and 30 and they are required to spend one year at HH acquiring a range of skills necessary to enable them to reintegrate into society. On completion of one year of residency at HH, graduates, as they are called, are invited to move into transitional housing where they will live with other graduates of the program and continue their recovery program through volunteer work at HH, entering into university or college or working in paid positions at HH or outside of the centre.

During a recent semester, communication skills workshops for residents of the centre were designed and delivered as part of a service-learning assignment in an undergraduate communication class at the University of Ottawa. Workshop topics were selected based on current research indicating skill areas important to recovery from alcoholism (see Bartholomew et al., 2000; Bartholomew & Simpson, 1996). Specifically, a series of six three-hour workshops in presentation skills, self-esteem, résumé writing and portfolio building, interpersonal communication, social etiquette, and decision-making were offered by students in groups of four over a period of four weeks.

The university students were exposed, during the first half of the course, to theory and practical examples of needs assessment, adult learning, training design and delivery, presentation skills and training evaluation. At the same time they were conducting needs assessments of their HH clients, gathering information on their topic and preparing a “dry run” of their workshop which was then offered to the rest of the class during the second half of the semester. Finally, using the feedback and evaluations from their dry run to improve on their

workshop, students delivered their workshops to the twelve residents from Harvest House over a four-week period.

Workshops were held at the university in a regular classroom. The first workshop, presentation skills, was delivered by the author (the course professor) with the students observing from the back of the classroom. This enabled the students to observe the professor and residents in action, and also to serve as an ice-breaker for the residents, many of whom reported having never been to a university campus before. For the remaining five workshops, all materials were prepared and provided by the student trainers, along with all facilitation of the exercises. Only HH residents made up the training group (e.g. no students other than the trainers were present). The professor and the Executive Director from HH observed from the back of the room and provided written and verbal feedback to the student trainers upon completion of their workshop. All residents received a certificate on completion of the six workshops at an informal “graduation” ceremony at the end of the last class.

The current study aimed to gauge the impact of the training program on the communication skills and recovery capital of residents of HH by using qualitative interviews to identify what Kibel (1999) calls success markers or statements that describe the “transformational changes and incremental gains” (Thayer, Fox, & Koszewski, 2002, “Evaluation Strategies” section, para. 2) that program participants have observed as a result of their participation in the program. Specifically, the following research question was posed: What is the impact of a series of communication skills workshops on the relationships and recovery capital of young men in treatment for substance abuse? Qualitative methods were used in order to amass a rich description of success markers in the words of the residents themselves and thus, as Cresswell (2007) suggests, kept the focus on the meaning for the participants of their experience in the training program.

Method

Participants

The research participants consisted of 12 residents (currently undergoing a one-year residential rehabilitation program at HH) or recent graduates (those who had completed the initial twelve-month residency at HH and who were living in transitional homes owned by HH) who participated in a series of six three-hour communication skills workshops offered within the scope of an undergraduate communication class at the University of Ottawa. The participants, all male, ranged in age from 15 to 32 with a mean age of 22.75. All were recovering substance abusers with a length of stay at HH ranging from 3 months to 5 years with most reporting a stay of 3-8 months.

Procedures

A graduate research assistant who was trained in qualitative interviewing interviewed participants three months following completion of the program. In order to reduce researcher bias and social desirability on the part of the participants, the student who conducted the interviews was selected because she had not been involved with the training program in any way and was unknown to the participants. Using a semi-structured interview protocol, the participants were asked to reflect on their perceptions of the impact of the training program on their recovery program as well as the ways, if any, that they had used the material presented in the workshops. Interviews were audiotaped and transcribed by the graduate research assistant.

Participants were told that their interview data would be treated as confidential but were aware that it could be used for research purposes in addition to being used for ongoing program evaluation activities at HH. They were told that their names would be disguised to protect their anonymity. Interviews lasted an average of 48 minutes.

Data Analysis

The transcripts were analyzed using a manual coding technique to classify and arrange the qualitative data and gain an understanding of the patterns and themes that emerged. Specifically, to ensure intercoder agreement or cross checking and thus enhance reliability (Creswell, 2007), the analysis followed Creswell (2007, p. 210) in the following way: Four coders (the author and three research assistants) independently reviewed the interview transcripts to identify any salient theme indicating positive changes as identified by the participants themselves. Based on this initial reading, the research team met to present, discuss and agree upon the themes and their operational definitions. From this, a codebook (Creswell, 2007) was developed. Using this codebook, the coders individually coded three randomly selected transcripts and compared findings on a line-by-line basis. Next, the coders independently coded all of the transcripts for references to these identified themes. Finally, the coders met to discuss each transcript and reach agreement on coded units. Disagreements between the coders were resolved through discussion. In this manner, the coders reached 100 per cent agreement on the identification of several themes related to the impact of the training.

Results

Five salient themes, or success markers, emerged. In the following pages, each theme will be briefly defined, several indicators, or concepts that were mentioned during interviews and were coded as reflective of that theme, will be presented and, finally, direct quotations from the interviews to illustrate the theme will be provided. (*Note: Names have been changed to respect anonymity.*)

Use of Communication Skills

This success marker was defined as an ability to interact more effectively with others using the skills learned in the workshop. Specifically, references to any of the following indicators were coded as *Use of Communication Skills*: presentation skills; telephone skills; listening skills; organization skills; social etiquette. Participants had little trouble coming up with specific examples of skills that they had learned during training and their subsequent use at HH. These are organized below into several categories of skills.

Presentation skills. Several participants referred to the impact of the training on their work in the VIP program where they make presentations in the schools. Here is how Ross spoke of the impact of the presentation skills training:

Yeah, for instance, we have the VIP program here. Values, Influences and Peers, where we go to the high school and we share our stories with the students. It's the most difficult part, I think it is, but I think this program definitely helped me to do that. To break that fear, because you have to stand up in front of a group, not only that, but you have to talk about personal problems that happened in your life as well, so it makes it even tougher in a way too. But this made me get up and have more confidence, just in speaking, to

breathe properly and it taught you all these techniques on how to stand up and present yourself...

Luc stated simply that the most important skills that he had learned related to the presentation skills course:

I would probably say the one that sticks out the most would be presentation skills, just how to properly introduce someone, a guest speaker, and how to properly introduce yourself when you are that guest speaker is probably the biggest thing that I learned from it.

Social etiquette skills. Several students referred specifically to the dining skills learned in the social etiquette workshop. Jason, for example, spoke of pride in being able to use the social etiquette skills and tie his tie:

I don't know if this is going to make any sense, but like the supper we had for Christmas. You know, we learned social etiquette that tells where to place the plates, the bowls, and you know, some of us did it to set the table for everyone. We were happy, we were proud. Same as dressing up and knowing how to tie our ties.

Telephone communication skills. Several participants spoke of how they had transferred things they had learned to their work selling cards and calendars in the phone room. Allan, for example, spoke of the impact of the communication skills training on his approach to phone sales:

Well, the impact is that my success in the phone room has changed. It has gone up! The other night I sold 20 packs of calendars.

Uncertainty Reduction about Post-Secondary Education

This success marker was defined as uncertainty reduction and confidence building as a result of actively attending classes held on the university campus, in a classroom with a professor and university students. Specifically, references that referred to any of the following indicators were coded as *Uncertainty Reduction about Post-secondary Education*: being trusted to go the university; gaining confidence and familiarity with a campus; having positive thoughts of self efficacy ("I can succeed at school"). This success marker fell into two broad categories. The first reflected themes around uncertainty reduction and "getting to know what university was like" and the second reflected an extension of this towards self efficacy, or a confidence in one's own ability to pursue post-secondary education.

Uncertainty reduction. Several examples illustrate this success marker. Jason, when asked what he liked about the whole experience, stated:

I think the setting, you know, being in a group, and interacting with the students in the class I guess, because, you know, with the lifestyle that I had, I wasn't really with students. I was with dealers, pushers, fiends...

Brad, who reported having never been on a campus before, stated:

I've never been in an environment like that, at a university campus. So I was pretty happy to go out there and have that opportunity. I think it will stick with me for a long time.

And James simply stated:

I like that I was going to a university, it was my first taste of it.

Self efficacy. Three examples show the impact of the training on participants' self efficacy, or confidence in their ability to continue their education. Peter suggested that he enjoyed the chance to "try out" university and gained confidence in his own abilities: "...just really getting a taste of the university, seeing that it's not so hard, that I could put a project like that together" and Randy stated:

Even though they were just small workshops, it makes me see that furthering my education is a lot easier than I thought it could be.

Finally, Allan referred to the chance to be on the campus and that this reinforced his desire to attend university:

It gave me an opportunity to be in a university style setting, so that confirmed the fact that I would like to go to school and that I'm comfortable in that setting. ... I haven't had that, in probably ten years, so it just, you know, I was doubting whether I wanted to go to school. It's kind of a scary thought when you've been out of school for 10 years and you've been in rehab for two. And that just helped, you know, to show me that there is nothing to be scared of. It's just like regular life.

A Positive Non-drug School-based Experience

This success marker was defined as an enjoyable experience in which the participant engaged in the learning process and observed role models of positive learning. Specifically, references that referred to any of the following indicators were coded as *A Positive Non-drug School-based Experience*: listening/learning/participating in class; enjoying the learning experience; seeing engaged students in action. The data fell within two broad categories in terms of a positive non-drug school based experience. The first reflected references to enjoyment of the learning experience and the second to comments about observing positive role models.

Enjoyment of the experience. Many participants referred specifically to how much they had enjoyed the learning experience. Adam, for example, spoke of the practical nature of the course material:

Well, I think the most useful part of the workshops was the fact that we were learning about things that we can use on a day-to-day basis. Not just learning about some, you know, some rhetorical or esoteric nonsense that we are never going to practically use. So, I think that the content itself is useful.

Michael, similarly, talked about the applicability of the material covered in the workshops:

I felt good when I was learning. For the first time I was learning things that I can apply directly to my life. Just being able to learn that sort of thing gave me the ambition to want to do well, to want to do my school work so that I could eventually reach that stage at university.

