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ABSTRACT

This study focuses the following: (1) the development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity as outcomes of service-learning courses, (2) the relationship between these two outcomes, (3) whether different course designs have differential effect, and (4) whether student characteristics results in differential outcomes. Development of social responsibility is a major motivation for those who theorize about or design community service and service-learning. The development of intellectual complexity is one of the goals of most higher education institutions. The possible relationship between development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity also needs to be studied. Course designs which emphasize and do not emphasize social justice need to be investigated in order to learn if they have different outcomes on development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity. Finally, students’ characteristics such as previous levels of volunteer involvement and reasons for taking service-learning courses were examined because they may have influence on students’ development of social responsibility.

In this study, the development of social responsibility is measured by the Scale of Service Learning Involvement (Olney & Grande, 1995), and students’ intellectual
development is measured by the Measure of Epistemological Reflection (Baxter Mogalda & Porterfield, 1985). Courses with strong, moderate, and minimal social justice content were compared on the two outcomes. Students with occasional and consistent volunteer history were compared as well as students who are required to take service-learning courses and students who freely elect to take service-learning courses.

The major outcomes are as follows: (1) Service-learning courses, especially the ones with strong social justice designs have positive influence on students’ development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity. (2) Students who had previous volunteer involvement and who took the courses as free electives had not only higher level of social responsibility development at the beginning of the courses but also developed more after taking service-learning courses than those who did not participate in volunteer work consistently and those who took the courses as required for their majors or as general education requirement. (3) Levels of social responsibility have a positive relationship with levels of intellectual ability. The development of social responsibility may presuppose intellectual development. There were exceptions, however. Some students in lower position of intellectual development also scored high in development of social responsibility. This issue needs further study.
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CHAPTER 1

CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF STUDY

Context of Study

Although service-learning programs began to spread in K-12 schools and higher education in 1980s, these programs probably began with government-sponsored efforts, such as Roosevelt’s establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1933, the Peace Corps and Vista programs of the 1960s, and the Youth Conservation Corps of the 1970s (O’Grady, 2000). Inspired by educational theorists such as John Dewey, Jean Piaget, David Kolb, and Paolo Freire, all of whom emphasized the importance of integrating experiential learning into the academic curriculum and some of whom (Freire and Dewey) emphasized achieving social change through reflection on action, today’s service-learning has an intentional focus on both service experience and academic learning and makes connections between the two components through reflective activities. A service-learning course, therefore, is taught at a college or university for academic credit. It includes a community service component and reflective activities on both class and service experience. The content of the courses is taught both in the service components and the classroom activities,
and reflective activities are usually built into the classroom, service site, or both. Such courses may or may not include emphases on social justice and social issues and may be voluntary or required.

In terms of the outcomes that service-learning programs can achieve, the National Service Act of 1993 has suggested that service-learning is not only a method of active learning of skills and knowledge, but also is a way of collaborating with the community, reflection on what students do and see during the actual service activity, and developing a sense of caring (Office of National Service, 1993). Therefore, possible outcomes can include meeting community needs, academic learning, enhancing students’ intellectual, personal, interpersonal, and moral development, as well as developing a sense of social responsibility. Among these outcomes, intellectual development and the development of a sense of social responsibility were selected for the outcomes of this study.

The intellectual development was chosen as one outcome of this study because it has been less well studied. Eyler (2000), for example, claimed that,

The effect of service-learning on cognitive outcomes has been less well studied and relatively little attention has been given to defining learning outcomes that would be expected to be enhanced by service participation. …. Most of the reports of learning are based on student self reports or faculty testimony (Eyler, Giles & Gray, 1999). Where attempts have been made to use grades as measures of learning, the evidence is mixed (Berson & Youkin, 1996; Markus, Howard & King, 1993; Miller, 1994; Kendrick, 1996). (p. 11)

However, Eyler believed that these self-report studies of learning or critical thinking or grades per se were not good measures of what service-learning promoted. On the one hand, self-report of learning “is not only a weak measure of the complex cognitive
outcomes we expect from service-learning, it also confuses satisfaction with learning” (p. 13). On the other hand, “traditional grades measure ‘replicative learning’ or memory of content, they are also weak measures of the outcomes we expect to see enhanced by service-learning” (p. 13).

