2002

Service learning: a study of administrators' goals at a Research I university

Christy Sanders
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Recommended Citation

Sanders, Christy, "Service learning: a study of administrators' goals at a Research I university" (2002). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 27.
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/27

SERVICE LEARNING: A STUDY OF ADMINISTRATORS' GOALS AT A
RESEARCH I UNIVERSITY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Educational Leadership, Research, and
Counseling

by
Christy Sanders
B.S., University of Southern Mississippi, 1992
M.Ed., University of Southern Mississippi, 1995
May 2002

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the two people in my life that encouraged each step of my academic career. Your love and support helped me see one of my dreams come true. My Mom feels as though she took every exam with me and was as anxious as I was for each defense. My Dad's confidence in me never wavered. They inspire me to be a better person and continue to show me what service to others really is. Sandy and Wade Sanders, my parents, thank you for your unconditional love. Dad, you can officially read the dissertation now.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank God for answered prayers.

Dr. Becky Ropers-Huilman, you are an amazingly talented woman. You were always so gracious to me through all that has gone on in my personal life the past few years and I am grateful for that. Thank you for your dedication to my completion. I do appreciate all that it took to get me to this point. We both learned much.

Jan, thank you for the energy and drive to make it through the end of this process. Your "yankee" tendencies are just what this Southern woman needed to push forward.

Jennifer has been through all three degrees and is still a friend. She let me cry, vent, and celebrate throughout the years. Thank you for all of your support.

Monica, Kelly, Laura, and Melanie, thank you for listening when I needed your ears.

Dawn and Mari Ann, thank you for your encouragement. Dawn, you helped me realize that life will continue past downfalls. Mari Ann, you will see the end and I will help you as much as your kind words and prayers helped me.

Diane, Kathy, and Bucky, you have all been mentors and friends to me. Thank you for giving me the time I needed and the encouragement to continue my career, both academically and professionally.

Eric, thank you for arguing with me. I know you should have been my editor throughout the dissertation. However, I just thought I would never finish because we would disagree on everything I wrote. I could not have finished without the time you gave to helping our family this past year. That time gave me the opportunity and peace of mind to do what I needed to do to complete the degree.

To my extended family in Georgia, you are a part of this work. Your names are included in some form or fashion. I specifically want to mention my loving grandparents, Willard, Ethel, Oscar and Virginia. Although some have passed, their inspiration continues to be a integral part of my life. I look forward to Ginger watching me receive my degree.

Ryan, my love, thank you for being you. Although you did not get to experience it all, you made the last year one that I could not have gotten through without your love and compassion. Thank you for the surprises, especially the one near Peabody Hall. You were there for me during one of the "top 10 days." I hope I will make it in the Myers family as at least now I have one degree from the "right" place. My love for you grows each moment. I look forward to a lifetime of "top 10 days."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

vi

ABSTRACT

This case study explored the administrators' goals of a service learning program at a Research I university. This research was aimed at discovering administrators' goals and determining whether or not these goals were achieved, as perceived by students, administrators, community service agency directors, and faculty members. A structured, tape-recorded interview was used to gather data from participants in all groups. Barriers to implementation of service learning by faculty, students, and administrators included time constraints, lack of institutional support and lack of clarity as to what constituted service learning. University engagement in service learning was defined as the process by which a university embraces service learning wholeheartedly. The engagement may take place through redesigned curriculum and teaching methodology. This study's findings reveal that administrators' goals related to university engagement in service learning. Furthermore, the administrators' goals showed that the students were supplementing their academic experience with service to the community. This dissertation suggests that service learning can be mutually beneficial to all partners. Further, for a service

learning program to flourish, all participants must have a

role in defining its goals and clarifying its purposes.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It is the first day of the semester of a medical
ethics course at a university. As every first day of
each semester, the students enter the room hoping that
the class does not last the full hour. All thoughts
are on receiving the syllabus and leaving early. The
professor enters, introduces herself, and then
distributes the coveted syllabus. The professor
explains the class requirements and then directs the
students' attention to the next speaker. The service
learning program coordinator begins her presentation
about one of the options listed on the syllabus. This
is when the atmosphere in the class begins to change.
The students curiously listen as the phrase "service
learning" is explained.

Students enrolled in this class are required to
either complete thirty hours of community service or
write a twenty-page research paper. They will receive
the same percentage of grade for completing the
community service or the research paper. Many of the
students questioned this option. One student asked:
why community service? The professor quickly jumped
in the discussion to explain how volunteering at one
of the local hospitals would give students the
opportunity to experience medical ethics first hand.
Other students were immediately excited about the
opportunity to opt out of writing a research paper.
They stated that they would much rather spend time
doing hands-on work than library research.

Service learning, the option given to these students,

is a method of instruction that requires them to engage in

an experience outside of the classroom. It links students

to the community in which their college campus is situated.

Although every service learning classroom may have

differing expectations, the overall goal remains constant,

giving students an opportunity to learn by experience.

Service is not a new concept to institutions of higher learning. In fact, mission statements of many universities connect teaching and research with service to the broader public. However, the integration of service learning into the formal curricula is less pervasive. Critics and proponents alike debate the implications of such integration. Are institutions of higher learning places where civic responsibility should be taught? Should institutions of higher learning be required to incorporate service learning into their curriculum? How could a mandate of service learning affect institutional diversity? Are educators responsible for teaching altruistic behaviors to students? Should students graduate with a clear understanding of what service to others really means? Proponents of the form of experiential education called service learning answer "yes" to all of these questions and believe that this would only enhance the diversity of each institution of higher learning.

Some consider service learning a mere higher education fad, rather than a legitimate teaching methodology. However, the service learning movement appears to be gaining momentum. In conferences across the nation, educators publicize the successes that their programs have achieved. For example, the 20th Annual First-Year

Experience Conference held many educational sessions and pre-conference workshops that were specific to the subject of service learning and the effect it has on the first-year student. Universities now incorporate service learning in many first-year experience initiatives to increase retention rates. Currently, a monograph is being written that will outline how service learning can be integrated into a first-year program.

Service learning is an important topic to be addressed in curriculum development. Some universities are redesigning their transcripts so that students will be able to clearly document how many volunteer hours they accumulate during their service learning experience. For example, The University of Southern Mississippi developed a "leadership transcript" so that students have a way to officially document their hours of volunteerism, whether the hours are through community service or service learning.

This chapter explores multiple definitions of service learning, then distinguishes sharply the difference between service learning and community service. The chapter concludes with a statement of the purpose for this research, a problem statement, and the research questions directing this study.

Definition of Service Learning

Service, combined with learning, adds value to each and transforms both. (Honnet & Paulson, 1989, p. 1)

Service learning comprises the process of connecting students' classroom experiences with service-related experiences outside the classroom. As such, it bridges the gap between students' classroom learning and what is happening in the community in which their campus is located. There are many different types of service learning programs. Some examples include internships, co-op programs, and classes that require volunteer hours for credit. Different types of experiential education, such as volunteerism, cooperative education, and internships all have characteristics of service learning. Service learning is a form of experiential education as are volunteerism, cooperative education, and internships, but all forms of experiential education do not constitute service learning. By definition, "service learning emphasizes critical reflection on the service experience, reciprocity between the providers and acquirers of service, and learning as a significant part of the exchange for everyone involved" (Kendall & Associates, 1990, p. 25). Volunteerism, cooperative education, and internships may or may not

4

incorporate all of the necessary components of service learning.

Students required to write a journal about their volunteer experiences are involved in a type of service learning. Their involvement could comprise a one-day service project, such as painting the house of an elderly person in the community, or constitute a long-term commitment, such as the revitalization of a neighborhood playground area. Service learning may also involve a spring break trip to Mexico to help build houses for a low socioeconomic community. There are multiple definitions because participants vary in needs and expectations. Stanton (1987) characterizes service learning as "an expression of values—service to others, community development and empowerment, reciprocal learning—which determines the purpose, nature and process of social and educational exchange between the learners (students) and the people they serve" (p. 67). This "educational exchange" moves the classroom experience into other communities outside of the classroom or campus environment. The exchange may not completely replace the traditional lecture- style classroom, but it involves students in a nontraditional method of teaching.

The definition developed by the National and Community Service Act of 1990 describes service learning as a method

> through which students learn and develop through active participation. It provides structured time for the student to think, talk, or write about what the student did and saw during the actual service activity, and provides students with the opportunity to use newly acquired skills and knowledge in real-life situations in their own communities (Hirsch, 1998, p. 12).

This definition is important because it emphasizes the act of reflection.

While there are many subtle structural differences in community service and service learning, the main distinguishing characteristic is the act of reflection. Volunteers who are not involved in a service learning situation are required rarely to reflect in a written manner about their particular action. However, service learning participants are required to reflect on the community service "in order to provide better service and to enhance the participants' own learning" (Giles, et al., 1991, p. 7). The National Society of Experiential Education believes that "it is crucial that service toward the common good be conducted with reflective learning to ensure that service programs of high quality can be created and sustained over time, and to help individuals appreciate how service can be a significant and ongoing part of life"

6

(Honnet & Paulson, 1989, p. 1). Further, Robert Rhoads

(1997) argues that "community service without reflection

does not lend itself to challenge students' perceptions of

social inequities and therefore is unlikely to achieve far-

reaching social change" (p. 9). The reflection students

engage in, either in written or verbal form, may bring

forward discussions on issues such as civic responsibility

and diversity. If a student has not had the opportunity to

participate in any form of volunteer service prior to the

service learning class, then that student may have

questions related to the types of people with whom he or

she has made contact. Some college students have not

interacted with lower socioeconomic income families. Some

college students have not worked with people who have

tested HIV positive. The exchange has the potential to

enhance students' learning during the out-of-classroom

experience.

Reciprocity of the service exchange constitutes

another important component to the definition of service

learning. The service experience should benefit not only

the student who participates in the process, but also the

person who receives the service. Through the act of

reflection, students can learn how their experiences

benefit themselves and the receivers of their services. In

<u>Integrating Service Learning and Multicultural Education in</u>

<u>Colleges and Universities</u> (2000), Rahima Wade states, "we

may not be truly serving others if we act without

compassion, engagement, and a willingness to be 'with'

rather than just 'for' another" (p. 25). Additionally,

Wade insists

> with service, compassion should replace pity and
> separateness should be transformed into the community.
> Service involves working alongside people in ways that
> assist them in defining and helping fulfill their
> needs…Service must be envisioned as empowering
> individuals to work on their own behalf as much as it
> is to provide food and shelter (p. 26).

Current literature reflects the debate regarding a standard

definition of service learning. Although most scholars

agree with the five basic components of service learning,

as discussed in the next chapter, the actual definition of

service learning remains problematic. "In 1990, Jane

Kendall wrote that there were 147 definitions in the

literature" (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Additionally, some even

disagree how one should write the words "service learning."

In literature, it is written both service learning and

service-learning. Eyler and Giles (1999) explain, "we have

embraced the position that service-learning should include

balance to the community and academic learning and that the

hyphen in the phrase symbolizes the central role of

reflection in the process of learning" (p. 4).

I clarify the definition of service learning used for this research in Chapter 1. Some faculty members, who researched service learning, choose not to classify or clarify. For example, Eyler and Giles (1999) contend that, "we accept that any program that attempts to link academic study with service can be characterized as service-learning" (p. 5). Barbara Jacoby (1996) defines service learning as

> a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service-learning (p. 5).

Furthermore, Sigmon (1996) believes that there are four ways in which service learning may be defined. Service learning is described as

> service – LEARNING, in which learning goals are primary and service outcomes are secondary; SERVICE-learning, in which service outcomes are primary and learning goals secondary; service learning, in which the service and learning goals are separate; and SERVICE-LEARNING, in which the service and learning goals are of equal weight and each enhances the other for all participants (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 5)

It is evident that service learning has multiple meanings to those currently involved in scholarly research in this subject. It is important to recognize the discord in current literature and understand that although there are

9

varying definitions and emphases, there are components that all consider essential to the experience.

The definition of service learning I use throughout this research is the definition used by the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education. This organization defines service learning as a "myriad of ways that students can perform meaningful service to their communities and to society while engaging in some form of reflection or study that is related to service" (Giles, et al., 1991, p. 7).

Additionally, this research focuses on service learning at the university level, which is the process that gives students the opportunity to receive academic credit for volunteer efforts. Furthermore, this research focuses on service learning that is at least a semester in length, rather than the projects that only take one day to complete.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to understand what the goals of the service learning administrators are and to determine if these goals were met. Literature has already examined potential negative facets of service learning, including an extensive faculty time commitment and students' involvement for self-serving purposes (Marullo,

10

1996; Rhoads, 1997). Other literature has identified positive aspects of service learning, such as improving student retention, promoting civic responsibility, giving students an opportunity to involve themselves in a diverse community, and developing altruistic behaviors in participants (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1997; Wills, 1992). I believe that administrators who are involved in the development of service learning programs play critical roles in defining program goals and facilitating positive outcomes for all participants. What current research does not state is how service learning administrators work toward attainment of service learning goals.

Administrators vary in title, position in the university structure, salary, and budget restrictions. Further, because there are many different ways that service learning can be enacted, administrators' roles vary. Some universities, such as Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, have a mandatory graduation requirement for all students to participate in a form of community service. Other universities, such as Florida State University in Tallahassee, Florida, have an entire office of staff, faculty, and students dedicated to volunteer efforts. Florida State also places volunteer and community service

11

information on student transcripts. Yet other universities merely have one administrator for the organization of all service learning classes.

While administrators' roles at different institutions will vary inevitably as structures and requirements vary, service learning administrators play an important role in constructing service learning experiences in higher education. For example, administrators can recruit faculty to participate in service learning experiences through seminars, student presentations, and grant incentives, if available. Administrators can influence faculty participation by promoting an established university reward procedure for involvement in service learning. If other faculty see that rewards are distributed to faculty involved in teaching service learning courses, they may be inclined to incorporate it into their curriculum. Administrators can place the service learning goals as a priority among the university constituencies. They also may use their influence for positive change with university community relations. A reciprocal relationship between the community and university has much potential to benefit both the community and university in a positive manner. Administrators involved in service learning can promote this type of relationship.

In addition, administrators coordinate the relations among students, faculty, and the community service agencies in which students are placed. The way that administrators structure the service learning program, the feedback they provide to the faculty, students, and agencies, and the opportunities they offer to students are all vital aspects of a service learning program. It is important to study what administrators do, why they do it, and how they do it. There are many ways for service learning programs to exist and be considered successful, so understanding how administrators define and implement their service learning goals will assist other universities in creating and implementing service learning programs. It also has the potential to benefit universities that have existing programs in need of improvement.

The purpose of this research is to understand the methods administrators use to work toward service learning goals and, subsequently, to determine if these goals are achieved. As such, the research questions are:

1. What are administrators' goals in the service learning program at the Research I university studied?

2. Were those goals achieved?

To better understand the ways in which administrators' service learning goals are and are not achieved, I studied

personnel at the community service agencies and the faculty involved in service learning, as well as the students involved in the actual programs. Therefore, supplemental research questions specific to the community service agencies, faculty, and students involved with service learning programs guided the inquiry. The supplemental questions included

1. To what extent are the service learning goals of university administrators achieved, as perceived by the community service agencies?

2. To what extent are the service learning goals of university administrators achieved, as perceived by the faculty?

3. To what extent are the service learning goals of university administrator achieved, as perceived by the students?

4. To what extent are the service learning goals of the university administrators achieved, as perceived by the university administrators?

The context for this case study is a service learning program in a large, public, Research I University.

The research is divided into five chapters. Chapter 2 consists of a review of relevant literature on the subject. Chapter 3 is devoted to a discussion of the methodology

used in this research. Chapter 4 outlines the case study

and describes the research findings. Chapter 5 is the

conclusion and discussion of the potential need for further

research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

As stated in the introduction, service learning programs do not all follow one particular method or pattern. Instead, service learning has varying components and differing structures that may contrast, depending on the needs of the participants. This review of literature explains the basic components that turn a volunteer process into service learning. These components rely heavily upon the actions of all service learning participants. Therefore, the main focus of this chapter is to review the research concerning the members of service learning programs: administrators, students, and faculty, as well as community service agencies. By discussing all participants, I share relevant literature to explain why service learning is currently an important topic in higher education.

I begin this chapter by discussing the components of service learning, its varying models, its theoretical perspective, and its position in the history of higher education. Then, I focus this review of literature on issues that relate specifically to faculty, students, the university, the community that receives the service, and the administrators to show that much information exists

about all service learning participants, but not about administrators' roles in service learning programs. I hope to begin filling this gap of knowledge with my dissertation.

Components and Principles of Service Learning

Although service learning programs vary, the basic components remain the same. The five major components include preparation and planning, action, reflection, evaluation, and celebration (NSEE Foundation Documents Committee, 1998). Preparation and planning involves determining the needs of the students, the faculty participants, the college or university, and the prospective community service agencies. Preparation may begin as a result of university administration direction. For example, the president of a university may instruct faculty members to get involved in a service learning classroom experience. Faculty members might then develop syllabi for the students in their classes. The students then contact the approved agency and the agency contacts the service learning recipients. The opposite preparation might happen if community service agencies contact the university to inquire about the possibility of having students volunteer. Each service learning participant is involved in some form of preparation.