Randy also discussed how much he had enjoyed learning, making reference to changes to his self concept as a learner, and expressed surprise that school could actually be fun:

It was great to see myself being in a classroom, understanding it and getting something out of it and being excited to be there. I definitely enjoyed it a lot. When it was done I definitely wanted to do more. And, it was a weird feeling actually enjoying being in a classroom.

Observing positive role models. Several participants spoke of the impact of seeing university students as positive role models for learning. James, for example, reflected on the kind of people that he perceived the university students to be:

The way the people thought -- I could tell it was completely different than here at Harvest House, or when you're out rolling on the streets of Toronto. People just act differently and I could tell. University people have something to offer, they're not just trying to take, you know. That to me was really cool, I noticed that. They didn't want anything from us. I'm not used to that. They were trying to give us knowledge.

Peer Mentoring

This success marker was defined as sharing new knowledge with others back at HH and reinforcing their learning with other participants. Specifically, references that referred to any of the following indicators were coded as *Peer Mentoring*: sharing new knowledge with others at HH who did not attend; reinforcement among participants who had also attended; being an example for others. Michael spoke of conversations he had back at HH about some of the material, in particular the portfolio building workshop:

I asked a couple of the guys in my room that were in the presentation. We just went over what we learned. So I talked to a couple of the guys about what they thought should be in the portfolio and asked a couple of questions about what I wasn't clear on.

Bruce spoke of trying out the skills he had learned with residents who had not attended the workshops, and of their reaction to his attempts to transfer his learning:

I think it's like, coming back to the house and trying an immediate application of what we learned. Trying different interactions with other guys who didn't go, it was different. Because we were passing off knowledge that we learned to them too, and they were just like, "Oh you learned that? Cool."

Increased Respect from Others and Self

This success marker was defined as a feeling of positive regard from friends, family members or staff at Harvest House, along with self-respect and self esteem as a result of their participation. Specifically, references that referred to any of the following indicators were coded as *Increased Respect from Others and Self*: reflections of positive feedback about the training program from family, HH staff, friends; signs of respect from the students/trainers/professor; tangible signs of completion of the training program (e.g. the portfolio, handouts, the certificate); enhanced self esteem. Several participants referred to the certificate that they received at the end of the training program as a tangible sign of their success and, seemingly, as a source of pride. For example, Brad stated:

So it was cool, I got a little certificate, and I say that on the phone to people [when selling calendars] that I did three seminars at University of Ottawa and then they are like "wow, that's good!"

And like many who referred to pride expressed by their parents in learning of their participation in a program at the university, Brad stated:

When I'm talking to my family, I'm telling them that I did that, that I took part and that I take the things they taught us in the seminars seriously. Like my dad was really proud of me... he gave me a lot of respect for that.

And likewise, Michael referred to his dad's pride:

When I got the certificate, that was pretty cool. I'm not even old enough to be in university and I have a certificate. When I called my dad afterwards and told him about my accomplishment he was pretty proud of me. I pretty much destroyed what little relationship I had with him over the past few years, so all these factors are building up a new bridge to connect with him. And him saying he is proud of me for the first time in five years, that had a big impact.

Many participants spoke of the sense of respect that they felt from the student trainers and the professor, and how it helped to build their confidence and self esteem to see that people could perceive them as valuable and worthy of the time and effort that had gone into the communication skills training program. James, for example, spoke to the issues of low self perception and self esteem that must be overcome in recovery:

The most useful thing was that it helped build confidence. And that's been a real big thing for me. Those people were trying to help us, so that proved to me that we were worth helping ... this is a big obstacle for a lot of guys who are coming off drugs and alcohol. You get it drilled in your head that you're nothing and that drugs is all you're good at, so that's why you do them, right? Just for someone to take the time to try and help us, that helped build my confidence more than anything.

Luc also spoke of the respect shown by the professor and students and the impact of this treatment on his sense of self:

Overall it was good because the students and the teachers treated all the guys with a lot of respect. That was important because I know for myself if I was in that situation and had never experienced something like this I would consider them inferior. I'd address them, but not address them as they did. They treated us all with a lot of respect and dignity. And that I think was important.

Discussion

People in treatment for substance addictions who have struggled with building healthy relationships may benefit by skills development in the area of interpersonal communication given that it is so integral to recovery capital. The five themes that emerged in the data all point to the development of some internal and external resources that make up recovery capital.

The references to specific skills gained, and the putting into practice of these skills informally and through peer mentoring, is important and, for this group of adolescents and young adults, seemed to contribute to the development of their personal recovery capital (White & Cloud, 2008) or, more specifically, their intrapersonal and interpersonal skills. References were made to presentation skills, listening skills, and social etiquette (e.g. table manners and dressing appropriately). Furthermore, the peer mentoring reported by many of the participants

gave them a chance to practice (and thus reinforce) their new skills by sharing them with others, and also enabled those who did not attend the training to enjoy some of the benefits. Karcher (2009) found that mentors themselves learned through the experience of mentoring others and that their experience led to greater connectedness to their school and increases in their self esteem. The results reported here showed that participants benefitted both directly and indirectly from the training through the experience of peer mentoring and this, therefore, contributed to their Personal recovery capital.

The data also showed that a training outcome was the exposure of the participants to positive role models, thus contributing to their family/social recovery capital. As Cloud and Granfield (2008) suggest, "Enduring membership in a drug-user subculture permits the development of discordant values that make it difficult to find quitting substance misuse appealing. The practice of associating substance use with "toughness" and "style" as well as seeing drug-related crime as a reasonable occupational option make re-entry into conventional life particularly challenging" (p. 1975). In other words, if drug users maintain their connections with a drug-using subculture and continue to perceive this community positively, then long-term abstinence is very difficult. However, in contrast, if substance abusers associate with non-drug users, perceive these people and the experiences associated with them positively, then this can make long-term recovery more likely.

According to Akers, Krohn, Lanza-Kaduce, & Radosevich (1979), "the probability of abstinence decreases and the frequency of use increases when there is greater exposure to using rather than to abstinent models" (p. 639). While these researchers looked at the friendship networks of recovering adolescents, and while the relationship of the training participants with the role model university trainers was short-term, participants nonetheless spoke of the enjoyment that they felt in associating with students and the pleasure of feeling respect from people who seemed surprisingly accepting, gracious and warm and genuinely interested in their learning experience.

Similarly, as Richter, Brown, & Mott (1991) argue, positive role models reinforce abstinence and demonstrate coping strategies for recovering adolescents and thus it is important that those in recovery observe young people who find enjoyment in learning, in participating in student culture and in working with each other in the university classroom. The fact that participants reported enjoying the experience of working with these young role models, and that the experience gave them the confidence to either complete their GED or consider pursuing higher education, is noteworthy. Certainly it cannot be assumed that the short-term relationship between the student trainers and the residents could be enough to change the trajectory of these adolescents and young adults. However, the exposure to a group of positive role models can contribute a positive dimension to the overall treatment program.

Finally, the data show that the participants perceived that their community recovery capital had been enhanced. Numerous studies have highlighted the importance of rebuilding all aspects of the community of those in recovery (see Meyers, Villaneuva, & Smith, 2005). Specifically, according to these authors the Community Reinforcement Approach (CRA), developed by Hunt and Azrin (1973), assumes that to avoid relapse an individual's community must be restructured in order to make it more rewarding to abstain from substance use than to use. CRA is composed of numerous modules, including relapse prevention training, communication skills development, relational counselling, job skills and social counselling (designed to help identify activities that can be considered fun without drugs or alcohol).

As Meyers et al. (2005) point out, central to the CRA is recognition of the need for those in recovery "to fill their newly found free time in a healthy and satisfying manner that does not

also place them back in an environment with friends who are still using” (p. 249). In other words, it is not just the social network that has to change, but also the activities and places that must be altered to support abstinence. The data show that participants perceived the learning environment to be a fun, interesting and engaging place to be, and that this pleasure could be experienced without the influence of drugs or alcohol.

Practical Implications

At least three practical implications emerge from this study. First, it is clear that learning requires motivation. In other words, for communication skills training participants to actively engage in the learning process, they need to perceive the learning opportunity as necessary to the attainment of their personal goals and interests and, as McCombs (1991) points out, helping a participant to see the link between his or her goals and the learning opportunity can enhance motivation and, ultimately, learning. This link needs to be made explicitly -- and, ideally, experientially -- at the start of the training program and repeated throughout.

Second, as Mills, Dunham and Alpert (1988) argue, instead of seeing high-risk youth as needing to be “fixed” through programs such as counseling, skills training, and other interventions, these approaches might be more effective if they were based on what these authors call a “wellness model”. This model is based on the assumption that these youth possess higher levels of functioning and inherent capabilities that need to be accessed in learning experiences and interventions. Further, it is focusing on these strengths, rather than identifying weaknesses and problem behavior and trying to correct them, that might motivate high-risk youth to engage more actively in the learning process. Based on this strengths-based philosophy, then, communication skills training for young people in treatment for substance abuse must begin by helping a participant to identify his or her particular communication strengths, working to determine what it is that he or she might need to learn and then tailoring the training program to meet these objectives.

Finally, as Jack and Jordan (1999) have argued, social capital – and, by extension, recovery capital -- is built on a foundation of trust. Vulnerable people must trust that those with whom they engage, particularly those who present opportunities for community recovery capital, will treat them decently, fairly, and honestly. The building of trust between training program participants and between participants and their trainers is necessary. Trust building components therefore should be included in communication skills training programs.

Conclusion

Abstaining from substance use is a complex and multi-faceted challenge for those who suffer from addiction, and exposure to a few sessions of communication skills training is not enough to alter patterns of behaviour that may have persisted over years and that, according to many researchers and practitioners, is a chronic illness (e.g. Hser, Hoffman, Grella, & Anglin, 2001; McLellan, Lewis, O'Brien, & Kleber, 2000) stemming from both genetic and non-genetic factors (Kendler, Prescott, Myers, Neale, 2003; Rhee et al., 2003). Furthermore, there is much evidence that addictive drugs provide a shortcut to the brain's reward system and, given the human brain's great capacity for learning, quickly take over as the main – or only – stimulus that provides pleasure (Crabbe, 2002; Hyman, 2005; Koob, 2004; Nestler, 2001). As a result, treatment must be complex and multi-pronged, often involving psychosocial, behavioral and

drug therapies (Hyman, 2001). Communication skills training, nonetheless, can make a contribution.