According to Eyler (2000), because service-learning often has students engage issues and problems in complex natural contexts, the expected outcomes of service-learning should include the following:

There is also reason to believe that the ability to recognize ill-structured problems (Voss & Post, 1988) embedded in messy social contexts, to sort out conflicting information and views, and to resolve an issue while understanding that such resolutions are inherently tentative all rest on attaining advanced levels of cognitive development (Lynch, 1996). The ability to function in the face of uncertainty requires critical thinking abilities more advanced than those typically attained by American college students (King, 1992), and there is reason to think that the challenges and support provided in some service-learning programs may facilitate this development (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Kitchener, Lynch, Fischer & Wood, 1997). (p. 12-13)

These speculations about the influence of service-learning on cognitive development have been supported by a few studies. Batchelder and Root (1994), Boss (1996), Eyler and Giles (1999) have provided some evidence to support the following:

Service-learning has an impact on complexity of problem analysis, identification of locus of problem or solution, use of information to support arguments, creation of practical strategies from community action, cognitive moral development, and critical thinking. (Eyler, 2000, p. 12)

However, “while these studies are encouraging, their small scale, lack of finely differentiated treatment conditions, and lack of replication limits their usefulness” (p. 12). In addition, what is needed in the area of cognitive development is the use of established production measures of development rather than self-report or recognition
instruments. In this study, service-learning courses studied had been developed over years, had long-term relationships with community partners, were taught by experienced instructors, and had incorporated rigorous reflection activities into their course designs. In addition, a reliable production measure of cognitive development, Measure of Epistemological Reflection (MER) (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1985) was chosen to study the impact of service-learning courses on students’ cognitive development.

Compared to studies on impact of service-learning on students’ cognitive development, more studies have been conducted on the influence of service-learning courses on the development of social responsibility, which is regarded as a critical part of the development of citizenship. Giles and Eyler (1994) pointed out that, “sustained citizenship participation is thought to rest on the values, attitudes, and beliefs about service that make up ‘social responsibility’” (p. 328). Hence, studies in this area try to examine the effects of service-learning classes on changes in beliefs about the importance of service, the causes of social issues, and self-efficacy to influence community and social issues. Many studies have reported results based upon a questionnaire developed by Markus, Howard and King (1993). This instrument attempts to measure several outcomes including the development of social responsibility. These studies have found positive evidence that service-learning courses influence the development of social responsibility (Giles & Eyler, 1994; Kendrick, 1996; Markus et al., 1993). Hudson (1996), on the other hand, did not get the same results using this questionnaire. Other instruments also have been used to
study the development of social responsibility and these studies have found some support for increase in civic responsibility and civic behavior (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Myers-Lipton, 1998).

However, social responsibility has been interpreted as either a commitment to social justice which also involves political action to correct injustice (e.g., Barber, 1994; Berman, 1997; Kahne & Westheimer, 1996) or a personal commitment to charity-oriented responsibility to help others (Cohen, 1994; Conrad & Hedin, 1994; Smith, 1994). Most studies did not consider or study this distinction in class design or outcome. Delve, Mintz and Stewart (1990) acknowledged this distinction. In their Service Learning Model, personal and charity-oriented responsibility is acknowledged; however, a political and social-justice-oriented outcome is considered more desirable. In this study the phases of the development of social responsibility were defined by the Service Learning Model of Delve, Mintz and Stewart and were operationalized by the instrument, Scale of Service Learning Involvement (SSLI) developed by Olney and Grande (1995).

This model and instrument were implemented also because most of the research on social responsibility has not focused on a possible relationship between student intellectual/moral development and the development of social responsibility. Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) have speculated how their model may be related to intellectual and moral development. Their speculations relate the phases of social responsibility in their Service Learning Model and levels of intellectual and ethical development (Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1975; Perry, 1970/1999). The Service
Learning Model describes five phases of the development of social responsibility that can result from participation in service learning. Each phase may have a parallel with positions in Perry, Kohlberg and Gilligan’s cognitive-structural theories.