17

Action is the process by which students participate in the service learning project. Reflection is the key component in which the students participating in service learning must deliberate on their experience and see "what is being learned in the service experience" (Giles, Honnet, & Migliore, 1991, p. 7). Reflections may be written or oral. Evaluation by the administrator, faculty, and agency helps everyone prepare for the next service learning project or task and celebration is the form of recognition given to the student participants. Celebration may also involve all service learning participants.

These components vary from organization to organization, depending on the needs of the situation. In addition to the standard components discussed above, complementary principles have been developed to guide practitioners in service learning programs. These principles were derived in consultation with over 70 organizations interested in service and learning (Honnet & Paulsen, 1989). The ten principles state that an effective program

- engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good;
- provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experiences;

- articulates clear service and learning goals for
  everyone involved;

- allows for those with needs to define those needs;

- clarifies the responsibilities of each person and
  organization involved;

- matches service providers and service needs through
  a process that recognizes changing circumstances;

- expects genuine, active, and sustained
  organizational commitment;

- includes training, supervision, monitoring, support,
  recognition, and evaluation to meet service and
  learning goals;

- ensures that the time commitment for service and
  learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best
  interests of all involved; and

- is committed to program participation by and with
  diverse populations (Honnet & Paulsen, p. 1-2).

In addition, these principles may be used to evaluate
current service learning programs and projects.

Service learning programs do not fit a strict,
definable mold; therefore, these components and principles
must remain flexible to adjust to the needs of all service
learning participants. Students may be involved in

19

tutoring after school or compiling an oral history of the local churches. The components and principles serve as guidelines that give practitioners an opportunity to see what is expected in programs of service learning.

Service Learning Models

Choosing an appropriate model to implement service learning engagements for desired outcome is essential. Common models used in service learning focus on charity, citizenship, and justice (Ottenritter & Lisman, 1998, p. 27). Ottenritter and Lisman describe the three models as

> The charity approach emphasizes promoting an ethic of community service. The citizenship model focuses on helping students learn how to become more adept at seeking solutions to social problems through the democratic process. The justice approach attempts to help students become more aware of and committed to rectifying social injustices (p. 27).

The most common model used in service projects is the charity model. For example, if a student organization works at the food bank for one afternoon, then the charity model is appropriate. Service learning programs do promote community service, but the citizenship and justice model push students to see beyond the idea that they are just involved in a form of charity. Faculty must be able to easily justify why adding service learning to their curriculum would enhance the classroom experience. The charity model does justify student organizations'

participation in one-day service projects. However,

service learning can promote more than community service.

The goal of the curriculum development should be driven by

the justice and citizenship models that allow for a richer

and deeper understanding of social issues that affect

students. Helen Oliver, Associate Professor of Education

and Service Learning at Rust College in Holly Springs,

Mississippi, states

> As a pedagogy, service learning builds on experiential
> learning theory. It is shaped by education reform
> principles that encourage students to take
> responsibility for their own learning. It is inspired
> by the belief that students learn by doing, and that
> the academy is fundamentally responsible for preparing
> students for citizenship (Oliver, 1996, p. 9).

Through their attention to social issues that effect

service learning recipients, the citizenship and justice

models push students to think about social change and how

they can be a part of it. These two models have been a

part of institutions of higher learning in varying degrees.

Historical Position of Service Learning in Higher Education

I hear and I forget.

I see and I remember.

I act and I understand.

(Chinese proverb, in Schine, 1997, vi)

Historically, service has been a component of many

institutions of higher learning. College and university

mission statements often include service with teaching and research. Although service learning has taken many forms, the underlying premise of service learning has been around for many years. For example, it was important in the colonial college to "educate civic leaders" as early as 1636 (Boyer, 1994, p. A48). The purpose of this section is to show that, historically, service learning is connected to universities that promote the advancement of higher education.

Many advocates of service learning recognize John Dewey as the first educator in favor of experiential education (Kendall & Assoc., 1990; NSEE Foundations Document Committee, 1998; Schine, 1997; Seigel & Rockwood, 1993). Dewey's treatise, Experience and Education (1938), favors using real-life experiences to teach and learn. Dewey believed "that education in order to accomplish its ends both for the individual learner and for society must be based upon experience—which is always the actual life-experiences of some individual" (p. 89). Also, Dewey "argued that traditional education was inherently undemocratic, since it is hierarchically structured, divorces subjective from objective ways of knowing, and separates experience from learning" (National Society for Experiential Education Documents Committee, 1998, p. 18).

Dewey's argument supports service learning today: service

learning is not a traditional method of teaching, and it

connects, not separates, experience with learning.

In his work on service learning, David Kolb (1984)

expands upon the early theorizing of John Dewey with his

concept of the experiential learning cycle. His model

outlines the learning experience as a four-step cycle that

is constantly revisited. Kolb believes learning is

> concrete experience, reflection on the experience,
> synthesis and abstract conceptualization, and active
> experimentation. Although one may enter the cycle at
> any point, a person engaged in service-learning often
> begins with concrete service experience and then
> embarks on a period of reflection on that experience,
> analyzing what actually occurred and what implications
> arise from those observations (Jacoby, 1999, p. 9-10).

Jacoby (1999) believes that implications of this model

are central to service learning. She states

> First, a course or other experience should be
> structured to present multiple opportunities
> continually to enable students to move completely and
> frequently through the learning cycle. Second, the
> model underscores how central and important reflection
> is to the entire process of learning. Third,
> reflection follows direct and concrete experience and
> precedes abstract conceptualization and
> generalization. Placing reflection at another point
> in the learning process is likely to create a less
> effective learning experience for students because
> they will not have the most direct and immediate link
> to the concrete experience of learning (p. 69).

The processes and goals of service learning are consistent

with Kolb's emphasis on continual learning.

Another supporter of experiential education, Ernest Boyer (1994), wrote "Creating a New American College," which challenges institutions of higher learning to reevaluate their priorities and to redefine scholarship in broader terms. Boyer wants the New American College to be "committed to improving the human condition. A new model of excellence would emerge, one that would enrich the campus, renew communities, and give dignity and status to the scholarship of service" (p. A48). He insists that as far back as 1636, higher education and the purposes of American society have been intertwined. In the "Colonial college, teaching was a central, even sacred function; the goal was to train the clergy and educate civic leaders" (p. A48). Boyer describes the "New American College" as "an institution that celebrates teaching and selectively supports research, while also taking special pride in its capacity to connect thought to action, theory, and practice" (p. A48). The ideal of Boyer's New American College relied heavily on the support of faculty's willingness to revise theories as they move back and forth between theory and practice. In Boyer's New American College, service learning teaching methodology, which embraces both theory and practice, would be welcomed. It must be noted that Boyer's philosophy of integrating

24

service learning would not currently be welcomed by all universities and faculty members. Institutions of higher education, both in mission and teaching methodology, must remain diverse to meet the needs of all types of students entering the realm of higher education.

Another focal point in the history of service learning is the founding of historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). HBCUs were "born out of the need to develop an educated citizenry, equipped with skills, appreciations, and insights that would enable individuals to live responsibly" (Oliver, 1996, p. 6). Helen Oliver believes that "strength of character makes for good citizens in our communities" (p. 5). This "strength of character" is enhanced by the service learning experience. Oliver believes that service learning is "shaped by education reform principles that encourage students to take responsibility for their own learning" (p. 8). Currently, Rust College, a historically black college, is involved in the DREAMS Project (Developing Responsibility through Education, Affirmation, Mentoring, and Service). Students immersed in this service learning experience are required to "complete 20 hours tutoring and mentoring services, keep a daily journal, write a reflective paper and make a classroom presentation" (p. 11). Another example of how

service learning is ingrained in the philosophy of teaching at HBCUs is Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. As mentioned in the introduction, Southern University requires that students complete 60 hours of community service before graduation.

Jane Addams' establishment of Hull House is another educational reform involving service learning. Addams designed Hull House to "provide a center for a higher civic and social life, to institute and maintain educational and philanthropic enterprises, and to investigate and improve the conditions in the industrial districts of Chicago" (Addams, 1910, p. 89). Addams did not view Hull House as a form of charity; "she viewed it as a living, dynamic educational process" (Lunblad, 1995, p. 663). This process worked both ways

> Addams was the pupil, and her neighbors were her teachers. From this experience she generalized that education ought to be perceived as a mutual relationship between teacher and pupil under the conditions of life itself and not the transmission of knowledge, intact and untested by experience (Lunblad, 1995, p. 663).

Jane Addams believed that the "reciprocal exchange of knowledge tended to empower learners and heal social, economic and ethnic divisions" (Munro, 1995, p. 277). Dewey, Addams, and Boyer share the theory of reciprocal learning. Service learning is a form of reciprocal

26

learning that involves both giving and taking of all participants involved.

Volunteerism and community service have continued to be highlighted through the years by many different presidents. President John F. Kennedy told Americans in his inaugural speech, "...ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country" (Kahne & Westheimer, 1996). Kennedy installed the Peace Corp program in the early 1960s to inspire people to "help create a better world" (Boyer, 1994, p. A48). Following the death of President Kennedy, several other presidents continued service initiatives. President George Bush signed the National and Community Service Act in 1990 that compiled "initiatives to reinstill an ethic of service in communities across the nation" (Ward, 1996, p. 55). President Bill Clinton followed this national initiative by signing the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. This act created the "Corporation for National Service, which funds and administers service programs such as AmeriCorps and Learn and Serve America" (Ward, 1996, p. 55). This act states that service learning should help foster civic responsibility and be "integrated into and enhance the academic curriculum of the students" (Century Community and Technical College, 1996, p. 4). Also,

27

President Clinton placed community service in the forefront in higher education with the work-study and community service program. The work-study program allows college students to earn money while working at a community service agency. Clearly, service has been an issue for many presidents over the past several decades.

Several national organizations also promote service initiatives, often paired with learning objectives. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, Learn and Service America and AmeriCorp are two organizations that promote the philosophy of service learning by developing written resources, organizing conferences, and generally sharing information on service learning. Other organizations that encourage various aspects of service learning include Campus Compact, Points of Light Foundation, and the National Society for Experiential Education. For example, Campus Compact is a "national membership organization of college and university presidents committed to helping students develop the values and skills of citizenship through participation in public and community service" (Campus Compact, 1997-1998, p. 1). In 1999, Campus Compact's membership included university presidents at 649 public and private, two- and four-year colleges.

Service learning has been a part of conversations of institutions of higher learning for many years. However, it has not always been titled "service learning." Some authors, such as C. David Lisman (1998), believe that we are currently in the "midst of a true higher education service learning reform movement" (p. 24). While service learning is part of the current reform in higher education, it has yet to secure full support. Administrators, faculty and students alike have many barriers to face with the implementation of service learning engagements.

Barriers to Implementation of Service Learning by Faculty

Faculty are often the main supporters of the theory and practice of service learning. They are the ones in the classroom who lead the reflective component of service learning. They may serve as liaisons between the community service agency and administration. Furthermore, they can also be the ones who train other faculty members in this method of classroom instruction. This section focuses on faculty participation in service learning by discussing barriers to implementation.

While participating in service learning initiatives, faculty must ensure that the service component complements course objectives. Jacoby (1996) reminds faculty that "if service is an add-on that is not designed to advance the

29

objectives of a course or does not help students learn course content, it degrades the academic integrity of the course" (p. 156-157). Service learning may fit in all the disciplines, but not necessarily in all classes within the discipline. A professor teaching a course that is based strictly on mathematical calculations may be hard-pressed to implement a service learning component. Furthermore, service learning induces "faculty to consider how their discipline, as well as their own teaching and research" relates to social issues and problems (Jacoby, 1996, p. 157). Using the math example again, the professor may not be interested in how a statistical analysis affects social issues and problems. In reality, the analysis may not affect social issues and a service add-on to the course may destroy the academic integrity of the classroom experience.

In addition to the course content, faculty members interested in service learning as a teaching pedagogy must remember that it takes an extended effort in preparation, beyond the effort required to develop a quick lesson plan. "Experiential education, because it attempts to teach holistically, can take longer to get rolling, but is increasingly efficient over time" (NSEE Foundations Document Committee, 1998, p. 21). The faculty member implementing service learning does not just compose a

lecture to hold the attention of students for fifty minutes. Instead, the professor may be involved in helping students connect to the community service agency, completing on-site evaluations, developing a method of calculating the hours completed by the students, and organizing a reward system for the students. This effort is in addition to the time spent preparing for the weekly class periods.

In addition to the development of course content and consideration of the time constraints, faculty members face other issues when implementing service learning programs. Sam Marullo, professor in the Department of Sociology at Georgetown University and proponent of service learning, believes the barriers that exist when constructing service learning programs include university and departmental politics, lack of institutional or disciplinary rewards, institutional backlash, and community skepticism. These barriers must be considered when moving forward with any new reform movement in higher education. However, relating specifically to the development of service learning curricula, Marullo (1996) states that some colleagues equate service learning to students' independent community service and, therefore, have a problem with granting college credit for extra curricular activities. As

discussed in a previous section of this review, service
learning includes a reflective component that distinguishes
it from community service. However, faculty must be
educated in this method of instruction to understand the
difference between community service and service learning.

Marullo also believes that service learning has the
potential to enable greater faculty teaching, research, and
service. He asserts that the most critical question for
the faculty is how service learning will be evaluated as a
teaching pedagogy. If service learning is valued as a
teaching pedagogy, then institutional and disciplinary
rewards may increase. Institutional backlash may not be as
high due to the credibility of the method of instruction.
Furthermore, community skepticism would be diminished as
community service agency administrators understand that the
university does embrace this method.

Other concerns follow the same line of thought. For
example, a university must answer the question of how
service learning is evaluated in regard to promotion and
tenure (Eyler & Giles, 1997). Critics also state that
experiential education is too much about feelings and not
enough about content or ideas; it is disorganized and
chaotic; it is time-consuming and/or expensive; and it
exposes students to too much risk (NSEE Foundations

Document Committee, 1998). The risk may be associated with
university liability issues, such as the student's
transportation to and from the agency. Additionally,
critics believe there are multiple risks in dealing with
the receivers of service. For example, a critic of service
learning may not understand or support a student's desire
to work with men or women that are HIV positive, stating
that the work is too risky for the student's well-being.
University administrators must view service learning as a
credible teaching method before these barriers will be
broken.

The barriers to faculty implementation are important
to consider when developing a service learning program. If
faculty do not see any reward in adding a service learning
component, then why should they take on the extra
responsibility? Although some faculty participate in
service learning because they believe in giving students
the opportunity to see social injustices and learn how to
seek solutions, other faculty may not participate because
of the lack of institutional reward. The academy today
focuses on tenure that is structured for faculty who are
interested in research. If service learning takes time
away from faculty research, then the hesitant faculty
member may remain hesitant.

Faculty Benefits

Although faculty have obstacles to overcome when
teaching service learning, there are also many advantages
to faculty participation. Bringle and Hatcher (1996) state
that faculty who teach service learning classes "discover
that it brings life to the classroom, enhances performance
on traditional measures of learning, increases student
interest in the subject, teaches new problem-solving
skills, and makes teaching more enjoyable" (p. 222). These
advantages give faculty positive and meaningful reasons to
implement service learning classroom experiences.

Other benefits listed in the *Service Learning Faculty
Manual* for Century Community and Technical College (1996)
are "the relevance of the experience to students' lives
validates our teaching, it helps build classroom community,
and it opens communication with the community" (p. 10).
Furthermore, research shows that students involved in
service learning have closer relationships with faculty
than students who are not involved in service learning
(Eyler & Giles, 1997). I believe that a service learning
professor must feel a sense of accomplishment at the end of
the semester because he or she has not only allowed the
community to receive a benefit, but also given the student

an opportunity to have a reflective, educational experience

outside of the classroom.

Service Learning Student Benefits

I learn more through my volunteer work than I ever do in
any of my classes at school. Talking to people from
diverse backgrounds provides so much insight that people
just can't imagine. I study all these different theories
in political science and sociology, but until you get a
chance to see how the social world influences people's
everyday lives, it just doesn't have much meaning.
(Student Reflection, Rhoads, 1997, p. 182).

How does service learning affect students? What types

of students participate in service learning? Why should

professors take a second look at this form of experiential

education? What benefits do students receive from taking

part in a service learning course? While a variety of

perspectives are useful to consider to fully answer these

questions, the purpose of this section is to discuss the

student benefits of participation in service learning

engagements.

Many of us had childhood experiences that included

hearing our parents and teachers declare, "the more effort

you put in to something, the more you will receive." In

service learning, the more willing a student is to embark

upon a new experience, the more that student will receive

from service learning participation. The current

literature on service learning shows many positive results

from participation in service learning. However, the research studies do not all agree on one particular set of positive outcomes. That discrepancy may be because of the varied nature of the course content. An English professor's goal may be that his or her students learn how to communicate in written form. A Political Science professor may desire that his or her students have a true political experience beyond the classroom discussions.

Varied positive outcomes of service learning are displayed by two research studies. One study (Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, & Kerrigan, 1996) showed support for all of the predicted student impact variables, which included awareness of and involvement with the community, self-awareness, personal development, academic achievement, sensitivity to diversity, and independence as a learner. This case study blended quantitative and qualitative measures in order to determine the most effective and practical tools to measure service learning impact. Some of the approaches were to be used in a pre-post format, others were to be used for ongoing assessment, and others were to be used for a one-time measurement (Driscoll, et al, 1996). Another study "described educational benefits in terms of attitude development, values clarification, and greater awareness of problems in society" (Checkoway, 1996,

p. 602). Both research studies were about service
learning, but the positive outcomes were classified in a
different manner.