Limitations and Future Research

The main limitation of this study is that the small number of subjects interviewed restricts generalizability. While the data provide rich examples of the perceptions of the participants of the impact of the training on their communication skills, interpersonal relationships and recovery program, it is limited to the experience of these particular trainees. It would be safe to assume that these general themes would be found in similar groups of young men in recovery, but it is unclear to what degree and with what differences. Future research could replicate both the training program and the study in order to verify the findings and the conclusions. Furthermore, extending the training to women in recovery, as well as to a sample of older recovering substance abusers and to adolescents, could provide useful insights into the success markers experienced by populations other than young men.

The fact that the training was provided by six different sets of trainers is another limitation. Specifically, because five of the workshops were offered by student groups and one offered by the professor, there was likely considerable variation in skill level in terms of design and delivery of the workshops. To control for this, future research should assess training offered with less variability.

In closing, this research has provided insight into the impact of communication skills training provided by undergraduate students within a service-learning program. While the experience of the undergraduate students themselves was not measured, and this would be an area for future research, the results show that participants reported a number of benefits beyond the specific skills learned in the workshops, most importantly related to the development of recovery capital.

This study has identified incremental changes that participants perceived in their Personal and Family/Social recovery capital (White & Cloud, 2008) following the training. This knowledge will help improve the design and delivery of training programs for recovering substance abusers and could allow other treatment centres to adopt similar approaches. While there is much research to be done on the psychosocial, behavioral and pharmacological aspects of treatment, this study has explored the impact of an experiential learning opportunity for residents of a substance treatment program on the development of recovery capital and shown the success markers that can emerge from such an experience.

References

- Akers, R. L., Krohn, M. D., Lanza-Kaduce, L., & Radosevich, M. (1979). Social learning and deviant behavior: A specific test of a general theory. *American Sociological Review*, 44, 636-655.
- Anderson J. G., & Gilbert F. S. (1989). Communication skills training with alcoholics for improving performance of two of the Alcoholics Anonymous recovery steps. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 50, 361–367
- Bartholomew, N. G., Hiller, M. L., Knight, K., Nucatola, D. C., & Simpson, D. (2000). Effectiveness of communication and relationship skills training for men in substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 18(3), 217-225.
- Bartholomew, N. G., & Simpson, D. D. (1996). *Time Out! For Men: A communication skills and sexuality workshop for men*. Bloomington, IL: Lighthouse Institute Publishing.
- Biernacki, P. (1986). *Pathways from heroin addiction: Recovery without treatment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Booth, B. M., Russell, D. W., Yates, W. R., Laughlin, P. R., Brown, K., & Reed, D. (1992). Social support and depression in men during alcoholism treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse*, 4, 57–67.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the theory of sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Cloud, W., & Granfield, R. (2008). Conceptualizing recovery capital: Expansion of a theoretical construct. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 43(12), 1971-1986.
- Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Suppl. 95), S94-S120.
- Crabbe, J.C. (2002). Genetic contributions to addiction, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 435–62.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- De Civita, M., Dobkin, P. L., & Robertson, E. (2000). A study of barriers to the engagement of significant others in adult addiction treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 19(2), 135–144.
- De Leon, G. (2000). *The therapeutic community: Theory, model, and method*. New York City: Springer Publishing Company.

- Fals Stewart, W., O'Farrell, T. J., & Birchler, G. R. (2001). Behavioral couples therapy for male methadone maintenance patients: Effects on drug-using behavior and relationship adjustment. *Behavior Therapy*, 32(2), 391-411.
- Gaffney, L. R., Thorpe, K., Young, R., Collett, R., & Occhipinti, S. (1998). Social skills, expectancies, and drinking in adolescents. *Addictive Behaviors*, 23(5), 587-599.
- Gordon, A. J. & Zrull, M. (1991). Social networks and recovery: one year after inpatient treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 8, 143-152.
- Granfield, R., & Cloud, W. (1999). *Coming clean: Overcoming addiction without treatment*. New York: New York University Press.
- Granfield, R., & Cloud, W. (2001). Social capital and natural recovery: The role of social relationships in overcoming addiction without treatment. *Substance Use and Misuse*, 36, 1543–1579.
- Hoffman, J., & Froemke, S. (2007). *Addiction: Why can't they just stop?* New York: Rodale Press.
- Hover, S., & Gaffney, L. R. (1991). The relationship between social skills and adolescent drinking. *Alcohol and Alcoholism*, 26, 207-214
- Hser, Y. I., Hoffman, V., Grella, C. E., & Anglin, M.D. (2001). A 33-year follow-up of narcotics addicts. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 58, 503-508.
- Hunt, G. M., & Azrin, N. H. (1973). A community-reinforcement approach to alcoholism. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 11, 91-104.
- Hyman, S. E. (2001). A 28-Year-Old Man Addicted to Cocaine, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 286, 2586–94.
- Hyman, S. E. (2005). Addiction: A disease of learning and memory. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 162, 1414–1422.
- Jack, G., & Jordan, B. (1999). Social capital and child welfare. *Children and Society*, 13, 242-256.
- Karcher, M. (2009). Increases in academic connectedness and self-esteem among high school students who serve as cross-age peer mentors. *Professional School Counselling*, 12, 292-299.
- Kendler, K. S., Prescott, C. A., Myers, J., & Neale, M. C. (2003). The structure of genetic and environmental risk factors for common psychiatric and substance use disorders in men and women. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 60, 929-937.

- Kibel, B. (1999). Success stories as hard data, New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Koob, G F., et al. (2004). Neurobiological mechanisms in the transition from drug use to drug dependence. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 27, 739-49.
- McCombs, B. (1991). Motivation and lifelong learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 26(2), 117-127.
- McLellan, A. T., Arndt, I. O., Metzger, D. S., Woody, G. E., & O'Brien, C. P. (1993). The effects of psychosocial services in substance abuse treatment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 269, 1953-1959.
- McLellan, A. T., Lewis, D. C., O'Brien, C. P., & Kleber, H. D. (2000). Drug dependence, a chronic medical illness: Implications for treatment, insurance, and outcomes evaluation. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 284, 1689-1695
- Meyers, R. J., Villanueva, M., & J. E. Smith. (2005). The Community Reinforcement Approach: History and new directions *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly*, 19, 247-260.
- Miller, W. R. (1992). The effectiveness of treatment for substance abuse: Reasons for optimism, *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 9, 93-102.
- Mills, R. C., Dunham, R. G., Alpert, G. P. (1988). Working with high-risk youth in prevention and early intervention programs: toward a comprehensive wellness model. *Adolescence*, 23, 643-60.
- Nestler, E. J. (2001). Total recall – the memory of addiction, *Science*, 292, 2266–67.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rhee, S.H., Hewitt, J. K, Young, S. E., Corley, R. P., Crowley, T. J., & Stallings, M. C. (2003). Genetic and environmental influences on substance initiation, use, and problem use in adolescents. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 60, 1256-1264.
- Richter, S. S., Brown, S. A., & Mott, M. A. (1991). The impact of social support and self-esteem on adolescent substance abuse treatment outcome. *Journal of Substance Abuse*, 3(4), 371-385.
- Simpson, D. D., Joe, G. W., Rowan-Szal, G. A., & Greener, J. M. (1997). Drug abuse treatment options that improve retention. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 14,(6) 565-572.
- Thayer, C. E., Fox, M., & Koszewski, W. (2002). Helping families transition from welfare to work. *Journal of Extension* 40,(3). Retrieved December 6, 2011, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2002june/iw2.php>

- Wekerle, C., Leung, E., Goldstein, A., Thornton, T., & Tonmyr, L. (2009). *Substance use among adolescents in child welfare versus adolescents in the general population: A comparison of the Maltreatment and Adolescent Pathways (MAP) longitudinal study and the Ontario Student Drug Use Survey (OSDUS) datasets*. London, ON: University of Western Ontario.
- Werner, E. (1986). Resilient offspring of alcoholics: A longitudinal study from birth to age 18. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 47, 34-40.
- White, W. (2002). *An addiction recovery glossary: The languages of American communities of recovery*. Retrieved December 6, 2011 from <http://www.bhrm.org/advocacy/add-rec-glossary.pdf>
- White, W., & Cloud, W. (2008). Recovery capital: A primer for addiction professionals. *Counselor, The Magazine for Addiction Professionals*, 9, 22-27.
- White, W., & Kurtz, E. (2005). The varieties of recovery experience. *International Journal of Self Help and Self Care*, 3, 21–61.

Author

JENEPHER LENNOX TERRION (jlennoxt@uottawa.ca), Associate Professor, Department of Communication, University of Ottawa

Spanish After Service-Learning: A Comparative Study

Laura Kanost

Service-learning has become my answer to an intermediate Spanish student population that is generally motivated to improve—they have, after all, chosen to continue studying Spanish after completing the four-semester basic language sequence—but that tends to view language use as a question of “getting the answer right” in a classroom rather than as a way of interacting with other people here in a small Midwest college town and in their home communities. In my Spanish Conversation course, many of these students are initially limited by two related issues: anxiety about speaking Spanish, and limited experience using Spanish outside of class. Service-learning provides structured opportunities to bridge classroom and real-world language use, allowing these students to combat anxiety with experience, and apply textbook information along with other resources in the process of achieving specific goals alongside a community partner.

Through constant oral and written reflections over the course of each semester, I witnessed the majority of my students gaining confidence, linguistic and cultural proficiency, and awareness of the ways they could use Spanish in their everyday lives and wide variety of future careers—right in line with the findings of a growing number of descriptive articles and case studies.¹ Although longitudinal research has indicated that service-learning fosters academic achievement, self-efficacy, civic engagement, social skills, and identity development (Astin et al 2000, Jones and Abes 2004, Kiely 2004), existing scholarship has not, to my knowledge, investigated long-term effects of service-learning experiences specifically on language learners.