The five phases of social responsibility are called Exploration, Clarification, Realization, Activation, and Internalization. In Exploration, volunteers explore new opportunities and may become excited by the opportunities they find. However, generally such students are naïve about the problems facing the people needing service. These students may be motivated by an opportunity to help, to get a reward, such as a tee shirt or peer recognition, or personal satisfaction. They have yet to form a commitment to “any group on campus or any population or issue in the community” (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, p. 14). The authors hypothesized that this phase might be parallel with Perry’s dualism position 2. In this position, students are comfortable with a clearly defined task without any question about the meaning or background of their service work. Their motivation is lower on social responsibility and higher on fun, social life, and peer recognition. This phase also may be similar to Kohlberg’s preconventional level stage 2. People in stage 2 are self-centered and “participate in their respective service activities because they know they will get something in return” (p. 20). This phase also may be analogous with Gilligan’s survival stage. Persons at this stage concentrate on their own performance rather than on understanding the people with whom they are working.

The second phase is Clarification. At this phase students become more discriminating about their services. They explore various service options before they
choose where to serve. They “make critical decisions about where they will exercise
their community-service energies” (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990, p. 15). Through
contact with diversity among friends who volunteer and people at the placement sites,
they clarify what is important to them in doing service. Often, the service activity
helps these students to feel part of a group and feel comradeship. If they value
membership in a group that has decided to do a service project, they do the project in
order to keep favor with the group. This can lead to repeated service and participation
in more of the group’s activities. The authors believed that Clarification might be akin
to Perry’s position 3. Students recognize multiple points of view and identify with
group norms. This phase also may be similar to Kohlberg’s conventional level stage 3,
“interpersonal concordance.” In this stage, students identify with and need approval
from their primary groups. Further, this phase also may be related to Gilligan’s first
transition where people are involved because of “their awareness and commitment to
group obligation” (p. 22).

The third phase is called Realization. Students realize “how the seemingly
diverse aspects of their community service all fit together” (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart,
1990, p. 15). “Usually through a profound transforming experience, the student is able
to grasp a larger truth for himself or herself; as a result, students become focused on a
particular population or issue and more confident in their beliefs” (p. 15). Students
focus on the social needs of the people served and develop commitments to a
population in need or an agency that goes beyond “fun,” “tee shirts,” or acceptance by
peers. They come to learn from the people served; that is, mutual learning takes place.
The authors speculated that this phase of their Service Learning Model might require Perry’s multiplicity position 4, where students begin to realize “the difference between unconsidered belief and a considered judgment” (p. 23). It may require Kohlberg’s conventional level stage 4, where the capacities to take a individual perspective regardless of group norms may lead to a personal concept of citizenship that includes public service. It may be parallel to Gilligan’s second level, where students are involved in service in order to help or protect those who are treated unfairly.

The fourth phase is called Activation. Service students become committed participants in service. They engage in formal and informal discussion about racism, social class prejudices, and other justice issues connected to their service experiences. The students may “feel a sense of solidarity with the population they work with and become an advocate on its behalf” (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990, p.16). The students both serve and learn about social justice. The authors speculated that this phase might require Perry’s relativism stage 5 and 6, where people start to see that “the expertise of the agency staff is critical to the outcome of their services,” (p. 24) and they also generalize their empathy from clients that they know to the client group in the abstract. This phase is also like Kohlberg’s postconventional level stage 5. At stage 5, people see that some laws are unfair, and they feel a responsibility to work toward changing those laws. They become morally obligated to work for justice. This phase may coincide with Gilligan’s second transition where people move from goodness to truth, that is, they are involved because they themselves realize the injustice and the necessity to work to correct it.
The fifth phase is called Internalization. Students “fully integrate their community-service experience into their lives and, as a result, make lifestyle and career decisions that include the values gained from such experience” (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990, p. 17). This phase may parallel and require Perry’s stage 7 to 9, in which students make personal commitment using stage 5 reasoning. It may require Kohlberg’s postconventional level stage 6, in which people live according to universal ethical principles. It also may require Gilligan’s level 3, where people try to live out the “morality of nonviolence” (p. 25).

Two tables from Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) are reproduced here to summarize the Service Learning Model and its relationship to the Perry scheme (1970/1999) of intellectual development. In Table 1, four key descriptive variables—intervention, commitment, behavior, and balance—and the two descriptive classifications for each variable—mode and setting—are summarized for each phase of the model. The last row of the table—Goal Transition—represents a fundamental assumption of this model, that is, service-learning should move students “from charity to justice” (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990, p. 26). According to the authors, this transition from charity to justice is important for students moving from one phase to another phase within the Service Learning Model.