Further research by Honnet and Paulsen (1989) shows
that the results of effective service and learning are that
participants

- develop a habit of critical reflection on their
  experiences, enabling them to learn more throughout
  life;

- are more curious and motivated to learn;

- are able to perform better service;

- strengthen their ethic of social and civic response;

- feel more committed to addressing the underlying
  problems behind social issues;

- understand problems in a more complex way and can
  imagine alternative solutions;

- demonstrate more sensitivity to how decisions are
  made and how institutional decisions affect people's
  lives;

- learn how to work more collaboratively with other
  people on real problems; and

- realize that their lives can make a difference
  (p. 2-3).

37

Honnet and Paulsen believe that there are multiple positive outcomes for students who participate in service learning.

In addition to the benefits listed in the preceding paragraph, service learning also allows students to take ownership of their educational processes. Lisman (1998) argues that service learning "motivates them [students] to take ownership in their learning. Students begin to grow as learners when they grasp that they are important players in the construction of knowledge" (p. 38). In my view, this benefit is one of the most important foreseeable outcomes that an administrator or professor must consider. For students to actually feel as though they have a voice in their education is one of the most positive outcomes. Often undergraduate students believe that they have no voice in their education. They are taught to sit quietly, take good notes, attend all class sessions, and study for the examinations. Service learning research shows that experiential education progresses the classroom to a higher level of student development. Rhoads (1997) research, that was derived from six years of research and participation in community service projects conducted with three universities, enforces this point with student dialogue. Rhoads (1997) collected qualitative research from 108 student interviews, 66 students completed open-ended

surveys, and more than 200 students were observed at various sites in which participant observation was the essential form of research. In his study, a student told him "the things that I learned in working with poor people in the inner city have been worth more to me than anything I've learned all my years in school. The feelings and issues you have to deal with just can't be taught in the classroom" (p. 209). Faculty and administration must decide what their desired outcomes are for the service learning experience.

Understanding how and why students are participating in service learning experiences is also an important factor in development of programs. Astin and Sax (1998) completed a research study that focused on how undergraduates are affected by service. This quantitative study was based on entering freshmen and follow-up data collected from 3,450 students (2,287 women and 1,163 men) attending 42 institutions with federally funded community service projects (Astin & Sax, 1998). The impact of community service participation on undergraduate student development was examined. Through their study, they found that the most "predisposing factor of service learning student participation was whether the student volunteered during high school" (p. 253). Other predisposing factors included

leadership ability, involvement in religious activities, tutoring other students during high school, being a guest in a teacher's home, and being a woman. Astin and Sax found that those "entering freshmen who were most likely to participate during college tended to be less materialistic" (p. 253). Understanding who is participating can help administrators as they recruit students to enroll in service learning courses.

As has been noted, there are many positive outcomes of service learning. Nevertheless, many oppose using service learning as a teaching methodology. The next section focuses on the opponents' rationales concerning student participation.

Concerns About Student Participation in Service Learning

Opponents of service learning voice many concerns. Students are the first to complain about the logistical issues. Community service agencies do not always sit on the boundaries of the campus. Not all students have transportation to off-campus community service agencies. Students required to travel to locations that are not convenient are less likely to attend on a regular basis.

All students do not have time for activities other than school and work because many students are financing their college education by the work they do in the

afternoons, evenings, and weekends. The professor and administrator of the service learning program must consider this variability in the typical college student. For example, all students enrolled in a first-year English class are not 18-year-old students who have nothing else to do but attend class. There is not a stereotypical first-year student. In fact, the *Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac* (2000) indicates that 32.6% of college-age students are 25-44 years old at four-year institutions. First-year students may be married with children, international students speaking little English, or students interested in a career change after 10 years. In concert with students, service learning practitioners and faculty members must continue to reevaluate their individual classroom experiences to see if they are meeting the desired outcome of their student participants.

The value in service learning experiences depends generally on the effort and desire of the student. If students are looking solely to build their resume, then the desired outcomes of service learning may not be met. Desired service learning outcomes depend upon the student "developing respect for individuality and experience of their clients" (Fleischauer & Fleischauer, 1994, p. 42). If a student believes there is no worth in the assignment

of volunteering at a homeless shelter, then he or she may not achieve the instructor's goals for service learning.

Many opponents to service learning believe that teaching social responsibility is not the duty of the professorate. Some students do not agree with the mandate of community service outside of traditional classroom responsibilities, and they struggle with mixed feelings about community service (Rhoads, 1997). Robert Rhoads shares quotes of students who, for various reasons, were unsure about their participation in community service. One student stated, "I'm not sure if I'm completely comfortable helping the poor families. I mean, who am I that I can help make their lives better? It seems somewhat condescending for me to believe that I can somehow make a difference" (Rhoads, p. 22). Other students saw the community service only as a means to impress potential employers. One student stated, "sometimes I feel like I'm only fooling myself and that I'm really only into service so that I can help myself. I list this stuff on my resume and I feel guilty because I know it will help me get a teaching job. Is that why I do this? I know it makes me feel better about what I do in my spare time, but who am I really serving?" (Rhoads, p. 23).

There can be an ethical dilemma in service learning participation. Honnet and Paulsen (1989) state many of the positive results of effective service learning for students. However, as shown by the comments from participants in Rhodes' research, there are issues that must be addressed. These students question whether their participation is truly making a difference in the lives of those who receive the service or merely a selfish act. This is a dilemma for many students involved in service learning. The students involved many times are the receiver of much more than the person or persons who are supposed to be receiving the service.

A final concern of student participation in service learning is the argument about the amount of time required to participate. When critics discuss this time-consuming issue, they usually mean that "it takes time away from the activities associated with traditional forms of education—lectures, for example" (NSEE Foundations Document Committee, 1998, p. 21). Both professors and administrators alike understand the time commitment that they are asking of their students, so they offer their students involved in service learning a choice. As mentioned in the introduction, some class participants may

choose to write a term paper in lieu of participating in service learning.

Community Benefits of Participation in Service Learning

University and community partnerships constitute a key ingredient to successful service learning programs. Barbara Jacoby (1996) concludes that "for better or worse, social issues of crime, violence, inadequate housing, and an under-prepared labor pool have compelled several colleges and universities to step down from the ivory tower and become involved in their communities for their own self-interest" (p. 92). Universities now realize that they must learn from and serve the surrounding community to maintain their existence. Service learning engagements with the community can be positive for both the community and university.

The community can benefit from the service learning experience if the partnership is successful. Positive outcomes for the community include

> increased human resources for problem solving,
> increased access to college resources, improved
> relations with the university, increased ability to
> hire good students, increased future citizen
> support/commitment, better career selection choices
> for students, expanded roles for student supervisors,
> and more contributions to meet human needs (Brevard
> Community College, 1995, p. 5).

An example of the overlap of benefits is that better career selection for the students is a meaningful result for both the community and the student. A student may choose to work at a nonprofit organization after graduation. Had the student not experienced a connection to this type of business during the service learning class, he or she might have chosen a different career path.

For the service learning experience to be successful, universities must develop strong community partnerships. Jacoby (1996) asserts, "collaboration and the ultimate focus on community empowerment are also required for the long-term success of campus-community relationships" (p. 3). Each institution must go through

> a process of institutional self-examination of its own
> philosophy, mission, and approach to community
> involvement. It is essential that institutions not
> regard communities merely as teaching or research
> laboratories, an approach that assumes a false
> hierarchy of power and perpetuates an attitude of
> institutional superiority (Jacoby, 1996, p. 95).

This institutional superiority can have a detrimental effect on the partnership. To protect partnerships and achieve service learning desired outcomes, no one involved in service learning can have an attitude of "I am better than you." One of the goals of service learning is for all participants to receive benefits. If the university

believes that it is "above" the community in any way, then the partnership will not reach its full potential.

The partnership with the community is a critical component of the service learning experience. Whether it be the community in which the college is situated, or a community abroad, the link is vital to attaining service learning goals. This link must be continually revisited to ensure success. University administrators play a key role in developing and maintaining successful relationships among service learning participants.

University Engagement in Service Learning

One of the main ingredients of a successful service learning program is the strong connection between the university and the community it serves. The community does not necessarily have to be just outside the university's welcoming sign. Instead, it may be in a nearby suburb, another state, or even another country.

The current literature in service learning uses the word "engaged" to describe a university that has embraced the concept of service learning wholeheartedly. Judith Ramaley, the President of the University of Vermont, states, "by engagement we mean institutions that have redesigned their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and

46

productively involved in their communities" (Campus Compact Fax, personal communication, September 21, 1998). Campus Compact, the national organization made up of university presidents across the United States, elaborates on the characteristics of what they consider an "engaged" university. Some of the characteristics include "strong leadership and sustained commitment from the university president and chief academic officers and institutional policies, programs, and courses that are evaluated for the impact of service learning on the institution, faculty, students, and the community" (Campus Compact Fax). The engaged campus is one in which service learning is thriving and integrated across the disciplines.

When an institution of higher education becomes engaged in service learning, the university will reap several benefits. For example, Brevard Community College in Cocoa, Florida, discovers many enrichments from participating in service learning, including improved public service delivery, broadened conception of educational roles, increased learning opportunities, improved motivational base of instruction and learning, improved linkages to community, reoriented educative processes to meet human needs, and improved student

satisfaction and retention (Brevard Community College, 1995).

Another example of an engaged campus is Loyola College in Maryland. Loyola's Center for Values and Service was created in 1989. By 1995, two-thirds of the student population engaged in a form of service, totaling over 68,000 service hours (Leder & McGuinness, 1996). Although this is not the only measure of an engaged campus, Loyola's Center for Values and Service specifically works to "coordinate student service activities and support service learning pedagogy" (Leder & McGuinness, 1996, p. 48). Loyola is currently in the process of pioneering a new set of service learning initiatives, including a service leadership track within the academic curriculum that is designed to develop students into lifelong leaders in service, to gain administrative support for the course, to create a colloquium experience, and to promote faculty development (Leder & McGuinness, 1996). This campus is fully embracing service learning because it acknowledges and supports all service learning participants. The administration searches for innovative ways to implement service learning programs, students take advantage of the service learning opportunities, and faculty are being rewarded for their service learning teaching methods.

48

Additional community service agencies, which benefit a variety of receivers of service, continue to be added and long-term partnerships with certain programs entrench service learning in the community.

To become an engaged campus, a university must be willing to take risks and be flexible. As described in a previous section, there are many issues to be discussed. For example, university faculty reward structures must be defined to allow for promotion based on the use of service learning in the curriculum. Departmental politics, lack of institutional or disciplinary rewards, institutional backlash and community skepticism, and increased burden due to effort in preparation are but a few of the institutional barriers universities must overcome (Marullo, 1996). Students face time constraints with work and class and some use service learning only as a means to impress an employer. An engaged campus will not happen overnight. Each university must evaluate how service learning could be integrated throughout the campus. Because of the variance in types of institutions of higher learning, the steps taken to become an engaged campus differ. Steps must be tailored to each institution, whether public, private, two-year, four-year, or vocational, serving both traditional and nontraditional students.

Administrators' Roles in the Service Learning Experience

Current literature stresses the important role of administrators when discussing the principles of service learning and how service learning can be a part of the university mission (Boyer, 1994; Giles, et. al., 1991; NSEE, 1998; Oliver, 1996). Ottenritter and Lisman (1998) insist that "reference to the importance of our colleges contributing to the improvement of community life usually exists somewhere in the institutional statement of mission and purpose" (p. 10). The administration of an institution of higher learning is largely responsible for the implementation of the university mission. As such, administrators are important to the success of service learning programs. Institutional support is necessary for successful university service learning programs.

Until hierarchy is not a factor in institutions of higher learning, the administration must support service learning. Individuals can make a difference, but having the support of the administration to develop an engaged service learning campus is critical. Administrators play an important role in the acceptance and implementation of an engaged campus.

Two relevant case studies place different emphases on the administrators' roles in service learning. Barbara

Jacoby (1999) stresses the importance of the partnership

between academic affairs and student affairs in the

development of service learning at the University of

Maryland, College Park. The University of Maryland is a

research and land grant institution, similar to the

institution studied in this research. Using qualitative

method of inquiry, this case study shows the progression of

the Office of Commuter Affairs and Community Service

(CACS). The current role of administrators at Maryland is

widespread. The coordinator of the service learning

program has connected faculty with local and national

faculty development opportunities. In addition to the

academic focus, the CACS has increased

> support of both curricular and co curricular service.
> Two graduate assistants coordinate a database of over
> 800 community service agencies which personalizes
> search capabilities that is available on the World
> Wide Web, a monthly community service newsletter with
> a mailing list of over 1,300, a computer mail
> reflector that provides weekly and emergency updates
> of current opportunities and needs, and orientation
> for new students (p. 33).

All of these services were not initially in place as

this office has grown since its inception in 1992.

Although important strides have been taken, the

administration still has many unanswered questions in

relationship to the placement of priority on service

learning initiatives. Questions yet to be resolved include

51

To what extent should the staff support co-curricular community service by fraternities and sororities and residence hall groups, rather than increasing services to faculty that teach service-learning courses? Should curricular or co-curricular service be focused on particular communities or issues? How can student affairs and academic affairs work together to continue to integrate service-learning into the life and work of the university? (Jacoby, 1999, p. 33)

The administration of University of Maryland has many goals it hopes to accomplish. The vice president of student affairs has identified the creation of a "comprehensive center for service learning as one of his division's priorities for the institution's current capital campaign. Additionally, the coordinator hopes to produce a faculty handbook and pilot an undergraduate teaching assistant program for service learning" (Jacoby, 1999, p. 33). These are all programs and initiatives that will enable the University of Maryland to moved toward campus engagement in service learning.

The second case study describes efforts to institutionalize service learning at the University of Utah, but stresses the importance of faculty-driven service learning initiatives. Buchanan (1998) stated that "without faculty and administrator institutional commitment to service learning, it is likely that service-learning will be recorded in the annals of history as yet another short-lived pedagogical fad" (p. 114). This case study reports

the importance of administrative support. For example, the

president of the university "included comments about

service-learning in the annual faculty address and was

instrumental in the creation of the Utah Campus Compact"

(p. 115). However, the majority of the elements for

successful integration of service learning initiatives

include recommendations for faculty, not administrators.

The essential elements involve the following

> initiatives for permanent change must be faculty
> driven, necessary funds are needed, faculty within an
> academic unit must want to integrate service learning
> into their curriculum, experience with service
> learning is critical, and designating a respected
> faculty leader secures commitment (p. 117-118).

Buchanan did recommend a future direction for the

University of Utah. Some of these recommendations were

specific to administrators' roles in the service learning

program. The following criteria were developed to improve

existing and develop new service-learning programs

> University and community programs should be developed
> on a strong foundation of mutual ownership,
> commitment, and partnership, and should be designed to
> address complex and important community needs;
> programs should be disciplinary and interdisciplinary;
> programs should involve a combination of service-
> learning, research, and community action; programs
> should strive for continuity beyond the length of the
> academic semesters; research and service activities at
> off-campus sites should be encouraged; and programs
> should enable students to graduate with the desire and
> the skills to be involved in the community (Buchanan,
> 1998, p. 118-119).

The main recommendation was that the "university and community programs should be built on a strong foundation of mutual ownership, commitment, and partnership and should be designed to address complex and important community needs" (p. 118). However, securing top level support remains as crucial as committed grassroots leadership.

Controversies and Complexities

The complexities of the previous case studies highlight the multiple conflicts and controversies surrounding the implementation of service learning in higher education. The only consensus in service learning is that reflection and action must be integrated into the curriculum (O'Grady, 2000). Through the literature review, I have noted the complexities involved in student participation, various barriers to implementation, definitions of community reciprocity with the university, understanding methods that move universities toward engagement, and faculty issues surrounding integration of service learning. These are but a few of the complexities involved in this teaching method. An additional concern is the potential for "paternalism being described in the word service learning" (O'Grady, 2000, p. 25). Jane Kendall (1990) argues

I have tremendous problems with the word service. It
suggests an inequity between the servers and those
served. It suggests that the former have resources
and that the latter do not...It does not carry the
connotation of social justice that is also an
essential component of service learning...And,
finally, I have heard service used too many times as a
self-righteous, vaguely disguised ticket to salvation
for upper and middle class people who feel guilty
about their access to resources (p. 24).

Such issues complicate service learning because each

constituency regards them differently. For example, The

University of Utah case study recognizes the importance of

administrators' roles, but clearly indicates that faculty

provide the critical link in program development.

Despite these complexities, service learning is

internationally recognized as an important teaching

strategy. The organization of Campus Compact alone is

substantial. The description of membership in 1999 was

that "639 public and private, two- and four-year colleges

and universities located in 41 states and the District of

Columbia" (Caron, eds., 1999, p. 2). Further statistical

data shows that students at Campus Compact campuses spend

more that 32 million hours serving their community (Caron,

eds, 1999, p. 3). Kezar and Rhoads (2001) suggest that the

continuing interest in service learning "may be interpreted

as a response to three general critiques leveled at

academe: lack of curricular relevance, lack of faculty

commitment to teaching, and lack of institutional (and

faculty) responsiveness to the larger public good" (p.

150).

Additionally, service learning may help higher education

respond to questions being asked about its role in society.

For example

> how are institutions of higher learning preparing
> students for active roles in public life? What good
> does college and university research provide for
> society? What is the responsibility of these
> institutions to the larger society, and are they
> fulfilling it (Weigert, 1998, p. 3).