ABSTRACT

To begin to assess the impact of service-learning participation on subsequent use of Spanish, this study compares survey responses of students who completed conventional and service-learning sections of the same intermediate university Spanish conversation course. Their responses suggest that the students who experienced service-learning generally describe themselves as more confident language users who continue their studies and use Spanish in their everyday lives at higher rates. In contrast, students who had completed the conventional sections tended to focus more on information learned and a greater percentage of them reported going on to study abroad.

The present study takes a step toward filling this gap by quantitatively comparing survey responses of my former service-learning conversation students with those of students who took the same course without a service-learning component. In comparison to those who had completed the conventional sections of the course, students who had completed the service-learning sections were—perhaps counterintuitively—less likely to report participation in study abroad, but as might be expected, more likely to report using Spanish within their everyday lives and by continuing their Spanish coursework. The service-learning group was much more likely than the conventional group to identify improved confidence as a factor in their language use after completing the course.

Service Component

Due to limitations in community opportunities as well as the need to align with the conventional sections of the course, the required total number of community service hours for the semester was set at a modest 9. This number was achievable with an average of one hour per week in the community, allowing time to organize the projects at the beginning of the semester, a week off for a holiday break, and time at the end of the semester to prepare for finals. At the beginning of the semester, students were given a list of possible projects and were invited to submit proposals for additional projects featuring oral communication at least 50% in Spanish. In their first meeting, students and their community contacts worked together to complete an activity identifying goals and methods for their projects. Each week students completed a guided reflection, alternating between individual and group, written and oral formats. In addition, I maintained communication with the community partners in order to incorporate their feedback.

The local Spanish-speaking community is small; according to U.S. Census Bureau 2006-2010 American Community Survey, 1,294 +/- 302 residents spoke Spanish at home (2.7% +/- 0.6% of the total population). In order to place 12 to 30 students each semester in service-learning collaborations with native or heritage speakers of Spanish, an eclectic approach was essential; projects involving the local community were combined with a conversation partnership via Skype that developed an international micro-community based on a common desire to improve conversational and cultural proficiency.

In the local community, several continuous partnerships were established. Each semester, a few students served as mentors and ESL tutors for native Spanish speakers enrolled at the local high school. A few participated in a mentorship and conversation group with socioeconomically disadvantaged bilingual young adults pursuing alternative vocational education. One or two students completed additional domestic violence and sexual assault awareness training in order to serve as informal interpreters or collaborate with me on translations for the local Crisis Center. Most recently, we began placing a small number of students at the local bilingual preschool, where they designed and led activities related to their majors (art, biology) and assisted in regular programs. Student-initiated projects have included mentorship through Big Brothers/Big Sisters, teaching salsa dance lessons in the community, assisting with English classes at a local church, and developing materials to facilitate communication between the university equestrian team and the Spanish-speaking workers who cared for their horses. To complement these local opportunities, each semester several students were paired with conversation partners who were students at the National Autonomous University of Mexico and wanted to pursue conversational English practice. The conversation partners met via Skype, often in the evenings or on weekends, and participated in extensive

discussions of everything from idiomatic expressions to international politics to recent films. An additional advantage to including this option was that it accommodated the needs of students whose other responsibilities outside of class would not allow them to participate during regular working hours. The need to think more flexibly about community became an opportunity for all course participants to explore the concept together throughout the semester.

Survey Design and Results

The survey was designed under IRB supervision and administered online in April 2011 to all students who had taken Advanced Spanish Conversation at Kansas State University from Fall 2007 to Fall 2010.² Without their knowledge, survey participants were divided into two groups. Group A had completed a service-learning section of the course taught by me; Group B had completed a conventional section of the course, taught by one of several other faculty members. The service-learning and conventional sections of the course were not differentiated by a special title in the schedule or catalog, but my sections were always the only service-learning sections offered. 59 out of 109 students in Group A (54%) and 72 out of 178 in Group B (40%) completed the survey. The online survey was set not to allow respondents to go back and change previously entered answers. All respondents described themselves as native speakers of English, with the exception of one native French speaker in Group A. The demographic makeup of the two groups was remarkably similar (see Appendices for complete survey and summaries of quantitative data). The first survey question after the collection of demographic data asked respondents to select all applicable descriptors of their usage of Spanish before taking Advanced Spanish Conversation. The two groups' prior experiences were also very comparable, with Group A reporting having used Spanish with family and friends or conversation partners at slightly higher rates and in community volunteer work at a slightly lower rate when compared to Group B.

Respondents were next asked to select the three most important things they took away from the class. In Group A, the most frequently selected responses were improved proficiency (78%), improved self-confidence in speaking (69%), and expanded vocabulary (66%). The most frequently selected responses in Group B were expanded vocabulary (84%), improved proficiency (65%), and improved self-confidence in speaking (52%). Thus, the two groups identified the same three results in greatest numbers, but Group A identified gains in skills at higher rates, whereas Group B valued its improvement in learning information at a higher rate. Continuing this pattern, 32% in Group A versus 1% in Group B selected "becoming involved in volunteer work or service-learning for the first time," while 19% in Group A versus 31% in Group B selected "learned about Spanish-speaking cultures."

The next survey question asked respondents to select all applicable descriptors of their usage of Spanish since finishing the conversation course. In this question, the percentages of respondents who reported having used Spanish in volunteer work and in their jobs were nearly identical in the two groups. However, because Group A had reported using Spanish as volunteers at a lower rate prior to taking the course, to reach the final number Group A saw a 150% increase in using Spanish as volunteers, while Group B increased by 50%. Both groups reported having used Spanish with family and friends/conversation partners at slightly higher rates after taking the conversation course, with slightly higher percent increases and higher final numbers in Group A. Strikingly, Group B had a substantially lower percentage go on to take more Spanish courses (76% compared to 90% in Group A) but significantly higher percentages go on to travel or study abroad. Overall, 88% of respondents in Group A and 72% of Group B

reported having used Spanish in their home communities (selecting one or more of the following options: with family, with friends/conversation partners, as a community volunteer, in my job); 47% of Group A and 60% of Group B reported having used Spanish abroad (selecting one or more of the following options: short-term travel, summer study abroad, semester study abroad, year study abroad). These numbers seem to suggest a positive association between service-learning and student retention³ and a tendency among service-learning participants to view Spanish as a skill that is a part of their everyday lives. On the other hand, study respondents who had not taken part in service-learning appear to have been more likely to see Spanish as information to be learned in class and to be used abroad. Responses to the open-ended final question illuminate these differences.

The final question asked if the respondents' experiences in Advanced Spanish Conversation had an important effect on their ability and/or motivation to take part in the activities selected in the previous question. They were asked to explain. In Group A, 83% clearly stated Yes and 17% clearly stated No. In Group B, 67.4% clearly answered Yes, 15.2% clearly answered No, and 17.4% of the answers were ambivalent, doubtful, or did not directly address the question. Thus, Group A seems to have a stronger and more positive conviction about the relationship between the course and their subsequent language use. In both groups' explanations of the relationship between the course and their subsequent language use, by far the most commonly identified factor was reduced anxiety/increased self-confidence. However, Group A respondents were much more likely to make this observation (50% of Group A versus 28% in Group B). Group A's higher retention rates may reflect this awareness of increased confidence and apparent view of language as a skill that can be developed and applied not just abroad, but at home. Some sample responses from both groups vividly illustrate their differing tendencies:

It is very important for people learning a language to have the opportunity to speak the language as much as possible. This doesn't always happen, even in conversation classes; but being partnered with a native Spanish speaker really helped me feel more comfortable practicing my Spanish. Being more comfortable made me more confident and able to use the language skills that I had learned. (Group A)

It helped make me much more confident with native speakers and in class, and decreased the amount of time I spent searching for words in the middle of a sentence- my speech flows much more smoothly now thanks to all the practice on Skype. I cannot recommend the Skype project enough! It was fantastic and I'd do it again in a heartbeat. In spring 2010, I volunteered as an English teacher for Spanish speakers with little to no English skills. It was difficult because I didn't really know how to teach English, but extremely rewarding to explain what the students needed/wanted to know. I also spent a summer working at Chipotle, and I was one of only two Caucasians on staff who knew Spanish more or less fluently. I was always translating things for the other white people I worked with, and my coworkers (and even some Latino customers!) were much more comfortable talking to me in their native language than they were trying to speak English with the English-only staff. I fit right in there! (Group A)

Yes, I believe that the exposure to new vocabulary (and the ability to pick and choose the vocab that we wanted to learn instead of just memorizing a list) as well as the opportunity to discuss important topics in small groups in Spanish helped me gain more confidence in

my speaking abilities. Also the book (Breaking Out of Beginner's Spanish) was extremely helpful in this class, and I still use it to this day. (Group B)

Yes. Advanced Spanish Conversation really improved my vocabulary and forced me to finally talk in a Spanish course. I still am not completely comfortable with speaking, nor do I feel that I am a fluent speaker, but this course made me more brave in Spanish speaking, less timid. Before I really tried to think out everything before I said it making sure the grammar was exact and all. It really has helped me in just short conversations when I travel to Spanish-speaking countries. (Group B)

All four comments assess their learning in the course positively, but the respondents from Group A refer to skills, practice, and language use at home, while the Group B respondents identify information (vocabulary) learned and language use abroad.

Conclusions

This preliminary comparison suggests that even a small number of service hours, when integrated cohesively throughout a semester, can make a significant difference in Spanish learners' reported self-confidence in speaking, perception of language as a useful skill in their everyday lives, and subsequent enrollment in Spanish courses. The data gathered also suggest that, perhaps because of these gains, students with local service-learning experience may be less likely to choose to study abroad. This finding adds complexity to the existing understanding of factors that contribute to student intent to study abroad, which generally associates language proficiency, desire to learn about other countries, and participation in community and diversity activities with higher levels of intent to study abroad (see Rust et al 2007/2008; Stroud 2010). The discrepancy observed here resembles a conclusion by Salisbury et al 2009, who found in their study of data from the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education: "While a positive attitude toward literacy and increased diverse interactions had significant positive effects on the intent to study abroad, high school involvement in activities that might provide social capital (one's networks for acquiring knowledge) or cultural capital (experiences and information that broaden one's horizons) had a significant negative, albeit small, effect on intent to study abroad". These researchers thus suggest that "there may be different types of social and cultural capital that benefit different types of equally important educational experiences." (p. 139) Since service-learning participation appears to have made my students focus so much on local uses of their language skills that many of them lost sight of opportunities abroad, it is advisable to incorporate additional structured reflection on the international applications and extensions of these skills throughout such a course.