In order for empowerment to occur, service-learning programs must move beyond a focus on charity, such as dance-marathon fundraisers and holiday visits to nursing homes. Programs that focus only on charity delay a student’s success at empathizing with the service population. Without that empathy, the student will not come to recognize the members of the client population as valued individuals in the larger society as well as sources for new learning. As a result, the student will miss an opportunity to learn significant lessons from the members of the client community, individual development will be thwarted,
empowerment of both the student and the client blocked, and ultimate societal justice forfeited. (p. 26)

Therefore, according to Service Learning Model, people at the highest phase of social responsibility will demonstrate not only their awareness of social injustice but also their willingness to commit to take action for social justice.

No research has been done to explore whether a service-learning course that has social justice as focus of course design will enhance students’ social responsibility more than courses without social justice focus. This study investigated the influences of the social justice focus of service-learning course designs on students’ development of a sense of social responsibility. In addition, because of the speculation on the relationship between social responsibility and intellectual development in the Service Learning Model, the influence of social justice focus of course design on intellectual development and the relationship between the development of social responsibility and intellectual development were also explored in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Variables</th>
<th>Phase 1 Exploration</th>
<th>Phase 2 Clarification</th>
<th>Phase 3 Realization</th>
<th>Phase 4 Activation</th>
<th>Phase 5 Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention Mode</strong></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group Individual</td>
<td>Group Individual</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting</strong></td>
<td>Nondirect</td>
<td>Nondirect</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment Frequency</strong></td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>One time to a number of activities or sites</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Long-term to group</td>
<td>Long-term to activity, site, or issue</td>
<td>Lifelong to issue</td>
<td>Lifelong to social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior Needs</strong></td>
<td>Participate in incentive activities</td>
<td>Identify with group camaraderie</td>
<td>Commit to activity, site, or issue</td>
<td>Advocate issue</td>
<td>Promote values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Feeling good, personal satisfaction</td>
<td>Belonging to the group</td>
<td>Understanding activity, site, or issue</td>
<td>Changing lifestyle</td>
<td>Living one’s values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Breading into involvement cycle</td>
<td>Choosing from multiple opportunities; dealing with group dynamics.</td>
<td>Confronting diversity; breaking from group.</td>
<td>Questioning authority; adjusting to peer reaction.</td>
<td>Living consistently with values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supports</strong></td>
<td>Activities, nonthreatening, structured</td>
<td>Group setting, identification; activities, structured.</td>
<td>Personnel service coordinators, supervisor, volunteers.</td>
<td>Partners, clients, volunteers.</td>
<td>Community; inner peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals for Transition</strong></td>
<td>From individual to group</td>
<td>From group to site, issue, or activity</td>
<td>From activity, site, or issue to community</td>
<td>From community to society</td>
<td>Charity-----------------------------Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1. Scheme of the Service Learning Model
In Table 2, the speculations on the relationships between the phases of social responsibility and the positions of Perry scheme are shown. Only the Perry scheme is included because this study focused on intellectual development and not the theories of Kohlberg and Gilligan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Learning Model Phases</th>
<th>Developmental Theorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: Exploration</td>
<td><strong>Dualism Position 1</strong>: Authority and absolutes are undifferentiated and therefore unquestioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Clarification</td>
<td><strong>Dualism Position 2</strong>: Issues are perceived as black and white, right or wrong. No gray. Knowledge is absolute. Right answers are in the authority’s domain. Multiplicity is perceived but suspect and opposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Realization</td>
<td><strong>Multiplicity Position 3</strong>: Variety of answers. More gray, no wrong opinions. Opens door to learning to distinguish ways of believing and judging. All opinions are valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Activation</td>
<td><strong>Multiplicity Position 4</strong>: Individual begins to see differences between unconsidered belief and a considered judgment. Relativism is perceived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5: Internalization</td>
<td><strong>Relativism Positions 5 and 6</strong>: Knowledge is contextual and relative. Almost too much gray. All answers are valid. Resists decision making, closing options. Moving to “6” leads to realization of need to choose. Authorities once again are valued, this time for their expertise, not position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commitment in Relativism Positions 7-9</strong>: Affirms self and responsibilities in a pluralistic world. Has come to terms with self. Established identity. Commitments such as religion, career, partnership in life’s experience. No longer “fence sitter.” Action is integrated with self.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Copied from Delve, et al. (1990, p. 18-19)