Service learning has the potential to answer all of

these questions. More institutions of higher learning are

discussing the importance of service learning. Conferences

nationwide are integrating the service learning topics into

their schedules. Continued research in this subject is

critical for the development of this teaching methodology.

Conclusion

So, I ask you to take that first step. Knock on the door
at the shelter. Call the volunteer coordinator at the
prison. Visit the high rise packed with older people with
time on their hands. Give service learning a chance.
You'll be embarking on a journey that puts people, often
found on the margins, at the center (Finger, 1997, p. 25).

This review of literature began with defining service

learning in the context of my research and then positioning

it in the history of higher education. In addition, I

discussed faculty, student, and university and community partnership issues.

Because of the importance of the administrators in successful service learning programs, I want my research to contribute to this very important knowledge base. There is little information about the administrators' role in service learning. I believe it is critical that all participants be represented in the literature.

The literature shows that there may be positive academic outcomes by student participation in service learning. I wish to understand how administrators support service learning. While faculty members have written about their own and their students' experiences, the literature has not fully explored the role that university administrators play in service learning. How does the university administration fit into the functioning and success of service learning programs? Do the students, faculty, and community service agencies meet administrators' goals? What type of support is needed from the administration to develop a successful service learning program? I hope that this research answers these questions about the administration of service learning programs.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This research was aimed at discovering administrators'
goals in one particular service learning program and
determining whether or not these goals were achieved. To
accomplish this task, qualitative research methods were
used. Students, faculty, community service agency
directors and higher education administrators involved in
the service learning experience were interviewed. This
chapter provides a rationale for why qualitative methods
were used, specifically the case study, and articulates
this study's methodological tenets.

Characteristics of Qualitative Research

Qualitative research allows the researcher to observe
the phenomenon of interest in its natural setting. Patton
(1990) states, "qualitative methods permit the evaluator to
study selected issues in depth and detail" (p. 13).
Instead of surveying the service learning participants, a
qualitative researcher listens to their direct responses
and observes their nonverbal patterns in detail.

Yin's (1994) mandate is that every investigator work
hard to report all evidence fairly. Because qualitative
inquiry is gathered in a verbal form or through the lens of
a researcher, the interpretation of a given event may vary.

58

Two people may observe the same action, but may relate the action differently. I made every attempt to observe my subject objectively, not asking leading questions that would betray my biases. I paid careful attention during the interviews when the interviewees shared information concerning a negative aspect of the service learning program, thereby refraining from dismissing their concerns by verbal or nonverbal communication. Although the researcher may not agree with the interviewee's statements, the researcher should not hinder the interviewee's ability to honestly answer the questions.

Additionally, the research process produces descriptive data, "people's own written or spoken words and observable behavior" (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975, p. 4). It was important to keep in mind that the researcher's eyes may see and ears may hear a different story of the service learning experience than another individual. This is why the exact transcription of the tape-recorded interviews was an integral part of the data collection process.

Another benefit of qualitative research is that it is holistic. One goal of this research was to be holistic by including all participants involved in the service learning experience. "The emphasis on holistic understanding in qualitative methods is in sharp contrast to the logic and

procedures of much evaluation conducted in a quantitative-experimental tradition" (Patton, 1990, p. 49). Because of specific research questions, the dissertation would not have been of value if only one group of participants were interviewed.

This study encompassed characteristics of qualitative research articulated by Valerie J. Janesick (1994). For example, Janesick (1994) states that qualitative design is "focused on understanding a given social setting, not necessarily on making predictions about the setting" (p. 212). This research was not meant to make predictions, but rather to study the role of administrators in a particular educational setting. Institutions of higher learning are not all the same. Some colleges might be small and private, while other institutions may have a commuter enrollment of 20,000. However, the research could be used as an example of a service learning program at a university in a developmental stage.

Additionally, Janesick (1994) states, "qualitative design looks at relationships within a system or culture" (p. 25). This research studies the relationships between the research participants as those relationships facilitate or impede the attainment of administrators' goals. Finally, "qualitative design incorporates room for

60

description of the role of the researcher as well as description of the researcher's own biases and ideological preference" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 25). Through peer debriefing, full transcription of all interviews, and the use of constant comparative method, I attempt to identify ways in which my biases affected this research.

Why Case Study?

Robert Yin (1994) states that "case studies are the preferred strategy when how and why questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context" (p. 1). Service learning meets all three criteria. Administrators were asked how they ensure that the service learning goals are met. There was no control over what students did or said at the community service agencies. Further, service learning is a contemporary phenomenon that deals with real-life situations.

This research is a single case study of a service learning program at a Research I university. The case consists of five higher education administrators, two faculty, five community service agency directors and nine students who were currently or previously enrolled in a service learning course.

Case studies have the power to affect change and can be helpful in establishing policies and procedures. While admittedly offering only one interpretation, this research will be useful to administrators who are in the process of constructing service learning programs. Scholars have examined student experience in service learning (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1997). Faculty have written articles on their experience and, as a result, principles have been established that give administrators service learning guidelines (Honnet & Paulsen, 1989). Still, little information exists concerning the administrators' role in service learning programs. Trends towards integrating service learning in research institutions are just getting started.

<div align="center">**Research Questions**</div>

As introduced in Chapter 1, the purpose of this study is to understand the methods administrators use to work toward service learning goals and, subsequently, to determine if these goals are met. As such, the research questions are

1. What are administrators' goals in the service learning program at the Research I university studied?

2. Were those goals achieved?

To measure the achievement of the administrators' service learning goals, I interviewed personnel at the community service agencies and the faculty involved in service learning, as well as students. Therefore, supplemental questions included

1. To what extent are the service learning goals of university administrators achieved, as perceived by the community service agencies?

2. To what extent are the service learning goals of university administrators achieved, as perceived by the faculty?

3. To what extent are the service learning goals of university administrators achieved, as perceived by the students?

4. To what extent are service learning goals of the university administrators achieved, as perceived by the university administrators?

The main questions in this research study concerned the role of administrators. Administrators were asked about their goals and the methods they used to achieve these goals. To triangulate these administrators' perspectives, I spoke with faculty, students and community service agency directors involved in the process. Supplemental questions targeted the concept of successful

63

completion of service learning goals. The perception of

whether or not the goals were being met by the participants

gave insight to the attainment of the overall goals of the

service learning program.

Defining the Case

The setting for this study was a large, public

Research I university in the Southeast. This university is

considered the "flagship" in the state.

The particular service learning program in this case

study was nestled within a department that provides a

multitude of services to students with academic needs.

Some of these services include seminars on test taking

strategies, stress management counseling, tutoring labs,

supplemental instruction programs, and computer services.

However, the program did not initially reside in this

division, but began as part of a grant, a joint venture

between a predominately white institution and a

historically black institution in the same city. Although

connected to both universities, the grant was administered

by a local reverend. At RWU (all names are fictitious),

the English Department taught most of the service learning

courses.

In the late 1980s the Belews, a married couple who

were both English faculty members, became the main

proponents of this teaching method. In my interview with Oscar, a university official, he referenced the moment when the Belews were up for tenure. One of the professors was denied tenure, so Oscar helped in reversing the decision due to the professor's intense involvement in service learning. During this time period, many faculty members and the upper echelon of administration did not see service learning as a credible teaching method. Sandra, a faculty member who teaches service learning courses, states that "service learning was sort of ghettoized in English because it has this connotation of liberal, humanist, volunteerism kind of thing and nobody wants to tangle with something that is daily related to a Christian connotation." There were many struggles through the development of the service learning program.

When the grant money ran out, university administrators did not want to completely shut down the program. The director of a unit within student services that specializes in promoting academic success was asked to direct the service learning initiatives on campus. She did not have a choice in accepting the program, but rather was placed in a situation in which she could not say no. She was invited to attend a meeting, with no knowledge of what the agenda of the meeting was. Without a chance to say no,

she was asked to absorb the service learning program into her department, with limited resources attached to the program.

In the beginning, a graduate assistant administered the program, with the support of the English department faculty. Members of the English faculty began meeting on a regular basis and recruited more faculty into integrating service learning experiences within their classrooms.

Currently the program has two full time administrators directing faculty issues and agency recruitment. An additional faculty member works directly with development of service learning in curriculum with individual faculty members.

The following is a detailed description of the groups of interviewees.

Sample Information

<u>Administrators</u>

Because the focus of this research was on service learning administrators, two primary administrators of the service learning program were interviewed. The two primary administrators had differing focuses within the service learning program. One administrator focused on community service agency recruitment and the other administrator focused on faculty recruitment and faculty training.

Through opportunistic sampling, other administrators were identified as potential interviewees, such as the second highest-ranking administrator at the university and the director of the department in which the service learning program was situated. Opportunistic sampling allows a researcher to "follow new leads during fieldwork, taking advantage of the unexpected flexibility" (Patton, 1990, p. 183). After reviewing literature concerning an "engaged" campus, I considered interviewing the higher level administrators very important. Engagement means that service learning is embraced by the upper level administrators and is integrated throughout the disciplines. Service learning, as a reform movement in higher education, must be supported by the upper level faculty and administrators, as well as integrated into the curriculum by faculty members.

Table 1

Administrator Interviewee Details and Pseudonym Explanation

Interviewee/Pseudonym	Details
Administrators:	
Sue	Director of office where service learning is situated.

Table 1 Continued

Oscar   Second Highest-ranking

                               university official

Jennifer   Part-time service learning

                               administrator and faculty

Virginia   Full-time service learning

                               coordinator

Melanie   Works in the office of the

                               highest-ranking university

                               official

Faculty

    The faculty member that the research focused on is an

instructor in the department within the liberal arts sector

of the campus who is involved only with service learning

classes at this time. She also serves as the part-time

administrator in the service learning program. She has

been active in promoting service learning through

conferences nationally and on campus and organizing faculty

meetings for those interested in teaching service learning.

She has incorporated service learning into both her English

and Drama courses.

    The other faculty member is an instructor who teaches

English and incorporates service learning into her

curriculum. The semester I interviewed her was her last

semester as a doctoral candidate at the university. She
was persuaded to use service learning as a teaching
methodology by the above-mentioned instructor. In
comparison, one instructor was entrenched fully into this
teaching method, whereas the other was not.

Table 2

Faculty Interviewee Details and Pseudonym Explanation

Interviewee/Pseudonym	Details
Faculty:	
Jennifer	Part-time service learning administrator and faculty
Sandra	Service learning faculty

Students

Initially, the part-time administrator and service
learning instructor gave me names of students who were
previously or currently involved in service learning.
These students were not necessarily students enrolled in
her English class. The faculty member and part-time
service learning administrator gave me the names of other
professors to contact. In addition, I contacted students
who had been or were currently being taught by three other
faculty members in the English department to interview

others who have participated in service learning while studying under various faculty. I interviewed a total of nine students, ranging from first-year students to juniors.

Table 3

Student Interviewee Details and Pseudonym Explanation

Interviewee/Pseudonym	Details
Students:	
Kelly	Junior (took SL course first semester in college)
Alicia	First-Year student (took SL course first semester in college)
Wendy	First-Year student; (took SL course first semester in college); currently enrolled in second SL course
Christopher	Sophomore (took SL course first semester in college)

Table 3 Continued

Laura	First-Year Student (took SL course first semester in college)
Eric	Sophomore; serving on SL Advisory Board; completed two SL courses
Holly	First Year Student; currently enrolled; enrolled for second course
Dorothy	Sophomore (took SL course first semester in college)

Community Service Agency Directors

The final members of the case study included the directors of the community service agency. Five community service agency directors who participate in the service learning program were interviewed. These agency directors perform diverse tasks in differing settings: two coordinate the volunteers at local hospitals, one organizes volunteers at local public schools, one places students at a shelter for children, and one coordinates volunteers to teach adult learners professional development.

Table 4

Agency Interviewee Details and Pseudonym Explanation

Interviewee/Pseudonym	Details
Service Agency Directors:	
Rebekah	Volunteer coordinator for a home for children
Monica	Volunteer coordinator at hospital
Allison	Director of center for adult learners
Leah	Volunteer coordinator at hospital
Cara	Volunteer coordinator for local public schools

The 21 interviews varied between 30 minutes and two hours each. The data collection began in fall 1999 and was completed in April 2000.

As can be determined from the pseudonyms, the majority of the interviewees are women. A woman directs the department in which the service learning is situated, and the service learning administrators are both women. All community service agency directors are women. Seven of the nine students interviewed were women.

Data Collection

A separate list of questions for each set of the constituents interviewed was developed (See Appendix A-E). I wanted to clearly answer the research questions, while also asking questions that might provoke answers that would allow for further probing by the researcher. The questions were approved in the fall of 1999, prior to the first interview. In the spring of 2000, all interviews began with noncontroversial questions, as suggested by Patton (1990), who advises an interviewer to ask for "straightforward descriptions" in the beginning of the interview (p. 294). All service learning participants signed a consent form (Appendix A), showing their understanding of my research methods and purpose. I conducted interviews according to a structured format, tape-recording them and transcribing the data.

Data Analysis

This case study uses Glasser and Strauss' (1967) constant comparative method, a strategy of data analysis that "combines inductive category coding with a simultaneous comparison of all social incidents observed. As social phenomena are recorded and classified, they are also compared across the categories" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 335). Initially I focused on organizing the data by

topical analysis, specifically by participant category.

The five participant categories included service learning

administrators, university officials, students, faculty,

and community service agency directors. According to Yin

(1994), "the strength of the case study strategy is in

having developed rich explanation for the complex pattern

of outcomes and in comparing the explanation with the

outcomes" (p. 115). By organizing the data topically,

"rich explanations" of how and why administrators' goals of

service learning were being met or not being met were

developed. Supplemental research questions were designed

to target each participant group to see if they perceived

that the administrators' goals were being met in the

service learning program. The data was then organized in

each participant category by specific topics in

relationship to the research questions. For example, the

categories used included university mission, community

service in high school, and engagement. The constant

comparison data analysis method allowed the researcher to

discover themes, "beginning with the analysis of initial

observations, undergoing continuous refinement throughout

the data collection and analysis process, and continuously

feeding back into the process of category coding" (Lincoln

& Guba, 1985, p. 335).

The administrators' goals were determined through this process of developing themes. I specifically asked the administrators what their goals were, and then through the process of analyzing the data, I compiled the goals into themes. Some of the goals were repetitive and some overlapped. However, the goals that I analyzed for this study were the goals of the two main administrators of the service learning program at RWU (Jennifer and Virginia). Although other university administrators were interviewed, as mentioned in the previous section, the purpose of this research was to look at the administrators that were involved daily in the service learning program.

Additionally, this research attempts to reflect Yin's (1994) four principles of quality research that "underlie all good social science" (p. 123). Yin states, "first, the analysis should show that it relied on all the relevant evidence" (p. 123). By analyzing the service learning documents and interviewing all participant groups in the service learning program, relevant evidence was sought. The answers to the research questions were built upon this relevant evidence. Yin's second principle is that "analysis should include all major rival interpretations" (p. 123). If the interpretations of the research conflict with any other current literature, or if there are

75

conflicting interpretations among the participant groups, then all of these findings were included. Yin's third principle is "analysis should address the most significant aspect of the case study" (p. 123). As Yin (1994) states, "why go to the effort of doing a case study unless you can address the largest issue?" (p. 124). The largest issue concerns the administrators' goals and whether or not they are being met. Data was analyzed keeping this in mind at all times.

According to Yin, a researcher's "prior, expert knowledge" is essential to developing a meaningful case study (p. 124). My prior expert knowledge of this program included one semester of interning with a service learning program and developing the research proposal. The previous experience with the subject of service learning did influence the research. Careful attention was given when questioning the research participants so that the questions were not leading in any way. Since I had positive experiences with my prior service learning experience, I had to consciously stay focused on the questions as to not lead the interview to be about only the positive aspects. My bias towards service learning did not change because of this research, but rather it was reinforced due to the students' responses to the interview questions. Yin's four

postulates guided the data analysis, thus ensuring that methodological tenets described in the following section formed this research.

Establishing Trustworthiness

Qualitative research relies heavily on the skill of the researcher. Patton (1990) insists that "generating useful qualitative findings through observation, interviewing, and consent analysis requires discipline, knowledge, training, practice, creativity and hard work" (p. 11). I understood the importance of these characteristics and attempted to generate a useful study. The following discussion details the methodological standards in relationship to the research.

Dependability

Similar to the concept of reliability, dependability refers to a researcher's method of analyzing the data in a way that produces results that are considered consistent and trustworthy. According to some researchers, the object of qualitative research is, "if a later investigator followed exactly the same procedures as described by an earlier investigator and conducted the same case study all over again, the later investigator should arrive at the same findings and conclusions" (Yin, 1994, p. 36). To do this, Yin (1994) recommends that the researcher "make as

77

many steps as operational as possible and to conduct research as if someone were always looking over your shoulder" (p. 37). Yin (1994) affirms, "a good guideline for doing case studies is to conduct the research so that an external auditor could repeat the procedures and arrive at the same results" (p. 37). Although I believe that a qualitative researcher should strive to clearly outline the operational steps of his or her research, I do not fully embrace Yin's position. Instead, I believe that similar methods will result in similar findings. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) state, "each repetition of the application of the same, or supposedly equivalent, instruments to the same units will yield similar measurements" (p. 292). In an effort to report dependable results, I developed operational steps and documented extensively. Specifically, the interviewing protocol was established carefully prior to the actual interview. If someone were interested in conducting the same study, he or she would have the necessary information to begin the process. However, I believe that similar findings would not necessarily be evident.