A limitation of the present study is that in addition to the variable being examined—service-learning participation—the two groups differed in one other significant way: instructor. Future research should be designed to compare sections of the same course taught by the same instructor, with the only difference being the service-learning component. A full-fledged longitudinal study following up with cohorts of students at the same time intervals would be preferable to the "snapshot" approach taken here.

Notes

1. See, for example, Hale 1999; Lear and Abbott 2008; Mullaney 1999; Muñoz-Christian 2010; Plann 2002, and Weldon and Trautmann 2003.
2. My sincere gratitude to my colleague Mary Copple for her essential assistance with the survey design and data interpretation for this study.
3. Service-learning participation seems to have a positive effect on student retention in general, as indicated by studies of first-year college students by Keup 2005 and by Gallini and Moely 2003.

References

- Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service learning affects students*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved from <http://heri.ucla.edu/PDFs/HSLAS/HSLAS.PDF>
- Gallini, S. M. & Moely, B. E. (2003). Service-learning and engagement, academic challenge, and retention. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(1), 5-14.
- Hale, A. (1999). Service-learning and Spanish: A missing link." In J. Hellebrandt & L.T. Varona (Eds.), *Construyendo puentes (Building bridges)—Concepts and models for service learning in Spanish* (pp. 9-31). Washington, D.C.:American Association for Higher Education.
- Jones, S. R. & Abes, E. S. (2004). Enduring influences of service-learning on college students' identity development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(2), 149-66.
- Keup, J. R. (2005). The impact of curricular interventions on intended second-year enrollment. *Journal of College Student Retention* 7(1-2), 61-89.
- Kiely, R. (2004). A chameleon with a complex: Searching for transformation in International service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10 (2), 5-20.
- Lear, D. W. & Abbott, A.R. (2008). Foreign language professional standards and CSL: Achieving the 5 C's. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 14(2), 76-86.
- Mullaney, J. (1999). Service-learning and language-acquisition theory and practice. In J. Hellebrandt & L. T. Varona (Eds.), *Construyendo puentes (Building bridges) Concepts and models for service learning in Spanish* (pp. 49-60). Washington, D.C.:American Association for Higher Education.
- Muñoz-Christian, K. (2010). Beyond the language lab: serving and learning in dual immersion classrooms. *Information for Action: A Journal for Service-Learning Research with Children and Youth* 2(1), 1-14.
- Plann, S. J. (2002). Latinos and literacy: An upper-division Spanish course with service learning. *Hispania* 85(2), 330-38.
- Rust, V., Dhanatya, C., Furuto, L. H. L, & Kheiltash, O. (2008). Student involvement as predictive of college freshmen plans to study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* 15, 1-16.
- Salisbury, M. H., Umbach, P.D., Paulsen, M.B., & Pascarella, E.T. (2009). Going global: Understanding the choice process of the intent to study abroad. *Research in Higher Education* 50, 119–39.

Stroud, A. H. (2010). Who plans (not) to study abroad? An examination of U.S. student intent. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 14(5), 491-507.

Weldon, A. & Trautmann, G. (2003). Spanish and service-learning: Pedagogy and praxis. *Hispania* 86(3), 574-85.

Appendix A: Survey

Survey Description

Prof. Kanost is studying the paths students take in their use of Spanish after completing Advanced Spanish Conversation at Kansas State University. Your completion of this brief survey is optional, anonymous, and highly appreciated. Please direct any questions or concerns—including inquiries about any future published form of this study—to Dr. Kanost. By completing the survey, you indicate your consent to participate anonymously in this research study, the results of which will be presented and/or published in the future. Thank you in advance for your valuable contribution to this research.

Opening Instructions

We estimate that this survey will take 5 minutes to complete. All answers are anonymous. You may choose not to answer a question or questions if you so desire.

Page 1

Before we begin, we need to collect some demographic information.

Question 1: Sex

Question 2: Year of birth

Question 3: Native language(s)

Question 4: Number of years of HIGH SCHOOL Spanish completed

Question 5: Major(s) at Kansas State University

Page 2

This survey will ask about ways you used Spanish before, during, and after taking Advanced Spanish Conversation.

Page 3

First we would like to know how you used your Spanish BEFORE taking Advanced Spanish Conversation.

Question 6: Before I took Advanced Spanish Conversation (SPAN 420), I had used my Spanish in the following settings (check ALL that apply):

- ☐ in other Spanish classes
- ☐ with my family
- ☐ with friends or conversation partners
- ☐ as a community volunteer
- ☐ in my job
- ☐ in short-term travel to a Spanish-speaking country (such as a vacation or mission trip)
- ☐ on a summer study abroad program

- ☐ on a semester-long study abroad program
- ☐ on a year-long study abroad program
- ☐ Other:

Page 4

Next we will ask about your experience in Advanced Spanish Conversation.

Question 7 : Thinking back on my experience as a student in Advanced Spanish Conversation, the three most important things I got out of this class were (select three):

- ☐ became a more proficient or fluent Spanish-speaker
- ☐ became more familiar with reading and film analysis techniques
- ☐ became involved in volunteer work or service-learning (aprendizaje-servicio) for the first time
- ☐ continued my previous involvement in volunteer work or service-learning (aprendizaje-servicio)
- ☐ expanded my vocabulary
- ☐ gained self-confidence in speaking
- ☐ got to know my classmates
- ☐ improved my pronunciation
- ☐ learned about Spanish-speaking cultures
- ☐ Other:

Page 5

Lastly, we would like to know how you have used your Spanish AFTER finishing Advanced Spanish Conversation.

Question 8: After I finished Advanced Spanish Conversation, I have gone on to use my Spanish in the following settings (check all that apply):

- ☐ in other Spanish classes
- ☐ with my family
- ☐ with friends or conversation partners
- ☐ as a community volunteer
- ☐ in my job
- ☐ in short-term travel to a Spanish-speaking country (such as a vacation or mission trip)
- ☐ on a summer study abroad program
- ☐ on a semester-long study abroad program
- ☐ on a year-long study abroad program
- ☐ Other:

Question 9: Did your experiences in Advanced Spanish Conversation (SPAN 420) have an important effect on your ability and/or motivation to take part in the above activities? Please explain.

Closing Message

Thank you very much for completing the survey. We hope you found it useful in gaining awareness of your own path as a language learner. The anonymous data collected will be used to help identify effects of participation in service-learning on students' subsequent engagement of Spanish-speaking communities, particularly involvement in study abroad and community service. Future presentation/publication of this study will be an original contribution to knowledge of the effects of service-learning pedagogy on language learners. Please direct any questions to Dr. Kanost.

Appendix B: Demographic Data

	Group A (service-learning)	Group B (conventional)
Number of respondents	59 out of 109	72 out of 178 (3 dropped out after starting)
Sex	14 males (23.73%), 45 females (76.27%)	12 males (16%), 62 females (82.67%), 1 N/R
Year of birth	1986: 4 1987: 13 1988: 13 1989: 16 1990: 9 1991: 4	1982: 2 1985: 2 1986: 8 1987: 10 1988: 19 1989: 20 1990: 10 1991: 3
Years of high school Spanish	0: 2 (3.39%) 1: 0 (0%) 2: 8 (13.56%) 3: 8 (13.56%) 4: 41 (69.49%)	0: 2 (2.67%) 1: 1 (1.33%) 2: 6 (8%) 3: 14 (18.67%) 4: 49 (65.33%) N/R: 3 (4%)
Major(s)	Spanish (including dual majors and Spanish Education): 15 (25%) Other: 44 (75%)	Spanish (including dual majors and Spanish Education): 17 (23%) Other: 57 (77%)

Appendix C: Summary of Responses

Thinking back on my experience as a student in SPAN 420, the three most important things I got out of this class were (select three)

	Group A (service-learning)	Group B (conventional)
became a more proficient or fluent Spanish-speaker	46 (77.97%)	49 (65.33%)
became more familiar with reading and film analysis techniques	10 (16.95%)	17 (22.67%)
became involved in volunteer work or service-learning (aprendizaje-servicio) for the first time	19 (32.2%)	1 (1.33%)
continued my previous involvement in volunteer work or service-learning (aprendizaje-servicio)	9 (15.25%)	0 (0%)
expanded my vocabulary	39 (66.1%)	63 (84%)
gained self-confidence in speaking	41 (69.49%)	39 (52%)
got to know my classmates	21 (35.59%)	19 (25.33%)
improved my pronunciation	29 (49.15%)	34 (45.33%)

learned about Spanish-speaking cultures	11 (18.64%)	23 (30.67%)
Other: _____	2 (3.39%)	6 (8%)
N/R	0	2 (2.67%)

Appendix D: Summary of Responses

Before (After) I took Advanced Spanish Conversation (SPAN 420), I used my Spanish in the following settings (check ALL that apply)

	Group A before	Group A after	Group B before	Group B after
in other Spanish classes	57 (96.61%)	53 (89.83%)	74 (98.67%)	57 (76%)
with my family	10 (16.95%)	13 (22.03%)	10 (13.33%)	11 (14.67%)
with friends or conversation partners	37 (62.71%)	50 (84.75%)	40 (53.33%)	49 (65.33%)
as a community volunteer	4 (6.78%)	10 (16.95%)	8 (10.67%)	12 (16%)
in my job	9 (15.25%)	22 (37.29%)	11 (14.67%)	29 (38.67%)
in short-term travel to a Spanish-speaking country (such as a vacation or mission trip)	23 (38.98%)	18 (30.51%)	29 (38.67%)	28 (37.33%)
on a summer study abroad program	4 (6.78%)	10 (16.95%)	5 (6.67%)	17 (22.67%)
on a semester-long study abroad program	2 (3.39%)	4 (6.78%)	1 (1.33%)	10 (13.33%)

on a year-long study abroad program	1 (1.69%)	1 (1.69%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other:_____	1 (1.69%)	6 (10.17%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.67%)
N/R	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)

Author

LAURA KANOST, (lakanost@ksu.edu), Assistant Professor of Spanish, Department of Modern Languages, Kansas State University

ABSTRACT

This article describes and examines the design and assessment practices of a Summer of Service-Learning and Social Justice Program (SSSJP). The program was developed to deepen students' learning outcomes through strategically constructing multiple high impact practices: service-learning, an internship, a learning community, collaborative projects and common intellectual experiences. The program and assessment instruments were constructed to build a culture of evidence and inquiry among service-learning educators in a new era for service-learning. Instruments were fashioned to measure evidence of student learning in cultural pluralism, civic engagement, self-direction, curiosity, leadership, and critical reflection in a service-learning and social justice program or course.