Table 2. Comparison of Student-Development Theory with the Service Learning Model
The Scale of Service Learning Involvement (SSLI) was developed by Olney and Grande (1995) to measure the social responsibility phases of the Service Learning Model. In developing SSLI, Olney and Grande found that the distinctions between the first two stages (Exploration and Clarification) and the last two stages (Activation and Internalization) were not strong enough empirically to create independent subscales; therefore, their scale had only three subscales, which were as follows: Exploration, Realization, and Internalization. The last subscale, Internalization, represents the highest phase of social responsibility and includes a personal sense of commitment to and obligation for citizenship, awareness of the complexities and importance of social justice issues, and a life or long-term commitment to work toward social equality and equity.

In order to explore the psychometric qualities of the SSLI scale, Olney and Grande (1995) administered the SSLI along with several other standardized instruments associated with the developmental speculations of Delve, Mintz and Stewart (1990). They used Scale of Intellectual Development (SID) (Erwin, 1981) to measure Perry positions, Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Rest, 1990) to measure Kohlberg stages, and the Measure of Moral Orientation-Caring Orientation subscale to measure development based upon Gilligan’s theory. The SID is a recognition measure of the Perry scheme. This means responses for every stage are created and presented in the instrument and students recognize the responses that they like the best and select them. Rest (1973) has established that people recognize and select responses higher or more complex than they can create or produce themselves. People can recognize and see
advantage of reasoning one stage more complex than they can produce it themselves. Hence, recognition measurements, such as the SID can inflate stage ratings. Production instruments, such as the MER (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1985), require students to produce their own reasoning, not to recognize responses already created, and production scores generally are more valid than recognition scores. Hence, this study used a standardized production measure of Perry scheme (MER) rather than a recognition instrument.

The results in Olney and Grande’s (1995) study supported the SSLI as a measure of the Service Learning Model and development of social responsibility. Cronbach’s alpha was used to assess the internal reliability of the three SSLI subscales and showed moderate to high consistency of the subscales. The alphas for Exploration subscale was 0.84, for Realization subscale was 0.70, and for Internalization was 0.74. Convergent validity of SSLI looked at whether predicted interrelations among the SSLI subscales were achieved. As expected by the authors, the Exploration and Internalization phases had a significant negative correlation, and the Realization and Internalization phases had a significant positive correlation.

In addition, the correlations among SID and SSLI subscales provided validity support for the speculated relationships between Service Learning Model and Perry’s theory. Exploration was positively related with Dualism and Relativism stages, and negatively related to Commitment and Empathy stages. Internalization was negatively related with Dualism and Relativism and positively related to Commitment and Empathy stages.
Finally, Olney and Grande (1995) also studied the divergent validity of SSLI. They compared the SSLI subscale scores for students with different levels of experience with or commitment to community service. Students with no previous experience and no interest in volunteering and students who volunteer only for credit had higher scores on Exploration subscale than students “with higher level of interest and more commitment to service” (p.49). The latter students had higher scores on Realization and Internalization. However, Olney and Grande collected their data all at once; no pre-course and post-course comparisons were made to see how service-learning courses influence students’ development of social responsibility as outcome of service-learning courses. This study addressed these questions.