Credibility

This research was analyzed in a way that was meant to produce credible findings. According to Patton (1990),

"any credible research strategy requires that the investigator adopt a stance of neutrality with regard to the phenomenon. This simply means that the investigator does not set out to prove a particular perspective or manipulate the data to arrive at predisposed truths" (p. 55). To produce credible findings, I used two methods, described in depth below.

<div align="center">Peer Debriefing</div>

Peer debriefing is a "process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer for the purpose of exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise remain only implicit within the inquirer's mind" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 308). A peer of the researcher who is familiar with qualitative research and holds a doctorate in higher education administration read interview transcripts and drafts of the research. Although the peer debriefer has not worked in service learning programs, she works on a college campus and understands the intricacies of the academic/community relationship. The role of the peer debriefer in qualitative research is to give the researcher the opportunity to clarify his or her research and ensure that accurate and truthful results are documented. It is a qualitative method of enhancing the credibility of the research. However, one must realize that in qualitative

research methodology, a researcher's bias and objectivity is included in the translations of the data.

Discussions followed with the peer and the researcher to ensure findings were not influenced by the researcher's prior knowledge of the service learning program. The main point of peer debriefing, "from the point of view of credibility, is to help keep the inquirer honest, exposing her to searching questions by an experienced protagonist doing his or her best to play the devil's advocate" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 308). Peer debriefing gave the researcher the opportunity to verify what was reported was accurate. It served as the external audit of the document.

Triangulation

Triangulation, the second method used to establish credible research, involves multiple and different collection modes and sources. These documentary sources included interviews, field notes, observations, course syllabi, program web sites, and literature produced by the service learning program. For example, to cross-check the reported goals of the service learning administrators, I compared the interviews with the literature published by their office. Additionally, field notes and observations were compared with the transcriptions to check for discrepancies.

Validity

Researchers refer to validity in varying ways. Yin
(1994) addresses construct, external, and internal in the
context of qualitative research, particularly the case
study method. Although validity is not always associated
with qualitative research, Yin's guidelines for validity
greatly enhanced this study. According to Yin (1994),
construct validity requires that an investigator provide a
clear definition for the concepts being studied. External
validity "deals with the problem of knowing whether a
study's findings are generalizable beyond the immediate
case study" (Yin, 1994, p. 35). Internal validity is the
process by which a researcher attempts to make correct
inferences from the relationships (Yin, 1994).

To address different types of validity issues, I
followed Yin's suggestions. Construct validity may be
achieved through using multiple sources of evidence or
establishing a chain of evidence (Yin, 1994). Multiple
sources of evidence allow the investigator to review
subject-related material holistically. For example,
written material was gathered on service learning that is
distributed by the program administrators as well as
information from the university web site. The multiple
sources of evidence criterion was met by the diversity of

81

participants involved in the study. The research was

designed to seek answers from the administrators, but

looked to others in the service learning interaction to

answer the supplemental questions. Additionally,

reflective field notes were analyzed to add to the multiple

sources of evidence. These field notes were important

because they reminded the me of thoughts and observances

from the experience. The field notes were referred to as

the transcripts were read for accuracy.

Furthermore, the chain of evidence must be clear and

well defined. Yin (1994) compares the chain of evidence of

case study research to a criminal investigation:

> As with criminological evidence, the process should be
> tight enough that evidence presented in "court"--the
> case study report--is assuredly the same evidence that
> was collected at the scene of the "crime" during the
> data collection process; conversely, no original
> evidence should have been lost, through carelessness
> or bias, and therefore fail to receive appropriate
> attention in considering the "facts" of the case
> (p. 98).

The research had to be well defined and well documented so

that the chain of evidence was clear.

Another form of validity is external. Yin (1994)

believes that single case studies are not designed to be

generalizable to the larger population. This research does

not lend itself to generalizability unless a university or

college has the same parameters and characteristics as the

university that was studied. Because of the lack of

information written about administrators' involvement in

service learning, this research may be useful in a variety

of ways. This research can inform, perhaps most

importantly, those who are beginning a service learning

program at their institutions. Through the thoughtful

documentation of the research questions and related

findings, this study shows how service learning goals are

met or not met. This information alone will be useful for

service learning participants in the evaluation of their

programs.

In addition to construct and external validity,

internal validity, which according to Yin (1994), seeks to

"establish a causal relationship, whereby certain

conditions are shown to lead to other conditions"

determines the effectiveness of data analysis (p. 36).

Although the research did not seek to establish causal

relationships between variables of interest, I sought to

make correct inferences about the information I analyzed.

Yin suggests that the researcher make every effort to

ensure that all inferences made are correct. The questions

to consider when making these inferences included "Is the

inference correct? Have all rival explanations and

possibilities been considered?" (p. 35). In this study,

participants offered many rival explanations that are

chronicled and interpreted in subsequent chapters.

Ethical Issues

Of the four most common types of ethical standards,

relational, utilitarian, ecological and deontological, I

chose deontological as the guiding ethical practice.

Deontological ethics judge the morality of decisions by

referring to absolute values such as honesty, justice,

fairness, and respect for others (Gall, Borg, & Gall,

1996). Service learning depends upon absolute values as

one of the guiding principles involves "engaging people in

responsible and challenging actions for the common good"

(Honnet & Paulsen, 1989, p.2). During interviews, I

attempted to be sensitive to the multiple demands on the

participant's time. For example, one community service

agency director had to assist various clients during the

course of our interview, so I waited patiently as she

completed instructing several clients. Additionally, I

attempted to retain, as much as possible, the data's

original form in my presentation. For example, I share the

actual words of the participants rather than rephrasing the

text, thereby ensuring that each participant retains a

distinctive voice in these findings. I respect the

individuality and integrity of each person who contributed to this study.

The other three ethical standards were not chosen for specific reasons. Relational ethics requires that a researcher be "a fully engaged member of the participants' community" (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 556). Although I was immersed in the process, there were times at which it was appropriate to be the detached observer. I considered ecological ethics, which is based on "participants' culture and the larger social systems of which they are part" inappropriate because ethnography was not the research method (Gall, et. al., p. 556). Finally, utilitarian ethics allows the researcher to justify deception "if it could be demonstrated that it did not harm the participants" (Gall, et. al., p. 556). I found it neither necessary nor useful to be deceptive in any aspect of the research. Instead, I attempted to be forthright with all participants by explaining in detail what the research was about and what I hoped to accomplish through this study.

Furthermore, an issue that was important was the confidentiality of the interviewees. Because I did not interview a large number of people for each service learning category, I considered the issue of confidentiality of paramount importance. While attempting

to safeguard participants' identities, I recognize that complete confidentiality is not possible in this study. Specifically, I acknowledge the difficulties of protecting the anonymity of the administrators on the campus that was researched since they may receive a copy of the final product. Based on the description of the service learning program, readers who are part of that campus community may distinguish the administrators. Confidentiality also determined what I shared with the men and women whom I interviewed. I refrained from mentioning any information from other interviews during the interview process.

Conclusion

As stated in the introduction, the research questions focus on administrators and participants involved in service learning. This case study examines one program at a large, public Research I university. By focusing only on one university, I was able to concentrate on the multiple partners in the service learning program, which included students, faculty, university officials, and community service agency directors. In addition, several ethical considerations guided the research methodology. The methodological standards by which this research must be built upon is of utmost importance. By building a rapport with the interviewees, the researcher hoped to gain the

level of trustworthiness that may make the research

valuable to scholars and practitioners interested in the

subject of service learning.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Research Questions

This chapter details findings of the data collection

and presents information in relationship to the research

questions, which are

1. What are administrators' goals in the service

learning program at the Research I university studied?

2. Were those goals achieved?

Furthermore, the supplemental research questions that are

specific to the community service agencies, faculty, and

students involved with service learning programs were

answered. The questions are

1. To what extent are the service learning goals of

university administrators achieved, as perceived by

the community service agencies?

2. To what extent are the service learning goals of

university administrators achieved, as perceived by

the faculty?

3. To what extent are the service learning goals of

university administrators achieved, as perceived by

the students?

4. To what extent are service learning goals of the university administrators achieved, as perceived by the university administrators?

This chapter first details the goals of the service learning administrators, then answers the remaining research question by discussing each goal in depth. Answers to the supplemental research questions are integrated within each specific goal. Throughout the chapter, pseudonyms are used (See Tables 1-4, p.63-68) to help clarify who or what I am referring to in the data presentation while also attempting to protect the confidentiality of the interviewees.

Administrators' Goals in Service Learning Programs

The first research question analyzes the goals of the administrators of a specific service learning program at the university I chose to study (R W University). During the course of interviewing the two main administrators involved in service learning, Virginia and Jennifer, I defined the goals. In this section, I review my research on the goals and attempt to compile the goals into succinct, yet distinctive goals. The beginning of the section is a broad discussion of the goals shared by the administrators in this study. The listing of compiled goals follows this broad discussion.

Jennifer and Virginia both situated their goals in their definition of service learning, which included explicitly both reflection and academic rigor. Jennifer affirms, "the goal of the program is to supplement the students' academic experience with their service to the community."

Additional goals of the service learning administrators were clarified by reviewing the web site associated with their program. During the interview, Jennifer referred to the description of the program's goals listed on the web site. Service learning is defined as

> learning by doing, applying academic concepts to meet community needs, meeting course objectives by serving outside the classroom, deepening understanding through reflecting on real life experiences, and integrating service into the academic curriculum to reinforce learning (RWU Service Learning Web Site).

These goals all relate to students' personal development and interaction in the service learning process.

Another goal Jennifer, the part-time administrator, emphasizes is that "our service learning here is to engage more [students] so that the retention at the university is higher." Jennifer insists that service learning promotes student discipline within the overall university because "there would be fewer [students] on probation and that service learning should help students to find alternative

activities to the self-destructive kinds of activities that sometime a lot of college students engage in, like binge drinking." Jennifer serves on a committee that focuses on using the environmental change theory to reduce high risk consumption of alcohol campus-wide. She believes that service learning offers an alternative to this type of behavior.

When I asked Virginia, the full-time administrator, about the goals of the service learning program, she discussed her long-range plans for the program, including the need of service learning to be "recognized as an important learning strategy by the administration." She expressed her desire to "improve the learning for the students and the quality of the service experiences." However, funding the program remains difficult so the real goal was to "institutionalize and get buy-in from the administration and the prominent faculty so that it [service learning] would be of value...and something that we were all proud of as opposed to putting obstacles in the way and saying that it is not important."

The goals did vary between the two main administrators of the program. The faculty member, who at the time of my research collection was also the part-time administrator, related everything back to the students, while the other

administrator spoke about broader university

constituencies. These goals did not contradict each other;

however, each of the service learning administrators

emphasize different aspects of service learning.

Additionally, the two main administrators I

interviewed, as well as other campus administrators, agree

that the goals of service learning relate directly to the

mission of the university, including research, teaching and

service. The second highest ranking administrator at the

university, Oscar, thinks

> The mission of the university and particularly a
> public university in a land grant setting is first of
> all to promote the transmission of knowledge. Service
> learning correlates highly with improved learning
> outcomes or improved transmission. Second, is to
> promote engagement with the community beyond the
> university in ways that benefit that community.
> Service learning provides a nexus in which
> intellectual and personal development are rich
> occasions to proceed...and in ways that are integral
> to each other.

The strategic direction for the university advocates

service learning implementation: the university should

"create a challenging learning environment that enriches

students' intellectual lives, develops their professional

and personal abilities, and fosters civic engagement." The

specific objective under this strategic direction is, "to

develop a wide variety of service learning and internship

opportunities." Assessment and university accreditation

are based, in part, on how effectively the institution implements its strategic plans and objectives during the year. By identifying service learning as one of its strategic objectives, the university commits publicly to this teaching methodology.

Furthermore, administrators describe how service learning fits into other areas of the mission. Jennifer believes that service learning fulfills both the service and research commitments of the university mission statement. The program engages students in research as they serve the community. Jennifer describes service learning as a form of ethnographic research. She hopes that soon the definition of service learning will officially include research.

Sue, the director of the unit in which the service learning program is situated, links the mission of the university to service learning by explaining how the university is supported by tax dollars

> being a land grant institution and being an institution that is supported by tax dollars of men and women whose dwellings surround the university community, [the university] certainly has a responsibility for doing what it can to use its resources and the talents here to help the community progress.

She insists that the relationship between the community and the university must be reciprocal:

at the same time the university does need to recognize
that there is a wealth of resources out in the
community that can benefit. Its knowledge base and
its experiences can benefit our students to become the
kind of informed graduates and conscious graduates
that not just the community, but the nation is going
to need.

Sue's conviction illustrates powerfully that service

learning goals and purpose are far-reaching. Service

learning, as defined by the service learning administrators

and university officials and bolstered by the mission of

the university, has the potential to make a permanent

impact on the lives of the students and the community.

In the preceding paragraphs I discussed the goals of

the administrators at RWU. To succinctly answer the

question of what the administrator's goals are, I

compressed the previous discussion into three goals:

1. To supplement the students' academic experiences

   with service to the community.

2. To apply academic concepts to meet community

   needs.

3. To make RWU an engaged service learning

   institution of higher education.

This listing compiles comprehensively the

administrators' goals. Still, it must be noted that some

goals overlap, and others are contingent upon each other.

Specifically, all the goals portray the administration's

vision of RWU becoming an engaged campus, a university

embracing the concept of service learning and

institutionalizing it campus-wide. All administrators and

university officials interviewed in this study agree that

the university should become an engaged campus.

The remaining data presentation revolves around the

administrators' goals, whether or not the goals were

achieved, and the perceptions of the service learning

partners in relation to goal achievement. Specifically, I

review evidence from students, community service agency

directors, faculty and administrators.

**Goal 1: To Supplement the Students' Academic Experience
with Service to the Community**

All groups interviewed, including faculty, service

learning administrators, university officials, community

service agency directors, and students, agree that

supplementing the students' academic experience with

service to the community is a goal for the service learning

experience. However, they varied in their assessment of

how that goal was achieved. The purpose of this section is

to share the evidence related to this specific goal. The

discussion of the goal is categorized by participant

category in the following order: students, community

service agency directors, university officials, and faculty members.

<p style="text-align:center">Students</p>

Supplementing their academic experience is not the initial reason that students participate in service learning. The students in this study desire a college education, but they did not enroll specifically in their class to supplement their college experience with service to the community. In fact, only one of the nine students I interviewed intentionally registered for the course. Eric, the only student who intentionally enrolled in the course, registered because a friend recommended the course. All other students were surprised on the first day of class when they discovered that community service would be part of the classroom experience. The students' surprise of the first day of class has been a recurring problem with service learning registration. At the time I interviewed the students, the telephone registration system did not distinguish between service learning and non-service learning courses. However, the service learning administrators told me that they are currently attempting to take corrective action with this issue.

Laura's first day of class was typical of the students interviewed in this study. She said that many students

dropped the class, but others liked the idea of not writing

as many papers as the other English classes. Kelly

confesses,

> Well, I was nervous because I didn't really know what
> it entailed. I didn't know if I had transportation
> there and I didn't know if maybe it would be a lot of
> extra work. I didn't know if I was ready for that in
> my freshman year. But then I kept going to class, and
> like the next class I went to, it just sounded neat
> and I wanted to see what it was like.

Christopher's reaction was typical of the students I

interviewed. He insists, "I'm in it because it was the

only one [class] I could get into and at the time I got

into it I did not know it was part of the service learning

program."

Even though they did not purposefully select the

service learning course, many of the students believe that

service learning did enhance their academic experience, not

only because of the community service aspect, but also

because of the particular professor who was teaching the

course. When questioned whether or not the service

learning enhanced the academic experience, one student

answered, "I think the service has a lot to do with it, but

also the teacher...she is a deep thinker...her main

question in class was "why." Why do you do this? Why do

you believe this?" Others believe that the community

service experience did help them to write better. Holly, a

first-year student who planned to enroll in a second

service learning course, reflects,

> I think, well, it hasn't really made me make good
> grades, but the fact that these kids are so
> underprivileged...and we are trying to instill in them
> that they should value their education, and they do.
> They love school, and it makes me realize how lucky I
> am to have attended a Catholic school and then to a
> really good high school, and now I'm going to college.
> I just sat one day, and I realized that I'm really
> lucky for this, and it just made me realize how lucky
> I am to have these experiences and that these children
> might not...service learning has made me realize how
> much I should value it [education].

To understand what the students actually learned at

the community service agencies, I posed the following

question to the students: What was a typical day like at

the service agency? I asked this because I wanted to know

how they interpreted their real-life experiences. This

question directly related to the goal of supplementing the

students' academic experience with service to the community

as answering this question allows the students to give

specific, concrete examples of their involvement in the

community. Answering this question displays generally how

students interpreted that they were enhancing their

academic experience.

All students whom I interviewed worked with children.

The hands-on service ranged from after school tutoring to

helping prepare children for a national achievement exam,

from assisting handicapped children when riding horses, and to enjoying recess with the children. Holly, one of the students who completed her hours at an elementary school, stated that the service learning professor wanted the students to learn about themselves through this experience. An example of Holly's learning was how she learned about school discipline and the need for it. Her first encounter with one specific teacher at the elementary school was not positive. She thought that the teacher was being excessively mean to the students. However, once she worked with the teacher, she understood the need for discipline. Holly reflects, "when I went into her classroom, I realized that that's her teaching. She has these kids that come from homes that don't get discipline, and when I spoke to her, she told me that they need discipline. Holly saw that the kids loved their teacher and, therefore, were well-behaved in class.