A New Era for Service-Learning: Designing an Intentional High Impact Practice

Mandi McReynolds

Introduction

As service-learning educators embark on new horizons for programming, it is imperative for the field to pay close attention to strategic design, implementation, and assessment of programmatic endeavors. Service-Learning educators are entering an era with three demands on the field. First, institutions are stressing high impact teaching practices for all students. Second, civic learning outcomes for higher education have risen to a national call to action. Third, the field of service-learning requires more rigorous explication and examination of learning outcomes and evaluation. Educators must reflect on how their new service-learning programming or courses can answer each of these demands. The purpose of this study is to describe the construction of a Summer of Service-Learning and Social Justice Program (SSSJP) and the assessment strategies for the program. It is to serve as a model for other institutions on intentional programmatic design and evidence-based response to the current era of demands for service-learning education.

The Current Era for Service-Learning

Service-Learning has been a building intellectual movement in education over the past four decades. It has served as a strong pedagogical practice for institutions to meet a vast array of educational goals across a variety of teaching, learning, and research practices within an institution. The field is entering a new era with colleges and universities considering majors and minors in service-learning, faculty developing stronger engaged scholarship, and the beginnings of models for programs and initiatives, which support a holistic view of the “engaged campus.” As service-learning is entering this intellectual growth movement, the question remains: how are institutions and educators committed to service-learning paying attention to the external pressures and markets on the academy and aligning their efforts to meet these demands (Butin, 2010)? The last four years has sparked a national dialogue and reports on high impact practices, civic learning, and evidence-based teaching with focused attention on higher education and service-learning playing a role in meeting these demands.

In 2008, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) released a report entitled *High Impact Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them and Why They Matter?* (Kuh). The report highlighted high impact practices such as service-learning, internships, community learning, collaborative projects and assignments, common intellectual experience and other engaged pedagogies for teaching. Each is essential to meeting vital student-learning outcomes. The publication calls for colleges and universities to create avenues for all students to engage in at least two high impact practices. Institutions are to become intentional and purposeful to ensure all students have opportunities and access to achieving the learning outcomes with high impact practices related to retention and success (Kuh, 2008).

In 2012, just a few years after *High Impact Practices* was published, the Nation’s attention began to focus more intently on civic learning. AAC&U partnered with the Global Perspective Institute, Inc. (GPI), and the U.S. Department of Education to form the National Taskforce on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. The Taskforce developed and published *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future*. The document calls for national action on making undergraduate college students’ civic learning and democratic engagement a top priority. Higher Education is asked to play an important role as an “Intellectual Incubator and Socially Responsible Partner” for the achievement of this national call to action. Two of the four key recommendations for higher education to achieve and demonstrate were first, to foster a civic ethos across all parts of campus and educational culture and second, to advance civic action through transformative partnerships at home and abroad (The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Education, 2012).

As pressure to meet civic learning outcomes and high impact practices have emerged, the institutional demand to produce evidence of achieved learning has heightened. Service-learning has been facing similar pressures. Service-learning research and literature has produced significant evidence and studies to support the impact of service-learning on students’ personal outcomes, academic and intellectual development outcomes, social and community engagement outcomes and civic outcomes (Austin, et al., 2006; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Felten & Clayton, 2011; Conway, Amel, & Gerwien, 2009; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). However, institutions and programs must move beyond focusing on quality of service-learning as a pedagogical method and student self-reporting assessment to a clear articulation of the expected learning outcomes matched with intentional design and rigorous tools for evaluation. (Eyler, 2011; Bringle & Hatcher, 2009; Hatcher & Bringle, 2010; Ash & Clayton, 2009; Hatcher, 2011). Critical reflection is the thread which links all service-learning programs together;

therefore, it can serve as a purposeful platform for evidences of learning and transferable assessment tools. New methods of qualitative and quantitative mix-method approaches with critical reflection as a base for the assessment is needed to create cross-institutional and cross-disciplinary tools. Once these tools are developed, dissemination of new instruments can be used to improve the quality of service-learning and growth of the field (Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, & Kerrigan, 2001; Molee, Henry, Sessa, & McKinney-Prupis, 2010; Steinbrg, Hatcher, & Bringle, 2011).

In this new era of high impact practices, demands for civic learning and spirit of inquiry has advanced the platform for service-learning and social justice programs to become the channel to achieve the desired outcomes has been elevated. Using assessment, allows practitioners and scholars to utilize the data to move the national conversation from the value of service-learning as a teaching methodology to articulating how service-learning can serve as an evidence-based pedagogical practice for high impact learning and civic engagement.

Program Design

When paired with critical reflection, service-learning provides a channel for students to gain four components of critical consciousness: self-awareness, awareness of others, awareness of social issues, and ethics of service as a change agent. These are characteristics and dispositions, which can influence a student's social justice mindset (Cipolle, 2010; Ash & Clayton, 2009). Intentional service-learning experiences embedded with a local community partner dealing with issues of justice can provide a transformative opportunity for students to move from understanding social justice issues to doing social justice work through service in a reciprocal community partner relationship and meeting community-defined need (Oden & Thomas, 2007). Developing a space for students to experience service-learning and social justice education became a the platform for a midsize Midwest university to pilot high impact practice design, student civic engagement development, and evidence-based programming with direct and indirect assessment design.

In the summer of 2012, the Summer of Service Service-Learning and Social Justice Program (SSSJP) was designed, implemented, and assessed at a midsize Midwest university. The program focused on two aspects of *A Crucible Moment* call to action: transformative partnerships and civic ethos across campus. Faculty, administrative staff, residence life staff, alumni, community partners and students all contributed to the designing and implementation of the SSSJP. As a pilot project, the number of students and agencies were intentionally limited. A smaller participant number allowed the service-learning coordinator to conduct multiple individual meetings with students and agencies to review the program. For seven weeks, the program partnered five undergraduate students and five local non-profit agencies in a service-learning and social justice internship experience. The SSSJP Interns' expectations included spending thirty hours a week serving at their community partner sites and five to ten hours a week completing readings, reflections, team meetings, and volunteering or attending other community events. Each agency and the SSSJP student interns co-created a plan to increase social capital for the agency and the local community. Plans were constructed based the on the community partner's defined need and the student's learning outcomes. Each agency as a co-educator supported an intern through assigning required reading specific to the agency's work in the community, providing an on-site mentor, attending an orientation as a co-facilitator for the program, constructing regular feedback on the intern's performance, and offering the student a proper on-site orientation. SSSJP Interns, the University Service-Learning Coordinator, and the

community partner all co-developed a learning contract for each student's experience.

As a part of the program, interns lived together in a learning community in campus housing. A poverty food simulation was a part of the community living experience and collaborative project design. The group meal budget was the equivalent of the food expense rate for families in the community living on free and reduced lunch incomes. Interns had to work together to develop menus, shop for food, and prepare meals for their community based on the limited budget.

Each SSSJP intern received a \$1,015.00 stipend and paid on-campus housing. The stipends and housing were funded through an internal university grant to support social justice initiatives. The SSSJP Internship was coordinated and overseen by the University Service-Learning Coordinator. Although no interns requested credit, SSSJP Interns had the opportunity to receive credit for their experience and/or meet their engaged citizen, multicultural and global understanding, or experiential learning general education requirements.

The SSSJP Interns worked alongside agencies committed to social change. All the community partner sites dealt with issues of social justice work: race, class, and gender. Therefore, it was important for the program to place equal emphasis on service-learning and social justice. Framing the experience with readings on social justice issues and group critical reflection developed a richer context for the students to dialogue about their own path of activism as they were enriching the local community through their service.

One important note for the design of the program is the intentionality behind the scope of the program. Kuh raises a significant question for consideration of institutions implementing high impact programs to meet learning outcomes. "How do we effectively raise the levels of accomplishment for all students, with special attention to those whose life circumstances—first generation, low income—may put them at particular educational risk (2008)?" This question was paramount for the designers of the SSSJP from the application process to the logistics and duration length. During the application process, applicants were asked for faculty references rather than a GPA requirement. The construction of a seven-week experience with full housing compensation, a stipend, and a community meal plan (based on free and reduced lunch rates) was designed to reduce the financial burden of the program to a student. Students were allowed to carry on other job employment or participate in other summer courses as long as the other experiences did not interfere with the requirements of the SSSJP Program. Four out of the five of participants either were taking other summer courses or held other part-time employment in addition to their SSSJP commitment. Many of the students were allowed to return to other full-time or part-time employment after the seven-week program. During the program, some participants articulated it allowed them to continue to gain financial resources to pay for their higher education experiences. Choosing to create a program for seven weeks provides a student the remaining seven weeks of the summer to return home or visit family. The design increased opportunity for a student from a first generation, low-income background to have this high impact experience with a limited financial burden and the remainder of the summer for educational or at-home engagement.

Student learning was at the center of the program design and elements. The SSSJP focused on learning outcomes in the areas of cultural pluralism, self-direction, curiosity, civic engagement, leadership, and critical reflection. Table 1 demonstrates the correlation of High Impact Learning and the intended outcomes for the SSSJP Program. As seen in Table 2 the AAC& U outcomes are matched with high impact practices and the examples of those practices found in the Summer of Service-Learning and Social Justice Internship Elements of Design.