In addition, Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997) found that students in their study “who choose to participate in service-learning experiences and those who did not differ significantly on virtually every outcome measure at the beginning of the service semester” (p. 8). Therefore, it is possible that students who are taking the service-learning course because it is required for the major or as a choice on a required list of courses for the major enter classes with levels of social responsibility different from those who are taking the courses as free elective courses for the content of the class or for the service component. The relationships between students’ reasons for taking service-learning courses and their initial levels of social responsibility need to be explored. In addition, the relationship between students’ enrollment reasons and their development of social responsibility as outcomes of service-learning courses also need to be studied. This study explored these aspects.
Several other studies have been conducted based on Delve, Mintz, & Stewart’s (1990) Service Learning Model and/or Olney and Grande’s (1995) SSLI. The findings are mixed. Johnson and Bozeman (1998) used the Scale of Social Responsibility Development (SSRD) revised from SSLI to examine the effect of service-learning class on the development of social responsibility in students. They found that the service-learning group increased significantly on each subscale, and a non service-learning group only increased significantly on the Activation subscale. The non-service-learning class, however, did focus on social issues as content, and, as a consequence, this finding may not be surprising. Kollcross (1997) used SSLI to examine students’ development of civic responsibility as a result of service-learning experiences. He studied two courses (Sociology and Psychology) that required service-learning, and two courses (Economics and Statistics) that offered students the option to earn extra credit. The author reported that there was no significant within group change for any of the four courses. Hence, neither required nor voluntary service-learning classes resulted in significant change in civic responsibly as measured by SSLI. More studies are needed to see how course designs will influence students’ development of social responsibility.

**Statement of the Problem**

In summary, the Service Learning Model (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990) may be a good description of social responsibility development. It is a usable framework to conduct studies on the development of social responsibility and the relationship between development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity. However,
Olney and Grande’s (1995) study used the SID, a recognition instrument, to measure Perry levels. The MER, a production measure, appears to be a more valid measure of Perry positions. New and replication studies using a production measure of Perry positions are needed to study the impact of service-learning courses on students’ intellectual development and relationship between students’ development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity.

In addition, current studies based on the Service Learning Model and the SSLI have had mixed findings. Different service-learning classes have had different patterns of change or no change on social responsibility (Johnson & Bozeman, 1998; Kollcross, 1997; Olney & Grande, 1995; Payne, 2000). Additional work needs to be done to study the impact of service-learning courses on students’ development of social responsibility.

Another area that needs to be explored is the effect of social justice focus in course design. According to the Service Learning Model (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990), the desired outcome of service-learning courses is social-justice oriented social responsibility. However, it is not clear whether service-learning courses with a social justice focus will foster students’ social responsibility and intellectual development more than courses without this focus.

Finally, although some studies have shown that students with different levels of previous volunteer involvement and motivation to participate in service-learning have different levels of social responsibility, it is not clear how these characteristics of
students will influence students’ development of social responsibility as outcomes of service-learning courses.

**Purpose of Study**

This study explored the outcomes of various service learning courses on the development of social responsibility and intellectual development. The courses used in this study enrolled first-year undergraduate through graduate students in order to obtain Perry level from position 2 through 5. Position 2 and 3 are common among undergraduates. Position 4 is present but less common among undergraduates. Position 4 and 5 are common among graduate students. Therefore, students from different service-learning courses were studied as a whole group as well as in each individual course.

Among the six courses in this study, some courses emphasized social justice and some did not. Courses were classified into different groups according to the degree to which social justice was a focus of the course design. Comparisons among groups were made to see whether the focus of design made any differences in terms of students’ social responsibility and intellectual development.

Similar to Olney and Grade (1995), the social responsibility of students with various levels of previous experience in volunteer work and reasons for participating in a service-learning course also were investigated. This study also examined the possible relationship between the development of social responsibility and Perry’s positions of intellectual development.
Research Questions

The following research questions will be used to guide this study:

1. What are the outcomes of participating in service-learning courses on development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity?

2. Does a social justice focus in the designs of service-learning courses make a difference in terms of development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity?

3. Do students with different levels of previous involvement in volunteer work have different levels of social responsibility at the beginning of the courses and different outcomes on the development of social responsibility at the end of the courses?

4. Do students with different reasons for taking service learning courses have different levels of social responsibility at the beginning of the courses and different outcomes on the development of social responsibility at the end of the courses?

5. What is the relationship between development of social responsibility and development of intellectual complexity?

Importance of the Study

Social responsibility is an important outcome for many who work with service learning initiatives. Intellectual development is a goal for almost all colleges and universities. In this study I gathered evidence to explore both outcomes. In order to understand the development of social responsibility and intellectual development,
course designs need to be investigated and characteristics of students need to be understood.

The course designs that include and do not include social justices may influence students’ social responsibility and intellectual development differently. Since people at the most desirable phase of social responsibility are held to be aware of social injustice as well as willing to take action to fight for social justice, it is very possible that students in courses with a social justice focus in their designs will gain more in the development of social responsibility than students in courses without such a focus. If this is valid, instructors who want to promote students’ development of social responsibility may want to consider incorporating social justice focus into their course designs.