Additional evidence supports the goal that students did enhance their academic experience with service to the community. Wendy learned that she likes children: "it changed my life because I'm looking at things a lot differently. . .I wasn't a kid person before I got into this. Now, I love kids. So, it has changed the way I think about kids. Wendy also learned to "look at things

different and that I am no longer as judgmental as I was before participating in service learning."

Dorothy believes that her service learning experience was a "more valuable education than something I could learn in the classroom." She learned through her participation that all people have some type of "handicaps." Dorothy helped physically challenged children ride horses. When Dorothy attempted to ride the horse as the children did, she realized just how difficult it was. She confesses, "we [the volunteers] didn't have any physical handicaps, and we could barely do it, and these kids were out there doing it every week and they could do it, but we were having problems. It just made me realize I'm handicapped too." This statement supports the idea that students are having experiences through service learning that enhance the academic environment by allowing the students to learn through their service to the community.

When questioning students about their perception of whether or not this goal was met, I found that their answers varied. In general, the students were less likely to know exactly what the administrators' goals of the program even were. Holly, a student who was enrolling for a second semester of service learning, believes that the goals include

to have a bonding-like a relationship with the
children. She [professor] would always bring up
points like poverty and abuse is what these children
face, and you can tell. I think she wanted us to
build a relationship with one of them.

Holly did not specifically answer the question in
relationship to the administrators' goal of supplementing
her academic experience with service to the community, but
rather in relationship to her professor's goals for the
entire class. The students perceived supplementing their
academic experience with service to the community as an
expectation of their professor, not necessarily as a goal
of the service learning administrator.

Community Service Agency Directors

The community service agency directors did not
articulate clearly whether or not they perceived this goal
was achieved. The community service agency directors are
concerned more with enhancing students' hands-on
opportunities than with supplementing their academic
experience. Monica, an agency director who
coordinates volunteers at a hospital, admits that she does
not have any specific goals for the students. She states,
"they come to me with particular goals, and we try to meet
that goal. My goal is to help them achieve theirs." Leah
hopes that "they will learn that you don't have to be paid
to get satisfaction out of what you do. Society could not

function without the gift of our volunteers, and I wish they were recognized a lot more." Most of the community service agency administrators understood that there was a connection to academics, but they were more concerned with the students having a positive experience at the agency.

When questioning the agency directors about their perception of whether or not the goal of enhancing the academic experience was achieved, I discovered that one agency director thought that this goal was met solely because she was placing them as volunteers within her organization. When I questioned her regarding administrators' goals, she stated that the goals were "none other than their [students] goals that they have been told [in class]." The agency directors who had a great deal of interaction with the service learning administrators seem to understand these goals more clearly and possess firm opinions about whether or not they perceived that this goal was met. Cara is an agency director who interacted more extensively with the administrators than the other agency directors. For example, Cara attended conferences with the program director, participated in the agency fairs on campus, and presented information to faculty and staff at an RWU function. She believed that program goals were spelled out in the packet that students received from the

service learning administrator at the beginning of the

semester. Cara insists, "it's pretty clearly written out

there-the purpose of the program and everything else about

it. I've just always read that and gone along with it."

She could easily define her goals and expectations of all

the service learning participants due to her interaction

with the program administrators.

<div align="center">

University Officials

</div>

University officials hope to enhance students'

academic experiences through integration of service to the

community. Oscar clearly stated

> Service learning details incorporation into rigorous
> academic curriculum of real world, hands-on,
> experiential learning in volunteer settings that allow
> students to develop a rhythm between abstraction and
> theory that is discipline-based and concrete
> applications in the real world in order to enhance
> learning outcomes.

Oscar is most concerned with the "academic rigor and

enhancement of learning outcomes," as he mentioned this

numerous times during the interview. However, he believed

that service learning moved the student into the community

to enhance the academic experience.

As I questioned the university officials about whether

or not they perceived that supplementing the students'

academic experience with service to the community was

achieved, an administrator who works in the office of the

<div align="center">

103

</div>

highest ranking administrator on campus replied that she believed that there are several opportunities for students to supplement their academic experience with service to the community. The university officials did perceive that this goal was being met by some of the "engagements" that were taking place, but not all. For example, research that was completed in the spring of 1999 regarding service learning at RWU did not classify all internships and co-op programs as service learning. These engagements did not necessarily meet the specific criteria for a service learning experience.

<div align="center">

Faculty Members

</div>

The goal of supplementing the students' academic experience with service to the community was easy for the faculty members to grasp, as it is the premise of service learning. The faculty members, Jennifer and Sandra, demonstrate that they comprehend this goal. For faculty members, this goal defines program implementation.

Jennifer, the part-time administrator and faculty member, equates the academic importance of service learning with community service. She argues "students volunteer or agree to work in the community in unpaid positions where they can both use community assets and help community needs, while they are developing the academic skills."

When questioning the faculty members about their perception of whether or not this goal was being met, one faculty member, Sandra, believed that the majority of the students achieve this goal. Sandra admits that she usually has one or two who do not "get it," but she insists that this is typical of any class. When I specifically questioned her about administrators' goals, she believed that the administrators would soon issue more written and well-defined goals. She stated

> I think they [administration] have been pretty
> flexible about setting up our own goals...we'd like to
> have a similar definition of what service learning is
> and what we would like them [students] to get out of
> it. As far as point-by-point goals, I am not sure
> that we have that, but I think we will now.

Faculty members, administrators, and university officials are more likely to comment on the academic aspect of service learning than the other groups of participants. The upper level administrator connected almost every question I asked back to academics. Students and community service directors are more likely to comment on the interaction with the receivers of service. Each student interviewed depicted clearly the actual service component. Supplementing students' academic experiences with service to the community is an integral goal for all participants as it is a function of service learning implementation.

However, there is great variance among the participant groups as to whether or not this goal is being achieved. There is also much question as to whose goal this actually is. Is it the administrators or just a role of the faculty to supplement the academic experience? This question is discussed in the conclusion.

Goal 2: To Apply Academic Concepts to Meet Community Needs

The following is a discussion regarding the research that relates to this goal. Faculty, students, and service learning administrators shared relevant information that relates specifically to applying academic concepts to meet community needs. To apply academic concepts to meet community needs means that students are using what they learn in the classroom during the time they are engaged with the receivers of service. This does not mean that students only learn in the classroom and not while they are at the community service agency, but rather that they are engaged in learning at both places. This goal relates specifically to the knowledge transmission from what happens at the community service agency to how it is brought forward through the classroom experience. Faculty and service learning program administrators hope to apply academic concepts to meet community needs through involving students in a hands-on service experience. Journal entries

and reflection, the predominant methods students used to assess the service learning experience, compels students to ascribe meaning and purpose to their experience as volunteers, thereby applying academic concepts to meet the needs of the community.

Faculty and Students

Journal entries and reflection seminars, the primary methods of applying academic concepts to meet the community's needs, allow students to assess their volunteer experiences. One model of journal entries used by faculty members is to ask three basic questions, making students change ink colors as they transition to each question. For example, black ink is the listing of factual events that took place at the service site. This is the "what" question. The next two questions are "so what" and "now what." Sandra, a faculty member, considers this method "is a kind of analysis of their experience of how it relates to life in general. They are actively thinking about their experiences, and you definitely get a sense throughout the semester of the frustrations they are having or the good experiences they are having." Sandra observes that students spend "much more time on the analysis section" at the end of the semester than they do at the beginning.

Wendy, a student in service learning, describes the journal as something that was due every week

> our journals are just like you tell them [professor] a story...something that happened and then you have to tell how you feel about it and what is the significance of it. She makes us write in three different inks. Black ink will be the story...and you have blue for how you feel and red ink is the significance. That helps a lot because you can distinguish...and like you can intertwine them.

Writing journal entries and discussing issues in class are very meaningful to the students. The discussions in class give the students the opportunity to see how the reading assignments relate to the volunteer work that they do at their service site. However, students gave the reflection seminars mixed reviews. One student shared how she liked going to the reflection seminar because she got to hear about the other unique experiences at varying service sites since her entire class went to the same agency. During one semester the reflection seminars were arranged by topic so students could attend the topic that was of most interest to them. One student particularly liked the reflection seminars by subject because she was able to choose a seminar that intertwined service learning with Christianity. She did not think she would have the opportunity to share her faith during class at college. She definitely saw the reflection seminar as a positive

aspect of the curriculum. Other students complained that reflection seminars were "meaningless," "a waste of time," and gave them no new insights because the questions asked at the seminar duplicated the questions asked during class.

Neither the students nor the faculty members stated specifically whether or not they perceived their program as achieving this goal. However, faculty members measured this goal by the classroom discussions and the journal entries. The faculty members generalized about whether or not their students derived meaning from their service learning experiences if they communicated information about their experiences in the class discussions and journal entries. Jennifer, the part-time administrator, relates her perception of this goal being achieved in relationship to the difficulty of teaching students in general

> Are they receptacles to receive all the wonderful things I have to give them? Not necessarily, but I mean, that's just one of the challenges of teaching. I don't expect them all to get it all anyway. The younger they are, the harder it is for them to make connections, and mostly I work with freshmen. I think it's easier in some disciplines when the service is really focused on that discipline, it's really easy for them to get it. There are also theoretical issues that are pretty complex, and I don't think we should assume or expect the students to make all those connections the first time. We don't pretend to teach them everything in a single class, so we shouldn't be terribly disappointed if they don't understand all of the issues that we want them to understand. Frankly, I think the faculty don't either when they first start. It's a learning process and it should be.

Because of Jennifer's dual role of faculty and administrator, she has insight in the workings of the classroom as well as in administrative pressures and duties.

Many of the students assume that the goals for the class duplicate the goals of the administrator. For this study, the students did not interact with the main administrator of the program except at the beginning of the semester, if in fact she attended their class to answer basic questions concerning the program. They had the opportunity to meet her if they chose to attend a reflection seminar that she led, and she did attend recognition ceremonies at the end of the semester to give the students a recommendation letter and celebrate their accomplishments. The majority of the students focused on their class expectations to determine whether or not their goals were achieved. Many of them assumed that the goals for the class, set by their professor, duplicate the goals of the administrator, so if they met their goals for the class, then they met the goals of the administrator as well.

Journal entries, reflection seminars, and in-class discussions are all methods used by faculty and service

learning administrators to ensure that the students are applying academic concepts to meet community needs. The hands-on service, coupled with academic discussion enables both faculty and service learning administrators to assess the program's effectiveness.

Service Learning Administrators

Successful service learning, for the administration at RWU, must be an ethical volunteer experience for both the student and the receiver of service. Jennifer stresses the reciprocal relationship between the university and the community. She describes service learning as a type of research for the student and hopes that one day the definition of service learning will include research. She stated

> The students learn about things when they do service learning that they cannot learn in any other way. Over and over, even freshmen tell me that their preconceptions were dispelled. They don't say those words, but that's what they mean, and it's not just the preconceptions that they have in the classroom. When they go to the site and meet the people, they form ideas of what people are like even after they have interacted for weeks...At the end of their service, what they think those people are like is different. So an ongoing, meaningful service teaches them something about how things are and what we know about things. Not just specific things, not just education or health care...but they come to realize with the reflective component how stereotypes are formed, how our initial impression of things are often inaccurate, how statistics can lie. I don't think they can learn this in any other way.

The reciprocal relationship must exist so that the university is not using the students or the receivers of service to garner false publicity or exploit the community as a "guinea pig or laboratory." Jennifer insists that "the research should actually be used by the community." An example of RWU using research ethically is when students researched a specific population of the community and then disseminated this information back to the people in this community in a meaningful manner. Several professors at RWU received a grant to study a certain area of the community. They researched in-depth a different issue, gathering recorded dialogue of members of the community who had either participated in or been a part of the actual topic. At the end of each summer, the faculty and students presented their research findings to the community. Additionally, a RWU drama class creates scripts from transcribing these tapes and performs these skits in the community in which the research was conducted.

The goal of applying academic concepts to meet community needs is a priority for faculty and service learning program administrators. The students regard this goal only as a course objective, not as a goal of the service learning administration.

Goal 3: To Make RWU an Engaged Service Learning Institution of Higher Education

The third goal of these service learning administrators involves transforming RWU into an engaged campus of service learning. I discuss the present strategies and methods that RWU uses to implement engagement and then conclude the section by analyzing various barriers to engagement. Engaging the entire campus in service learning is a specific goal for the administrators whom I interviewed. Therefore, rather than organizing this section by categories of service learning participants, I arrange the material into the issues surrounding engaging the entire campus in the service learning program. I believe it is important to share this section of research by integrating the service learning participants into specific engagement topics so that the issues surrounding engagement are clear.

RWU Moving Towards Engagement

Both administrators and university officials concur in transforming the university into an engaged campus by "institutionalizing" service learning. As stated in the review of literature, university engagement is defined as "institutions that have redesigned their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become

even more sympathetically and productively involved in

their communities" (Campus Compact Fax, personal

communication, September 21, 1998). The full-time

administrator focuses on facilitating this process. I

discovered that the process toward engagement is occurring

on this campus.

Both program administrators and university officials

desire to create an engaged campus now. Melanie, a

university official, speculates,

> I think we are moving toward it. We've got a lot of
> stuff that is going on. I think one of the problems
> that we have is that it's not communicated...the
> campus is so huge that half of the time we don't know
> all of the engagements that actually take place...I
> think we're working towards that, but we have a ways
> to go. We are starting a little late in the game.

Several service learning initiatives have taken place

over the course of the past year. Examples of moving

toward engagement include the development of a faculty

advisory board, the hiring of additional staff in the

service learning program, the engagement initiatives in the

office of the highest ranking university administrator, and

the funding of service learning seminars on campus.

According to the director of the office in which the

program exists,

> the university is at a place where we are poised with
> the faculty advisory council, and the nucleus of
> people here who have some kind of service learning in

114

their courses are poised to move the university to the
point where they do get it and they are committed to
doing it.

Nevertheless, these initiatives have a long way to go

before this university can substantiate any claims of being

an engaged campus.

The faculty advisory council that was formed this year

is an important step for entire university engagement. Sue

a program administrator, argues,

> One of the things that's really important for service
> learning is that if it's going to be accepted
> university wide, it has to be accepted by the faculty.
> They are the ones that have to implement the program.
> It's very easy for programs like this to remain
> marginalized and not have full support of the faculty
> or not be championed by the faculty.

<u>RWU's Barriers to Engagement</u>

Barriers to engagement shared by many of the

interviewees include the belief that service learning is

not well understood by faculty members and therefore, is

not seen as a credible teaching method. According to one

of the program administrators,

> Most faculty members don't really understand what it
> is, don't see it as part of their mission because it's
> not one of the traditional teaching methods. Service,
> I think, for most senior faculty, means service to the
> university and service to the profession instead of
> service to the community.

The "buy in," as stated by a university administrator, must

be embraced by the department head that "sent it down

through the junior faculty ranks." Melanie insists that

the faculty senate is one segment of the university

community that service learning has to "penetrate" because

it has the power to spread the word and "kill an idea or

give birth to an idea." She believes that engagement is

difficult because

> We are such a huge campus, and a lot of times, too, if
> you are not a faculty member yourself, someone with a
> Ph.D., it's not as easy for you to get through and
> connect. That's another reason I think the faculty
> senate is very important and that the message needs to
> start from the top and kind of trickle down.

Additionally, if the department head does not view service

learning as a "credible tenure indicator," then the problem

will continue. Melanie thinks

> A lot of junior faculty members may be interested in
> that [service learning], but when their dean or
> department head only values traditional teaching
> methods...or they interpret them to only value
> research as a part of their tenure process, that comes
> into play as well. So those that may want to be
> actively involved in service learning may be swayed
> against it because of time limitations. Because they
> figure that, you know, their time should be used in
> something that their supervisors value as more
> creditable tenure indicators.

Another issue that the university must understand is the

concept of partnering with the community. The university

cannot afford to solely determine what is best for the

community. One administrator conjectures that

> The university probably sees itself as the entity that
> can contribute to the community...decide what the

community needs and then provide that without really understanding that it really has to be engaged in the dialogue of the community and the community has to agree...well, actually help set the agenda for the university's involvement.

Furthermore, budgetary constraints continue to play a part in the barrier to engagement. Sue listed several needs of the program that are all tied to budgetary issues. She argues, in terms of budgetary needs,

> I can tell you that I think, just based on what I've learned in the past few weeks really, that there needs to be someone in the upper level administration concentrating on service learning. The equivalent of a dean of service learning or someone who has really campus-wide responsibilities for the service learning program. There needs to be someone whose major focus is on the academic components of it so they would be recruiting faculty who would be coordinating workshops to help faculty learn how to rewrite syllabi. Someone who is primarily responsible...the community/university link and also developing and recruiting and training new agencies that are going to be working with students and faculty. I think it would be good if there were service learning scholarships for students. Also, it would be great if there were some release time for faculty who were doing service learning or developing service learning courses. If there is no money available...then you are back to people who are doing it because they really want to do it, but these [people] are typically already overloaded and overworked.

A faculty member in the department that has the majority of the service learning courses notes that "we are just now getting institutional support after eight or nine years." However, her reason for this support was that she thought that service learning was trendy. She stated that

117

"service learning is trendy across the nation and everyone wants to jump on the bandwagon."