Table 1: *Correlation of Outcomes for High Impact Learning and SSSJP*

Outcomes for High Impact Learning	Areas of Learning for SSSJP
Fostering Broad Knowledge of Human Cultural and the Natural World	Cultural Pluralism
Strengthening Intellectual and Practical Skills	Self-Direction, Curiosity
Deepening Personal and Social Responsibility	Civic Engagement, Leadership
Practicing Integrated and Applied Learning	Critical Reflection

Table 2: *Correlations among the AAC&U High Impact Outcomes, Practices, and the SSSJP Design*

AAC&U Essential Learning Outcomes for High Impact Practices	AAC&U High Impact Practices	Summer of Service-Learning and Social Justice Internship Elements of Design
Strengthening Intellectual and Practical Skills & Deepening Personal and Social Responsibility	Collaborative Assignments & Projects	Community Exploration & Food Simulation
Strengthening Intellectual and Practical Skills & Practicing Integrated and Applied Learning	Internships	30 hours a week at a local non-profit organization
Fostering Broad Knowledge of Human Cultural and the Natural World & Practicing Integrated and Applied Learning	Learning Communities (linked to a “big question”)	Students living together in a residence hall community while exploring issues of service and social justice. Community readings, community meals and reflection were a part of the living environment.
Fostering Broad Knowledge of Human Cultural and the Natural World	Common intellectual experiences (exploring “big questions” in history, culture, science, and society)	Group Readings and Critical Reflection Pre, During, and Post Experience
Deepening Personal and Social Responsibility & Practicing Integrated and Applied Learning	Service-Learning	As students read various readings from community partners and the campus coordinator, they engaged in a service-learning internship focusing on a project related to a social justice issue. Together, faculty, staff, community partners, and students engaged in critical reflection throughout the experience.

Assessment Design

For the SSSJP Internship experience, the university constructed a three-tier assessment design. The first tier assessment “Appendix A” was an indirect self-reporting, post-survey instrument designed to look at measurements of students’ perceptions of growth and accomplishments in meeting the intended outcomes of the program. Within the instrument, the survey designers implemented a few short essay reflective prompts. These prompts can be used to capture written qualitative data for future direct analysis or analysis using the Summer of Service-Learning and Social Justice Rubric measurement. The second tier assessment is a post-evaluation instrument “Appendix B” designed as a direct measurement conducted by the community partners in the program. The post-evaluation captures the reflective observations of the community partner on the students’ work and demonstration of their achievement or progress towards the learning outcomes during their time of service at their agency. The post-evaluation used a direct measurement to compare to the students indirect measurement data from the student post-survey. Juxtapositioning the student survey with the community partner survey builds an inclusive assessment model, recognizing the value of community partners as co-educators and co-assessors in the program. The post-evaluation of their reflective observations provides a deeper direct measurement of the student’s learning and can validate or negate the student’s perceptions of learning. The third tier was a service-learning and social justice rubric “Appendix C” as a direct measurement of student learning during critical reflection. The rubric was used to assess student learning during weekly group reflection, a public presentation and dialogue with community partners, administrators, and faculty members and a focus group reflection two months after the summer of service-learning and social justice internship. The Rice University Community Involvement Center Alternative Spring Break Rubric and the Student Agency Rubric from the Associated Colleges of the Midwest Faculty Career Enhancement Project on Developing Student Agency through Community Exploration, Reflection, and Engagement influenced the construction and creation of this rubric. Each of tools was intentionally designed to match the learning outcomes of the SSSJP with assessment practices. The combination of these mixed methodological assessment tools and measurements provide other educators examples of an evidence-based service-learning program designed to meet the demands for high impact learning and civic engagement.

Challenges

There were three challenges to the design of the program and the assessment development. First, the program had a small number of participants for a pilot program at one university. This produced a small sample size for each of the assessment instruments. Even though, IRB approval was requested and granted, the sample size limited the depth of the study. Larger sample sizes through either cross-institutional collection or multiple years of data from the program will provide the opportunity to compare demographical information on race, ethnicity, social economic status, and gender. In addition, an increased sample size over numerous models of multiple high impact designed programs or courses will supply a strong test of the tools adaptability among various programs, courses, and institutions. The second challenge was a small amount of pre-service and during-service rubric evaluation conducted during students’ critical group reflections and writings. For future research using the SSSJP Rubric in all phases of critical reflection will support stronger evaluation of the students’ learning over the course of the SSSJP internship. Lastly, in the spirit of reciprocity, the assessment instruments had to be concise and not time consuming for the community partners. As site

supervisors, they had contributed to the program through overseeing a student for 30 hours a week for seven weeks, co-facilitating orientation segments, supporting critical reflection and reading assignments, and evaluating the student's learning at the end of the term. Since the assessment instrument was designed to not be time consuming, the community partner evaluation mainly focused on student learning. However, 100% of community partners shared in reflection sessions and other meetings the positive impact the program had in building areas of human and financial capacity for their organization. As the field seeks to balance the workload among community partners as co-educators, service-learning practitioners should reflect on how to compensate the co-educators of the program fairly and take into consideration their time demands for serving as co-evaluators. If more qualitative data on the community impact is desired, some form of compensation for the agency time should be developed.

Implications for Future Practice

With examples of cross-institutional and cross-departmental tools used for assessment beginning to develop, the field can collaboratively investigate new questions related to service-learning, social justice education, civic learning outcomes and high impact practices. Do new or stronger learning outcomes exist when two or more high impact practices are utilized in the same service-learning and social justice program or course-based experience compared to those with only one high impact practice component? What are the longitudinal effects on students who experience an intentionally designed multiple high impact service-learning and social justice program or course-based experience? How strongly does multiple high impact service-learning and social justice programs impact civic outcomes and other learning outcomes? What new or emerging outcomes form for students when the intersections of multiple high impact practices are placed within one programmatic design for service-learning and social justice education?

To investigate these areas of inquiry further, practitioners must consider two contributing factors. First, what support and development will be needed for faculty and staff to engage and create a multi-high impact practice? Adding layers to one high impact practice can increase various demands on faculty and staff time, energy and resources. This increased workload may require colleges and universities to consider various allocations of resources to support new models of multi-high impact practices. Second, developing assessment across disciplines, departments, or institutions will require more construction of critical reflection prompts, practices, and evaluation instruments. To support cohesion of the research and assessment from discipline to discipline or institution to institution, faculty, staff, and community partners will need to work to co-design each of these elements.

Conclusion

Entering the new era for service-learning, the SSSJP and assessment was meant to serve as a model for faculty, staff, and community partners on how to meet the growing demands for multi-high impact models, institutional civic engagement and assessment tools related to critical reflection and mixed methodological practices. The work across the field of service-learning and social justice education can be enhanced through models of strategic design, implementation, and evaluation. As the field shares these new models of linking multi-high impact and civic engagement experiences to a culture of evidence through quality assessment, collaborative scholarly work can begin to take shape and contribute to the body of literature on service-learning and other high impact civic engagement pedagogies.

References

- Ash, S. L., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). Generating, deepening, and documenting learning: The power of critical reflection in applied learning. *Journal of Applied Learning In Higher Education* , 1, 25-28.
- Austin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service- learning affects students*. University of California. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Austin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Misa, K., Anderson, J., Denson, N., Jayakumar, U., et al. (2006). *Understanding the effects of service-learning: A student of students and faculty*. University of California, Los Angeles, The Higher Education Research Institute Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. Los Angeles: Atlantic Philanthropies.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2009, Fall). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. *New Directions for Higher Education* , 37-46.
- Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice*. New York, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cipolle, S. B. (2010). *Service-learning and social justice: Engaging student in social change*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Conway, J. M., Amel, E. L., & Gerwien, D. P. (2009). Teaching and learning in the social context: A meta-analysis of service learning's effects on academic, personal, social, and citizenship outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology* , 36 (4).
- Eyler, J. (2011). What international service-learning research can learn from research on service-learning. In R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G. Jones (Eds.), *International service-learning: Conceptual frameworks and research* (Vol. 1, pp. 225-241). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Felten, P., & Clayton, P. H. (2011, Winter). Service-learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* , 75-84.

- Gelmon, S. B., Holland, B. A., Driscoll, A., Spring, A., & Kerrigan, S. (2001). *Assessing service-learning and civic engagement: Principles and techniques*. Boston, MA: Campus Compact.
- Hatcher, J. A. (2011). Assessing civic knowledge and engagement. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 81-92.
- Hatcher, J. A., & Bringle, R. G. (2010). Developing your assessment plan: A key component of reflective practice. In B. Jacoby, & P. Mutasico (Eds.), *Looking in reaching out: A reflective guide for community service-learning professionals* (pp. 211-225). Boston, MA: Campus Compact.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High impact practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Molee, L. M., Henry, M. E., Sessa, V. I., & McKinney-Prupis, E. R. (2010). Assessing learning in service-learning courses through critical reflection. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 33 (3), 239-257.
- Oden, R. S., & Thomas, A. C. (2007). Advancing Service Learning as a Transformative Method for Social Justice. In J. Z. Calderon (Ed.), *Race, poverty, and social justice: Multidisciplinary perspectives through service-learning* (pp. 3-22). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Steinbrg, K. S., Hatcher, J. A., & Bringle, R. G. (2011). Civic-minded graduate: A north star. *Michigan Journal of Service-Learning*, 18 (1), 19-33.
- The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Education. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Appendix A

Student Survey

Questions about you

- Student ID number
- Gender
- How many courses have you had in college where you participated in community service to meet some of the course requirements?
- Other than this experience, have you done any volunteering/community service in the past twelve months?
 - If yes, where and for how long?

Your Opinions

Please respond to the following questions based on your SSSJP experience.

My participation in the SSSJP program has influenced my attitude that (SD, D, N, A, SA)

Attitudes and perceptions toward civic engagement

- social problems directly affect the quality of life in my community
- social problems are more difficult to solve than I used to think
- if I could change one thing about society, it would be to achieve greater social justice
- I can have an impact on solving the problems in my community
- I can play an important part in improving the well-being of my community
- I am more aware of the needs in my community
- this experience showed me how I can become more involved in my community
- I have a stronger awareness of the importance of being involved in the community
- I have a stronger awareness of the importance of contributing to the greater good

Self-direction

- having an impact on community problems is within the reach of most individuals
- skills and experiences that I gain from community service will be valuable in my career
- doing work in the community helped me to define my personal strengths and weaknesses
- performing work in the community helped me clarify which major (or career) I will pursue
- the community work in this experience assisted me in defining which profession I want to enter.