Characteristics of students consist of but are not limited to their intellectual development, previous volunteer involvement, and reasons for taking service-learning courses. Students’ intellectual development may be necessary but not sufficient conditions for different levels of social responsibility. We need to know the relationship between students’ intellectual development and social responsibility development in order to design more appropriate challenges and supports to promote development. In addition, students’ previous volunteer involvement and reasons for taking a course may influence students’ development. These motivational factors need to be better understood.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This study sought to understand the impact of service-learning courses on college students’ development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity. Specially, this study explored the impact of a social justice focus of course design on students’ development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity; the impact of students’ previous volunteer involvement and reasons for taking service-learning courses on the development of social responsibility; and the relationship between development of intellectual complexity and development of social responsibility. In this chapter, relevant literatures to these foci are reviewed.

The context of service-learning is reviewed in order to show the evolution of service-learning and why social responsibility and intellectual complexity are the outcomes of most concern to service-learning practitioners and theorists. A review of literature on cognitive structural theories and studies on intellectual development as related to service-learning and social justice education is then given. Finally, theories and studies on citizenship and development of social responsibility are reviewed.
Context of Service learning

Evolution of Community Service

Service-learning directly evolved from the practice of community service; therefore, the evolution of community service practice and policy in USA is contextually important. Community service has several meanings. It can refer to the community service sentenced by judge as a penalty to offenders (Pease, 1980). It also can refer to the institutional purpose of colleges and universities in terms of providing “identifiable benefits to a community,” which is the legacy of the “land grant institutions and city colleges” (Sagaria & Burrows, 1995, p. 4). When related to service-learning, community service refers to “a particular form of voluntary action in which individuals and groups donate time and effort to benefit others” (Serow & Dreyden, 1990, p. 554). Because voluntary action, including community service, is believed to “have salutary consequence for donors as well as recipients,” community service has become a frequent theme both in practice and theory among educational institutions (p. 554).

In their overview of community service, Morton and Saltmarsh (1997) believed that “community service is a modern phrase, and did not enter the everyday language of Americans until sometime in the 1940s” (p. 137). Hence, the history of community service “entails responses to the individual and social dilemmas that emerged from the crisis of community at the turn of the 20th century” (p. 137).

In general, the crisis of community refered to a decline in civic participation (Brandhorst, 1990; Raskoff & Sundeen, 1998). This decline was related to the
“fragmentation of a unified American culture by the combined forces of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration, and by the increasing centralization of political and economic power in the hands of a private, industrial elite” (Morton and Saltmarsh, 1997, p. 139). A loss of networks, norms, and social trust resulted (O’Keefe, 1997; Raskoff & Sundeen, 1998). Therefore, community service emerged to counteract these negative trends in American public life, that is, to improve the “citizen involvement, civic participation and citizenship” (Smith, 1994, p. 37).

As a result of the declining of citizenship in America, the service movement worked to increase interest in service programs, and “played an important role in generating support for service legislation at the national level—which culminated in the 1990 National and Community Service Act” (Smith, Jucový, Solms, Baker, Furano, & Tierney, 1995, p. i). In this Act, the definition of “service opportunity” was inclusive, that is,

Service opportunity means a program or project, including service learning programs or projects, that enables participants to perform meaningful and constructive service in agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help to meet human, educational, linguistic, public safety and environmental community needs, especially those relating to poverty. (Smith, Jucový, Solms & et al., 1995, p. 11)

After the 1990 Act, a considerable amount of activity took place. “Commission for National and Community Service (CNCS) was established, a staff was created, and the first round of grant awards was made to states for service-learning programs, youth service and conservation corps, and a small number of demonstration programs” (Smith, Jucový, Solms, & et al., 1995, p.12). The funding of CNCS was modest, however, and its actions were relatively unknown except for its grantees and a few
service advocates. In 1993, however, things changed with the National and Community Service Trust Act. This act was built on 1990 legislation, and was designed to reflect President Clinton’s emphasis on service, especially by young people. Its primary goal was to “connect service opportunities to post-program education benefits, thus linking commitment to serving with chances to further one’s education” (p. 13). Guidelines for this Act were as follows:

1. National service must address unmet educational, environmental, human, or public safety needs. National priorities may be established within these areas.
2. National service must improve the life of the participants, through citizenship education and training.
3. Participants may not displace or duplicate the functions of existing workers.