Engagement is a goal that was not fully achieved by service learning administrators, but rather one that has potential to be achieved. The perception of faculty members and administrators was that RWU was moving in the right direction, but there is still much to be done. As administrators and faculty members move the institution towards engagement, they must remember to focus on incorporation of service learning campus-wide. Service learning, although popularized in the current culture of institutions of higher education, will not lend itself to self-creation. Service learning practitioners must be willing to continue sharing and teaching this methodology to others.

Administrator Methods Used to Assess Attainment of Goals

The administrators and university officials with whom I spoke undoubtedly want the students to have a positive experience, both in and outside of the classroom, as evidenced by the administrators' goals. This is further backed by Oscar's statement that service learning experiences should be target "improvement in the learning outcomes and courses with rigorous academic content with collateral benefits such as the promotion of citizenship

118

and learning and education." Although this was not a
specific research question, I believe that it is important
to include the assessment information in relationship to
the administrators' goals because higher education has
become deeply entrenched in outcomes assessment as it
relates to monetary and staffing issues. This is an area
of my research that I believe is important to include.

<u>Service Learning Administration Methods</u>

When questioning the administrators about whether or
not they achieved their goals in the service learning
program, I asked them the mechanism or measure used to
determine the success of the program. In this way, I
wanted to learn how their methods of assessment related to
their goal of achievement. Jennifer explained that the
"measures of our service learning program have really been
more anecdotal in terms of how students felt about their
learning experience and also quantitative measures...for
example, how many courses are engaged in service learning
activities, what kind of activities do they do." What this
particular administrator hoped was that researchers would
begin looking to determine "if people retain more course
information" by being enrolled in a service learning class
versus a non-service learning course.

The other administrator, Virginia, suggested that evaluation of the methods used could include how service learning students are spending their time outside of class versus how a non-service learning student is involved outside of class. This question has not been asked of the university population.

The two main administrators listed several techniques that lead them to believe that the methods they are using are successful. One of the main measures of success is the "number of students that keep coming back every year." Jennifer reasons, "I don't have to go out and solicit them. Just by word of mouth, they tell other students...often students will even say that they want to come back to volunteer even though it is not for service hours." Several students who were continuing their experience by enrolling in the second service learning course confirm her rationalization. Furthermore, two students recruited either their roommate or boyfriend to enroll in the class.

Additionally, the supervisor at the community service agency evaluates the students' performance at end of the semester. Students must submit both mid term and end-of-the-semester volunteer hours. The direct administrator of the program requires each faculty member, student, and agency to complete an evaluation at the end of the

120

semester. The community service agency directors evaluate each students' performance as well as the service learning program in general, which enables them to express any concerns they may have about the students or logistics of the program.

<div align="center">Faculty Methods</div>

The methods used to attain these goals were well defined by the faculty members. According to Jennifer, "much of that [methods] is really dependent upon the instruments the professor uses to determine what the level of learning is and how they assess whether or not the course objectives have been met." For example one way to determine if course objectives have been met is final exam questions.

Methods used to ensure goal attainment can take many forms, as evidenced by the many ways that academic courses are framed through lectures, exams, reading assignments, and journal entries. Some courses just have one exam the entire semester, some have weekly quizzes, and others may only have essay examinations.

One faculty member, Jennifer, uses journal entries as one of her main methods of measuring the course's success in achieving her objectives. She notes that "most teachers read them on a weekly basis and others read them at mid

term and then again at the end of the semester, so there is some evaluation going on all the time." The journal entries allow "you to intervene when you see they are not making the connection or that service is not meaningful." She uses the example of finding out that a student spent the last few days at the agency filing, which neither the faculty members nor the program administrators consider to be meaningful service. Another faculty member, Sandra, discusses the difficulty in evaluating the effectiveness of various methods because she does not want her students to think that they are evaluated solely on the number of hours they complete at the community service agency. For Sandra, the journal actually counts more than the service hours because students recount and interpret their service experiences. Furthermore, the journal portrays "an analysis of their experience of how it relates to life in general and the big picture...you definitely get a sense throughout the semester of the frustrations they're having or the good experiences they are having."

During the two semesters in which I completed my interviews, one of the faculty members had 50% of her fall semester class enroll in the spring semester class. For both semesters of this course, all students volunteered at the same local elementary school rather than choosing their

own agency. For this faculty member, students' continued enrollment measured directly the success of the service learning program.

The research did not show that administrators were closely monitoring or enforcing any particular method to ensure attainment of these goals, but rather that they set up the program and monitored progress at the end of the semester. The administrators do attempt to articulate clearly their goals to students, faculty, and community service agency directors. However, the methods used to attain these goals vary due to faculty implementation of course curriculum and differing outcomes of involvement with the receivers of service.

Conclusion

This chapter details the results of the data collection and presents the information in relationship to the research questions. I shared the administrators' goals, whether or not the goal was achieved, methods used to assess goal achievement, and the perceptions from the service learning participants as to whether or not these goals were attained. Chapter 5 concludes with the implications of the findings and provides information about other opportunities for further research.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

With the growth of service learning, both in the realm of faculty work and student affairs practice, has come much confusion about what it actually is, what relevance it has, and what contributions it has to offer college students. Is service learning part of the developmental component of higher learning concerned with social responsibility and citizenship? Or, is it more relevant to helping students master abstract academic concepts and principles? In other words, what are the learning outcomes to be expected from service learning?
(Kezar & Rhoads, 2001, p. 153-154).

The final chapter is dedicated to a discussion of the findings, recommendations and implications of this research for scholars and practitioners interested in service learning. Through this study I found many answers to my research questions. The main purpose of this research was to find out the goals of the service learning program administrators, and the extent to which the goals were achieved by the service learning participants. As stated in Chapter 4, the goals of the administrators are

1. To supplement the students' academic experience with service to the community.

2. To apply academic concepts to meet community needs.

3. To make RWU an engaged service learning institution of higher education.

The following discussion reviews the three goals posed by the administrators in this study. In each section, I share what I learned and pose recommendations for future achievements of each goal.

Goal #1: To supplement the students' academic experience with service to the community

From this research, I learned that the students I interviewed supplemented their academic experience with service to the community. The engagement of the students took place in the classroom with the faculty member, as well as with children at a variety of agencies. Faculty members and community service agency directors shared the responsibility for directing the student to meet this goal.

The research illustrated that the students generally had positive out-of-classroom experiences and were excited about going to the community service agencies as they enjoyed the interaction with the children. Several students were continuing their hours with the children even after completing the required hours, and others continued volunteering after the semester was over.

There were several issues that were brought up in relationship to the overall attainment of this goal. It was clear through this research that service learning administrators must realize that contact with the agency

director is critical. If the agency director does not understand the concept of service learning, then this goal may never be met. An additional recommendation to enhance this goal is that the service learning administrator must secure information from the community service agency directors about the service experience. What engagements and interactions will the student have? I believe it is critical that the administrators remain in close contact with the agency director throughout the students' participation. Faculty members must become more involved in the process, or the model of all students attending one service site should be enacted. Furthermore, I learned the actual definition of what constitutes a service learning experience must be well defined by both the faculty and community service agency directors. The definition is not defined the same by all constituencies. This is problematic in many areas and the entire campus has no way of accounting for the types of service learning engagements that are taking place, as there is no definition that clarifies and classifies the service learning experience.

One issue that still lingers regarding this research question is that the students saw this goal as the goal of their professor, not the administrators. When questioning the students about enhancing the academic experience, they

believed that if they were meeting the goal of their professor, then they were meeting the goal of the administrator. I find this only problematic in my study because it was difficult for the students to articulate administrator's goals, especially as the goal related to academic achievement. The students found it difficult to distinguish between what was considered a goal of their professor and what was a goal of the administrators.

Goal #2: To apply academic concepts to meet community needs

Although the students could not clearly state that they were applying academic concepts to meet community needs, the faculty members illuminated this goal through discussing journal entries, requiring papers throughout the semester, and conducting reflection seminars.

Faculty members fused academic rigor with service learning throughout the semester. The upper level administration never deviated, depicting service learning as implementing academic concepts to enhance the community. The faculty member and part-time service learning administrator hopes that one day research will be added to the definition of service learning. She believes that the students are involved in a form of ethnography while they were at their community service agencies.

Faculty members discussed the varying models of service learning. From this research I learned that one model is not sufficient for all types of service learning experiences. Some faculty prefer the mandated hours at the same agency, while others want students to have the option for community service hours. Some like the option and variance among the agency sites for their classroom participants. Multiple models of service learning give faculty members the flexibility to do what best fits their curriculum objectives.

All university administrators with whom I interviewed for this study agree that service learning connects with each component of the university mission: teaching, research, and service. This university shows a well-defined commitment to service learning by placing it as one of the strategic objectives in the university planning documents. During the next accreditation process of the university, an evaluation will take place on how well the university is meeting its stated objectives. Naming service learning in the university's strategic plan demonstrates powerfully administrator's commitment to this pedagogy.

Goal #3:   To make RWU an engaged service learning institution of higher education

The administrators did face barriers to successful implementation of their service learning goals. With campus budgetary issues, turnover rate with community service agency directors, lack of full-time staff committed to the program, and little credibility across the disciplines, the service learning program at RWU confronts many challenges, so achieving this goals will be difficult.

Program administrators have no control over the agency director turnover rate. However, if the agency director training were more standardized, training new directors would become less of a concern. Currently, the formalized orientation/training for the agency directors takes place only once a year. Virginia, one of the program administrators, assesses the troubling situation

> When an agency volunteer director stays long-term, that relationship grows with each contact so you have a stronger relationship with them, but the turnover is so great, you get the relationship on good footing and then the person leaves.

For Virginia, this high turnover rate is one of the biggest challenges for those involved in service learning.

As discussed in the review of literature, Sam Marullo (1996) asserts that university politics, institutional reward, and community skepticism all played a part in the

evolution of service learning programs at universities. Although this research does not detail community skepticism, RWU struggles with university politics and institutional rewards. University politics is always a battle, but concrete facts of institutional rewards are now being seen. For example, grant money is now available for faculty members if they implement service learning into the curriculum. Service learning is slowly and in small increments making its way across the disciplines. From this research I learned that engagements are taking place, but true university engagement is not sustained.

Additionally, this research illustrates that faculty members disagree on the exact definition of service learning, as well as how to implement the program campus-wide. Some faculty members believe that internships and cooperative education programs are forms of service learning. Other faculty members dispute this because such programs lack a reflective component. Sandra, one of the faculty members I interviewed, insists that service learning should always be tied to productive volunteerism for those who are less fortunate. If an overall definition for the entire campus is created, she wants it to include a stipulation for who is receiving the service. This lack of

specificity with the definition does not allow for true classification of service learning on campus.

Additionally, faculty members need to address concerns that were mentioned in the review of literature. Robert Rhoads (1997) discusses some of the complexities involved in participating in service learning, especially the issue of personal gain from service learning participation. His study reveals that some students question their participation. One student confesses, "I'm not sure if I'm completely comfortable helping the poor families. Who am I that I can help make their lives better? It seems somewhat condescending for me to believe that I can somehow make a difference" (Rhoads, 1997, p. 22). This issue was not addressed by this study and I believe that it is a critical element to be included in the development of service learning initiatives. The service experience should be based on the development of reciprocal relationships.

Finally, faculty members lack standards for interacting with the community service agency directors. If the students are allowed to pick from 30 agencies, faculty members can not establish a relationship with all of the agency directors. Comparing the two faculty members I interviewed, one faculty member was always at the community service agency interacting with the agency

director. The other faculty member did not deal with the agency directors at all because she considered this the responsibility of the full-time service learning program administrator. This limited interaction between the faculty and the community service agency directors may have implications for the student's experience at the agency.

Another challenge to this specific service learning program is rather differing priorities for the main administrators, who are working daily in service learning. One focuses on agency development, while the other focuses on faculty recruitment and training. Although these are two key areas of service learning development, there does not seem to be one vision that the two administrators are working from. This may not have any effect on the short term program development, but has the potential to be damaging if the program is expected to grow and thrive at this Research I university.

Implications of this discord are that the two main administrators are working from different visions of what needs to be completed to ensure that the goals are being met. At present, it seems that the work of the two administrators is complementary to each other. However, I envision disagreement if the service learning program continues its current pattern of growth. One administrator

132

may believe that her priorities are more important that the other's; therefore, the shared resources may need to be allotted unequally. If both the administrators do not agree on the program's future, conflict could disrupt the program's progress, even destroying it altogether. The two program administrators must determine jointly the short-term and long-term goals for the entire program and how they relate to all the service learning partners.

All service learning constituencies should have a voice in formulating the program's plans. Currently, Jennifer is working with faculty members, not only recruiting faculty to incorporate service learning into their curricula, but also helping faculty rewrite syllabi and choose a model that will fit their course objectives. The full-time administrator, Virginia, works with students and community service agencies by developing reflection seminars, creating the student workbook, and seeking new community service agencies for student placement. Virginia also trains new community service agencies on the difference between service learning and volunteerism. Both of these administrators seek further university support for service learning so their overlapping responsibilities include working with upper level administration.

The main complaint by the students was that they did not know that they were registering for a service learning course. Until recently, the course was distinguished only in the course schedule booklet, not during the phone registration. The university has corrected this ambiguity by revamping the phone registration and advertising this course more prominently. Students' positive interaction in the service learning program is certainly one of the main components of a university becoming an engaged campus. The administration should consider students and their diverse needs before developing service learning initiatives.

Controversies and Complexities Revisited

This research focused on the administrators involved in a service learning program at a Research I university. In my research design, I assumed that the administrators that were most involved in the service learning program would have clearly defined goals and that through my research, I would be able to distinguish the goals. However, I learned that administrators' roles vary. This variance in roles caused an inconsistency in the goal prioritization. This variance in roles also clearly demonstrated the complexity of service learning implementation. Service learning implementation is difficult and complex due to the multiple priorities of all

134

the service learning participants. The individual roles of each participant, which include faculty, students, university administrators, community service agency administrators and the receivers of service, are not known to each participant at all times. How can a service learning administrator know on a daily basis how a student will react to particular situations at a community service agency? Service learning program implementation assumes that the experience will be of mutual benefit to both the student and the receiver of service. However, this assumption can not be guaranteed each time the student walks into the community service agency. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the faculty member involved in the service learning experience is paying close attention to the reflection component to determine whether or not the student is having a mutually beneficial experience. This does have an impact on my findings in that more questions are needed to clearly define the involvement of the service learning administrator. Probing questions of the faculty members involved may have led this research to differing findings. What if I had asked the faculty members and not administrators for their goals? What information would have been discovered through the goals of the faculty and

how would faculty goals enhance or impede the administrative goals?

Additional complexities surround the question of whether or not it matters if the service learning partners truly understand each other's goals. My research showed that even though they did not understand the goals of each other, the mutual benefit was present. The students did receive both an educational experience and service experience and the community service agencies received a service that was helpful to their particular agency. The overall goal of reciprocity in service learning was met.

Implications for Further Research

A guiding purpose for this research is that it would be useful to both administrators immersed in the subject on their campus and administrators at other institutions who are creating new service learning programs. I hope that both entering professionals as well as those with years of experience will use this research. Many opportunities for future research, for both scholars and practitioners, exist. For example, the separation of service learning courses and non-service learning courses, in the English department suggest that these courses could be compared readily. Data that may suggest other positive or negative outcomes of the service learning teaching methodology could

be collected over the course of a semester. This research could give the service learning program a significant study to approach the upper level university administration for additional funding and resources.

While organizational theory was not used as a guiding principle of this research, its implications have much to offer service learning practitioners as they develop programs at educational institutions. By reviewing and applying Karl Weick's (1976) idea of educational settings as "loosely coupled systems," one might infer that service learning researchers and practitioners need to discover the coupling that takes place between those involved in a service learning process. Loosely coupled means "coupled events are responsive, but that each event also preserves its own identity and some evidence of its physical or logical separateness" (p.3). Educational organizations, specifically service learning programs, may be etched in this manner. For example, the administrator of a service learning program and the chair of the English department may be attached, but yet each "retains some identity and separateness and that their attachment may be circumscribed, infrequent, weak in its mutual effects, unimportant, and/or slow to respond" (p. 3). One advantage of loose coupling is that "it suggests the idea of building

blocks that can be grafted onto an organization or severed with relatively little disturbance to either block or the organization" (p.3).

Weick (1976) easily debates the pros and cons of loose coupling. For every positive aspect, he offers a negative. One function that I believe is most crucial to service learning development is the concept that "loosely coupled systems preserve more diversity in responding than do tightly coupled systems, and therefore can adapt to a considerably wider range of changes in the environment that would be true for tightly coupled systems" (p. 7). Most importantly, this is an area of organizational theory that may have implications for service learning development. Weick even suggests that a "methodological trap" of loose coupling involves focusing the coupling on the wrong goals. He suggests that one should develop an "exhaustive listing of goals rather than parsimony" in order to appropriately identify and match potential participants in an organization (p. 10). The future research in this area has the power to affect program development of service learning in institutions of higher learning.

Further, the students are powerful untapped resources. If I conducted a more evaluative type of research, then I would focus on clear and well-defined measures of student

success. I also believe that it would be interesting to compare service learning opportunities to traditional community service hours completed by students in regular student organizations. Knowing the benefits of service learning courses, in comparison to the community service projects completed by student organizations, would be of value to student organization advisors and chapter officers as they plan and execute community service opportunities for their members.