Leadership

- it is important to me to become a community leader
- participating in the community helped me enhance my leadership skills
- I am comfortable advocating the need for others to become active and involved citizens
- I promote awareness of social, political, and economic issues.

Cultural pluralism

- I am comfortable working with cultures other than my own
- I am aware of some of my own biases and prejudices
- I am able to take seriously the perspectives of others, especially those with whom I disagree
- I have an increased ability to learn from diverse perspectives
- I am respectful of others when discussion controversial issues or perspectives

Curiosity

- I can see how the subject matter I learned can be used in everyday life.
- I am interested in exploring social justice topics

Skills and Activities

My participation in the SSSJP program has improved... (SD, D, N, A, SA)

Attitudes and perceptions toward civic engagement

- My desire to participate in community affairs
- My ability to identify social issues and concerns
- My desire to participate in advocacy or action groups
- My desire to continue social service and social justice work
- My understanding of ways to address social issues

Self-direction

- My ability to take action
- My understanding of how my choices impact the community
- My understanding of how my talents can be used to serve a community need

Leadership

- My effectiveness in accomplishing goals
- My ability to work with others
- My ability to lead a group
- My ability to develop a plan to involve others
- My ability to engage with a community partner/service agency to meet a need

Cultural pluralism

- My ability to respect the views of others
- My tolerance of people who are different from me
- My awareness of cultural identity
- My awareness of inequality

Curiosity

- My efforts to think about the future
- My empathy to all points of view
- My ability to develop my own ideas
- My ability to challenge my previous opinions
- My interest in exploring social justice issues
- My ability to pose new questions of myself and others
- My interest in developing a deeper understanding of social justice

Learning Activities

Rate the importance of these activities in your learning; limit “most important” to two or three items (most important = 4, very important = 3, somewhat important = 2, not important = 1)

Much of my learning came from:

- Reading
- Simulation
- Living in community
- SSSJP discussions with Service-Learning Coordinator
- Site experience
- Community exploration (e.g., Arts Festival, meals from marketing group)

Open-ended: Please share how these experiences impacted your learning.

Community (SD, D, N, A, SA)

- As a result of this experience I have developed close personal relationships with other students
- The student friendships I have developed during this experience have been intellectually stimulating
- Open ended: Are there things you learned from this experience that you wouldn't have learned in the classroom?

Site (SD, D, N, A, SA)

- My site provided an orientation that familiarized me with the agency's mission, the community needs the agency addresses, and the expectations that the agency has of its volunteers.
- My site supervisor was accessible and offered me appropriate guidance, feedback, and supervision.
- My site supervisor offered me insights into the social justice issues faced by my site's clients.
- Through discussions with and/or observations of the clients/supervisor at my site, I was able to make connections to the presented social justice theories.

Open-ended: Think about your learning in one of these areas: civic engagement, self-direction, leadership, cultural pluralism, or curiosity. What was the most important thing that you learned?

Appendix B

Community Partner Survey

Community Partner Feedback

- Agency name

Please indicate your ratings of the student's ability to demonstrate the following skills/abilities.
(scale suggestions? Need to include NA...did not observe)

Attitudes and perceptions toward civic engagement

- desire to participate in community affairs
- ability to identify social issues and concerns
- desire to participate in advocacy or action groups
- understanding of ways to address social issues

Self-direction

- ability to take action
- understanding of how the students' choices impact the community
- understanding of how the students' talents can be used to serve a community need

Leadership

- effectiveness in accomplishing goals
- ability to work with others
- ability to lead a group
- ability to develop a plan to involve others
- ability to engage with a community partner/service agency to meet a need

Cultural pluralism

- ability to respect the views of others
- tolerance of people who are different from me
- awareness of cultural identity
- awareness of inequality

Curiosity

- efforts to think about the future
- empathy to all points of view
- ability to develop student's own ideas
- ability to challenge my previous opinions
- interest in exploring social justice issues
- ability to pose new questions of self and others
- interest in developing a deeper understanding of social justice

General

- Did your organization and the people you serve benefit from the service provided by these students?
- Explain:

(SD, D, N, A, SA) for following items...

- The student was generally punctual and contacted our agency if he or she could not be available during a scheduled time.
- Regarding appropriate communication skills, the student utilized proper verbal skills.
- In relationships with the population served by your agency, the student showed compassion, care, empathy, and an ability to develop appropriate relationships.
- In relationships with the agency staff and volunteers, the student demonstrated the ability to work as a team member and take direction as needed.
- Regarding the students' general attitude, he or she expressed emotions appropriately, displayed a positive attitude, appeared to learn from the experience, and used good judgment in decision-making.
- What do you feel are this student's main strength(s)?
- Are there any areas in which the student could improve?

Appendix C

Rubric for the Summer of Service-Learning and Social Justice Program

	Member (1) <i>Not concerned with her/his role in social problems.</i>	Volunteer (2) <i>Well-intentioned, but not well-educated about social issues.</i>	Conscientious Citizen (3) <i>Concerned with discovering root causes; asks "Why?"</i>	Active Citizen (4) <i>Community & social justice becomes a priority in values and life choices.</i>
Attitudes and Perceptions Towards Civic Engagement	Does not see value in program or service-learning and social justice experience.	Participates without expressing understanding of his or her impact on service-learning and social justice experience	Articulates recognition of goals and execution of service-learning and social justices. Understands how the program impacts on self	Clearly articulates desire to incorporate social justice and civic involvement in the future. Impacts future life choices.
Self Direction	Expresses a lack of direction either because they are overwhelmed by too many choices or don't know of resources.	An express a desire to be involved in the future but doesn't have an action plan or awareness of resources.	Articulates an understanding that there are more opportunities for involvement and knows what resources to use to find them.	Clearly articulates a plan of future involvement (classes, research or service).
Leadership	Content with participating in the group or program, but no desire to increase personal responsibility.	Acknowledges the need for leadership to promote change, but not actively taking the role.	Articulates a desire to or has actively involved others in activities	Clearly articulates a plan to lead others in activities in the future.

Cultural Pluralism	Expresses perceptions of problems without an understanding or acknowledgement of others or other points of view. Singular focus.	Expresses an understanding or acknowledgement of differences of others, but unaware of their impact.	Articulates awareness of the cultures of others and their personal context/place/role in society (peers, community, and self). Expresses sensitivity towards community in daily life.	Clearly articulates awareness of the impact (either positive or negative) of the program and individual. Expresses the desire to be an advocate for diverse cultures through working with other impacted communities.
Curiosity	Expresses limited interest in deeper examination of the community and social justice issues	Demonstrates some interest in examining the community and social justice issues and its relevance to lived experiences as citizens	Demonstrates a strong desire to explore community and social justice issues in depth to gain insight into lived citizen experiences	Uses deep exploration of community and social justice issues and its relevance to lived experiences to pose new questions to self and others
Critical Reflection	Describe own experience in general descriptors	Articulates strengths and challenges of experience to increase effectiveness in different contexts	Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complexity and interconnected areas of learning from academic learning, civic learning, social justice learning, and personal development	Demonstrates plans for action of a future self as an engage citizen and social justice contributor based on experiences that have occurred in multiple and diverse contexts.

Appendix D: Service-Learning Project Learning Contract

Student Name:		
Local Address:		
Local Phone:	Student e-mail:	
Course		
Instructor:	Phone Number:	
Site (agency or organization):		
Supervisor:	Email:	Phone Number:
Days and times student will be at agency:		

What is Service-Learning?

Service-Learning is a significant pedagogy that can be used to fulfill Drake University's mission to provide an exceptional learning environment that prepares students for meaningful personal lives, professional accomplishments, and responsible global citizenship. For the past twenty years, research has shown service-learning fosters one of the best experiential and collaborative-learning environments for students, faculty, staff, and the community. Service-Learning is designed to link service to learning outcomes in order to deepen the student's development process. It goes beyond charitable work and "doing good." It is a partnership, meeting a community need, while building the knowledge and skill sets of students.

This Service-Learning Project LEARNING CONTRACT is designed to:

- Assist the student and agency in understanding the learning objectives for the course.
- Clarify the activities in which the student will be involved at the agency in relation to the learning objectives.
- Insure that both the student and the agency are aware of their responsibilities as partners in this service-learning project.

Course Learning Objectives (see syllabus)

1.
2.
3.
4.

Agency Objectives and/or Activities (Agency and student should collaborate here to meet course objectives)

1.
2.
3.
4.

Integration Plan (How will you, the student, connect your activities at the agency to your course content and vice versa? *Check out the assignments related to this project in your course syllabus. Include any readings assigned by community agency)

1.
2.
3.

What do you as a student hope to learn during this experience? (Personal Learning Objectives)

FINAL AGREEMENTS:

I agree to honor the minimum commitment required for the service-learning option in my class, as well as any of the additional training and/or time requirements of my service-learning site as detailed by the course syllabus and the agency/school representative. I also agree to contact either my professor or the Service-Learning Coordinator should I have any concerns about my service-learning project.

Student Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

I agree to provide adequate training and supervision for the service-learning student, to plan activities for the student within the agency which meet the stated learning objectives for the student's course, and to complete necessary service-learning forms by due dates (learning contract and final evaluation). I also agree to contact the Service-Learning Coordinator (515-271-2338 or mandi.mcreynolds@drake.edu) should I have any concerns about the service-learning project or student.

Agency Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Approved by: _____
Professor's Initials

Author

MANDI MCREYNOLDS, (mandi.mcreynolds@drake.edu), Director, Community Engagement and Service-Learning, Drake University

[The *Journal of Service-Learning*

in Higher Education is published by
the University of Louisiana System.

Opinions or points of view expressed
in the publication are those of the
authors and do not necessarily
reflect the official position of the
University of Louisiana System or
institutions or organizations
affiliated with the *Journal of Service-
Learning in Higher Education*. For
more information visit

WWW.ULSYSTEM.EDU/JSLHE]