Additionally, understanding the implications of male and female interaction in the service learning process may help scholars and administrators develop recruitment strategies that encourage participation by either sex. The majority of my research participants were female. I will not speculate that the reason for this is that women fulfill nurturing roles more often than men do, but believe that understanding why women or men are more likely to participate in certain activities would be quite valuable in marketing service learning.

Service learning, as labeled by one faculty member, is "trendy." Universities across the nation are beginning to seek ways to incorporate this dynamic pedagogy in their traditional curricula. Many universities are beginning to use service learning to increase retention rates of first-

year students. As a reform movement in higher education,
service learning has a long way to go. However, as
administrators ascertain more credible evidence, both
qualitatively and quantitatively, to upper level
administrators and tenured faculty members, service
learning has much potential in becoming a credible teaching
methodology.

Conclusion

This is a university moving towards engagement.
Although university administration has much to accomplish,
their commitment is evident. The status of RWU's service
learning program has improved during the completion of my
writing. The part-time administrator was upgraded to full-
time, and another part-time administrator who is strictly
working with the English faculty replaced her. The upper
level university administrator continues to show his
support by investing resources, such as inviting academic
practitioners to campus to teach faculty members how to
implement service learning into their curricula.
Furthermore, the highest ranking university administrator
supported publicly the philosophy of service learning at a
seminar I recently attended.

All service learning partners should reflect upon this
set of complementary principles, which were developed to

guide practitioners in service learning programs. According to these ten principles, an effective program

- engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good;

- provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experiences;

- articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved;

- allows for those with needs to define those needs;

- clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved;

- matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstances;

- expects genuine, active and sustained organizational commitment;

- includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals;

- insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interests of all involved; and

- is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations (Honnet & Paulsen, p.1-2).

These complementary principles should be revisited as service learning programs develop. For a service learning program to flourish, all participants must have a role in defining its goals and clarifying its purposes. RWU could spend time reflecting on these complementary principles as they continue to strive for an engaged campus.

For now, resources should be made available for a centralized office of service learning on campus so that the goals of the university administrators could continue being developed and implemented. The university should create a new position, at least the equivalent of a dean, to oversee this program. Faculty members, community service agencies, and students must have a central location to connect with service learning. Having two full-time administrators-one working with faculty recruitment and training and the other working with community service agency recruitment-the program has potential to grow dramatically over the next few years. I am hopeful that the picture of service learning on this campus will change and the view will continue to get better. The administrators must continually remind themselves that the ultimate goal of service learning must be tied intimately to the academic mission of the university and that the collaborative efforts with community service agencies must

foster a reciprocal relationship. Service learning gives

students an opportunity to step outside of the walls of the

academy. This is an opportunity that has merit inside the

academy. Rather than being "trendy," service learning is a

new term for an established concept, and universities

across the nation are now beginning to formalize their

commitment to forms of experiential education. Service to

the community is reaching a level of credibility necessary

for sustainability. Still, there are complexities to this

methodology, and further research is needed to examine

these complexities if full engagement of service learning

is to occur.

REFERENCES

Addams, J. (1910). <u>Twenty years at Hull-House</u>. Macmillan: New York.

Aptowitzer, C. (1993). <u>Seton Hall Law Review, 24:</u> 547.

Astin, A. & Sax, L. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. <u>Journal of College Student Development, 39</u> (3), p. 251-263.

Boyer, E. (1994). Creating the new American college. <u>Chronicle of Higher Education, March 9, 1994, Vol. XL, No. 27: A48.</u>

Brevard Community College. (1995). Institutionalization. Center for Service-Learning Handbook on Institutionalization: Cocoa, Florida.

Bringle, R.G. & Hatcher, J.A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. <u>Journal of Higher Education, 67</u> (2), p. 221-239.

Caron, B. (Ed.). (1999). <u>Service matters: the engaged campus</u>. Campus Compact.

Century Community and Technical College. (1996). Service-learning faculty manual. (Eric Reproduction No. ED 407 035)

Checkoway, B. (1996). Combining service and learning on campus and in the community. <u>Phi Delta Kappan, 77</u>(9): 600-606.

<u>Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac</u>. (1997). Vol. XLIV, No. 1, August, 29, 1997.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (1994). <u>Handbook of qualitative research</u>. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Dewey, J. (1938). <u>Experience and education</u>. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gemon, S., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). An assessment model for service-learning: comprehensive case studies of impact on faculty, students, community and institution. <u>Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, (Fall)</u> p. 66-71.

Eyler, J. & Giles, D. (1999<u>). Where's the learning in service-learning</u>? San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Farrell, J. (1997). Johnny can't read or write, but just watch him work: assessing the constitutionality of mandatory high school community service programs. <u>St. John's Law Review, 71</u>, p. 795.

Finger, B. (1998). Service learning in the community—are we ready for the journey? <u>National Society for Experiential Education Quarterly, 23</u> (3) 4-5, 23-25.

Fleischauer, J.F. & Fleischauer, J.P. (1994). College credit for community service: a "win-win" situation. <u>Journal of Experiential Education, 17</u>(3): 41-44.

Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (1996). <u>Educational Research: An Introduction, Sixth Edition</u>. Longman: New York.

Giles, D., Honnet, E.H., & Migliore, S. (Eds.). (1991). <u>Research agenda for combining service and learning in the 1990s</u>. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Giles, D.E. & Eyler J. (1997). A service learning agenda for the next five years. <u>New Directions for Teaching and Learning</u>. Jossey-Bass Publishers: San Francisco.

Herndon v. Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Board of Education. 89 F. 3d 174 (4th Cir., 1996).

Honnet, E. P. & Paulsen, S.J. (Eds.). (1989). <u>Principles of good practice for combining service and learning: a wingspread special report</u>. Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation, Inc.

Immediato v. Rye Neck School District. 73 F. 3d 454 (2nd Cir., 1996).

145

Jacoby, B. (1996). <u>Service learning in higher education</u>.
     San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kahne J. & Westheimer, J. (1996). In the service of what?
     the politics of service learning. <u>Phi Delta Kappan,
     77 </u>(9), 593-599.

Kendall, J.C. & Associates (Eds.). (1990). <u>Combining
     service and learning: a resource book for community
     and public service, Vol. 1</u>. Raleigh, NC: National
     Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kezar, A. & Rhoads, R. (2001). Dynamic tensions of
     service learning in higher education: a philosophical
     perspective. <u>The Journal of Higher Education</u>. (72)
     2, p. 148-171.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). <u>Experiential learning: experience as
     the source of learning development</u>. Englewood Cliffs,
     New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Leder D. & McGuinness, I. (Summer, 1996). Making the
     paradigm shift: service learning in higher education.
     <u>Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum,
     (7) </u>1, p. 47-56.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). <u>Naturalistic inquiry</u>.
     Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Lisman, C.D. (1998). <u>Toward a civil society: civic
     literacy and service learning</u>. Westport, CT.
     Bergin and Garvey.

Lunblad, K.S. (1995). Jane Addams and social reform: a
     role for the 1990s. <u>Social Work, 40</u> (5), p. 661-669.

Marullo, S. (1996). The Service learning movement in
     higher education: an academic response to troubled
     times. <u>Sociological Imagination, 33 </u>(Winter), p. 117-
     137.

McPherson, K. (1997). Service learning: making a
     difference in the community. <u>Schools in the Middle, 6</u>
     (3), 9-15.

Minden, S. (1995). The constitutionality of mandatory
     community service programs in public schools.
     Southern California Law Review, 68, p. 1391.

Munro, P. (1995). Educators as activist: five women from
     Chicago. Social Education, 59 (5), p. 274-278.

National Society for Experiential Education Document
     Committee. (1998). National Society for Experiential
     Education Quarterly, 23(3) p. 18-22.

O'Grady, C. (Ed.) (2000). Integrating service learning
     and multicultural education in colleges and
     universities. Mahwah, NJ: Lawerence Erlbaum
     Associates.

Oliver, H.T. (1996). Voices, places, and conversations
     about service learning: making connections. Memphis,
     TN: National Historically Black Colleges and
     Universities Faculty Development Symposium. (ERIC
     Document Reproduction No. ED 402 853)

Ottenritter, N. & Lisman, C.D. (1998). Weaving service-
     learning into the fabric of your college. National
     Society for Experiential Education Quarterly, 23(3)
     p. 10-11, 26-28).

Rhoads, R. (1997). Community service and higher learning:
     explorations of the caring self. New York: State
     University of New York.

Rhoads, R. & Howard, J. (Eds.) (1998). Academic service
     learning: a pedagogy of action and reflection. New
     Directions for Teaching and Learning. (73, Spring).
     San Fransico, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schine, J. (Ed.). (1997). Service learning: ninety-sixth
     yearbook of the National Society of the Study of
     Education. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago
     Press.

Seigel, S. & Rockwood, V. (1993). Democratic education,
     student empowerment, and community service: theory
     and practice. Equity & Excellence in Education,
     26(2), p. 65-70.

147

Sigmon, R. (1996). The problem of definition in service-learning. In R. Sigmon and others, <u>The Journey to Service-Learning</u>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Independent Colleges.

Stanton, T. (1987). Service learning: groping toward a definition. In J. Kendall & Associates (Eds.), <u>Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service, Volume I</u>. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Steirer v. Bethlehem Area School District. 987 F. 2d 989 (3rd Cir., 1993).

Students or serfs? Is mandatory communities service a violation of the thirteenth amendment. (1997). <u>Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review, 30</u>, p. 809.

Ward, K. (Fall, 1996). Service-learning and student volunteerism: reflections on institutional commitment. <u>Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3</u>, p. 55-65.

Weick, Karl E. (March, 1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly, 21,</u> (1) p. 1-19.

Wills, J.R. (Spring, 1992). Service on campus and in the curriculum. <u>Educational Record,73,</u> (2) p. 26-32.

Yarmolinsky, A. & Martello, J.S. (1996). Engaging the campus in service to the community. <u>Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum, 7</u> (1), p. 39-46.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM
ELRC 9000: Dissertation Research
College of Education, Louisiana State University-Baton
Rouge

Title of Research Study: Service Learning: A Study of
Administrators' Goals at a Research I University

Investigator: Christy Sanders
                             W: (225) 388-3016
                             H: (225) 216-2808

I,_____, agree to be interviewed by
Christy Sanders for the purposes of dissertation research.
I understand that I may be asked to reveal information of a
personal nature during the course of this interview, and
that every effort will be made by the investigator to
protect my confidentiality. Any identifying information
will be eliminated from the research report, and
transcripts and audiotapes of this interview will be stored
in a secure location with access limited to the
investigator.

I also understand that my participation is entirely
voluntary, and I may withdraw consent and terminate
participation in all or part of the interview at any time
without consequence. In addition I understand that I will
be given an opportunity to ask questions and address
concerns prior to and after the interview. I will also be
entitled to a copy of the final research report if I so
desire.

*I have been fully informed of my rights, and I give my
permission to be interviewed.*

_____   _____
Subject's name (please print)   Birth date

_____   _____
Subject's signature   Today's date

TO BE COMPLETED BY INVESTIGATOR
Case ID No._____   Number of Tapes_____
(Adapted from Hong, L. (1998). Redefining Babes, Booze
and Brawls: Men Against Violence – A New Masculinity.
Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State
University, Baton Rouge.

149

APPENDIX B: ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

ELRC 9000: Dissertation Research
College of Education, Louisiana State University—Baton
Rouge

1. Please state your name and describe the current
position you hold within the university. How long have you
been in the current position?

2. What are your job responsibilities? What percentage of
your job is dedicated to service learning tasks?

3. When did you first hear the phrase service learning?

4. What is your definition of service learning?

5. How does your definition of service learning relate to
your definition of experiential education?

6. How does service fit into the mission statement of the
university?

7. What institutional policies and practices support and
enhance service learning?

8. What are your goals of the service learning program?

9. Does your university view service learning as a
valuable academic practice? If yes, then how? If no, then
why?

10. Do you have records on the effect of your service
learning programs on students' academic achievement?

11. Do you understand what an "engaged" campus is? If so,
is your university considered an engaged campus? If not,
then what steps are needed to institutionalize service
learning?

12. What are the budget constraints for your program?

13. How many faculty are involved with service learning?

14. What is your interaction with the faculty?

15. How do you classify service learning in relationship to volunteerism?

16. How do you evaluate your program? How do you measure success of the program?

17. What is your involvement with the community service agencies?

18. What is your involvement with students participating in service learning programs?

19. What is your involvement with the receivers of the service?

20. Are there any legal issues associated with your service learning program?

21. Do you do any site visits during the semester?

22. What methods do you use to ensure successful attainment of your goals?

23. Were your goals for the service learning program met this semester? If yes, then how? If no, then why?

APPENDIX C: FACULTY INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

ELRC 9000:   Dissertation Research
College of Education, Louisiana State University—Baton
Rouge

1.   Please state your name and describe the current position you hold within the university. How long have you been in the current position?

2.   When did you first hear the phrase service learning?

3.   What is your definition of service learning?

4.   What institutional policies and practices support and enhance service learning?

5.   What are the goals of the service learning program as stated by university regulations (the service learning program at the university)?

6.   What do believe are the administrator's goals of the service learning program?

7.   What are your goals of the service learning experience for your students?

8.   What are the goals of the service learning experience for all other participants? (receivers of service, community service agency, university)

9.   Does your university view service learning as a valuable academic practice? Are there faculty rewards for participation in service learning teaching methodology? If so, what are they?

10.   How do you evaluate your classroom experiences? How do you measure the success of the service learning program?

11.   What is your involvement with the service learning program coordinators?

12.   What is your involvement with the community service agencies?

13. What is your involvement with the receivers of service?

14. Do you do any site visits during the semester?

15. Were your goals for the service learning program met this semester? If yes, then how? If no, then why?

16. Were the administrator's goals met this semester? If yes, they how? If no, they why?

APPENDIX D: STUDENT INTEVIEW PROTOCOL

ELRC 9000: Dissertation Research
College of Education, Louisiana State University—Baton
Rouge

1. Please state your name, age, classification, major and
hometown.

2. Did you purposefully enroll in the service learning
class? If yes, why? If no, then why have you decided not
to drop the course?

3. What is your definition of service learning?

4. What are the expectations, as outlined by your
professor, for this class?

5. What are your goals for this service learning
experience?

6. How do you believe that you achieved these goals?

7. What do you see as the university's goals for you? For
your participation in service learning?

8. Have you performed any type of community service before
enrolling in this class? If so, what have you done?

9. Describe a typical day at your community service
agency.

10. How has this experience enhanced your academic
experience?

11. Did you successfully meet all requirements of the
class expectations?

12. How could the service learning administrator helped
you attain your goals?

13. You stated the university's goals as
_____. Did you meet, meet and exceed, not
meet these goals? Why?

APPENDIX E: COMMUNITY SERVICE AGENGY DIRECTOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

ELRC 9000: Dissertation Research
College of Education, Louisiana State University—Baton Rouge

1. Please state your name and describe the current position you hold within your agency? How long have you been in the current position?

2. When did you first hear the phrase service learning?

3. How did you make the connection with the university to request students for your agency?

4. What is your definition of service learning?

5. What are your goals of the service learning program?

6. Do you have records on the effect/benefit of your service learning program on the receivers of service?

7. What is your interaction with the service learning program administrator?

8. What is your interaction with the faculty?

9. Do you have any orientation with the students before they begin working at your agency?

10. How do you evaluate your program? How do you measure success of the program?

11. Do you know what the program administrators' goals are? If so, what are they? How do they related to your goals?

12. Are there any legal issues associated with this program?

13. Were your goals for the service learning program met this semester? If yes, then how? If no, then why?

14. Were the program administrator's goals met? If yes, then how? If no, they why?

VITA

Christy Elizabeth Sanders, a native of Slidell, Louisiana, completed her undergraduate education at The University of Southern Mississippi in Banking and Finance in 1992. She then earned her Master of Education in Counseling in 1995 at Southern Miss. She completed her Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Leadership, Research and Counseling, from Louisiana State University, in May 2002.

She began her professional career as an Admissions Counselor in 1992 for The University of Southern Mississippi. She advanced to the position of Coordinator of High School Recruitment at Southern Miss. She left Southern Miss in 1992 to obtain her doctorate from LSU. While at LSU, she was the Graduate Assistant in the Office of Greek Affairs, serving as the Panhellenic Advisor. After completing her doctoral coursework, she advanced to the Coordinator of Greek Life. Currently she is employed at The University of Southern Mississippi as the Director of the Freshman Year Experience. This position entails both orientation and freshmen retention programming.

Her professional affiliations formerly included the Association of Fraternity Advisors, Missianna, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administration.

She currently is a member of the National Orientation Director's Association and the First Year Experience and Students in Transition.

   While at LSU, she presented at the Southeastern Panhellenic Conference, Southeastern Interfraternity Conference, and the Association of Fraternity Advisors Annual Conference.

   While at LSU, she served on the Task Force on Greek Recruitment, Campus-Community Coalition for Change, Women's Center Advisory Board, Orientation Committee and several search committees. At Southern Miss, she currently chairs the Advisory Board for the Luckyday Citizenship Scholars Program.

   She is a graduate of the Interfraternity Institute and has facilitated at two Undergraduate Interfraternity Institutes.

   She enjoys time with her family, friends, and her rat terrier, Macy.