A new agency, Corporation of National Service (CNS) was established to “streamline the way that service initiatives would be administered at the federal level” (Smith, Jucovy, Solms, & et al., 1995, p. 14). And it had three main programs – AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve America, and the National Senior Service Corps, which provided a broad range of opportunities for Americans to serve the communities and the nation (CNS).

The courts also became involved and supported the constitutionality of mandatory community service in public schools despite the opposition of some students and parents. The first case was the Steirer v. Bethlehem Area School District (1993) in Pennsylvania. In this case, two students and their parents objected to the mandate from the school district to participate in community service. They maintained that the graduation requirement violated the free speech clause of the First
Amendment because it forced student to engage in a particular form of expression, and it also violated the Thirteenth Amendment because it constituted involuntary servitude (Bittner, 1994). In 1996, another two students from Chapel Hill High School in North Carolina brought the school system to court. They also claimed that 50-hours service requirement for graduation was unconstitutional on the grounds that it violated the 13th Amendment, which prohibits involuntary servitude and the 14th Amendment, which guarantees parents’ rights (O’Keefe, 1997). However, in both cases, the courts have consistently decided in favor of mandatory Community Service programs and the school system. The courts believed that the Community Service programs were valuable in exposing “students to the needs of their communities and to the various ways a democratic system of volunteerism can respond to those needs” (O’Keefe, 1997, p. 50). In addition, the courts insisted that the school district had control of the curriculum, and attending the Community Service program was neither a forced expression of certain belief nor a physically forced involuntary servitude, therefore, it was not unconstitutional.

In summary, community service policy emerged out of social need to improve citizen involvement and participation. Federal legislation, financial support, and judicial findings, all combined to support these efforts.

**Evolution of Service-learning**

With the development of community service as backdrop, service-learning, as a form of experiential education, established itself and flourished on many college campuses in the late 1960s and the 1970s (Jacoby, 1996). The term “service-learning”
first emerged in the work of Sigmon and William Ramsey at the Southern Regional Education Board in 1967 (Giles and Eyler, 1994). Then in 1969, the newly established National Student Volunteer Program became the National Center for Service-Learning. In 1971, this program along with VISTA and the Peace Corps formed the federal agency ACTION, which was a national center for student service and involved more than ten thousand students in the 1970s. At the same time, there were also many campus-based service programs, regional and consortiums programs, and organizations developed outside the federal government, such as National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, which became National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) in 1994 (Jacoby, 1996).

However, the service-learning movement that emerged in 1960s and 1970s did not last. Kendall (1990) believed that there were three reasons for this. The first reason was that “most of the programs were not integrated into the central mission and goals of the schools and agencies where they were based” (p. 8). The second reason was that the charity or “helping others” and “doing good” tendency produced “the unequal relationships between the parties involved” (p. 10). The third reason was that service per se did not ensure significant learning would take place.

After a number of educators, community leaders and students identified the elements that were necessary for successful service-learning program, there was a new surge of interest in service learning in 1980s. In 1985, the Education Commission of the States began Campus Compact: the Project for Public and Community Service. This was an organization of college and university presidents who pledged to
encourage and support academically based community service at their institutions. At the same time, a group of college graduates formed the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) to encourage students to serve their communities. In addition, from 1983 to 1989 consultants trained by NSEE worked with college and universities to develop and strengthen experiential education based on the premises that service-learning programs must be firmly rooted in the mission of the institution, involve faculty, be integrated into the curriculum and be grounded in sound theory and pedagogical practice (Jacoby, 1996).

In order to respond to the need of identifying a set of principles of good practice, NSEE began in 1987 and established in 1989 the Principles of Good Practice in Combining Service and Learning. Service-learning was defined as “service, combined with learning, adds value to each and transforms both” (Porter Honnet & Poulsen, 1989, cited by Jacoby, 1996, p. 14). In 1990s, there was an exposition of literature and conferences on service-learning, which helped practitioners and theorists to communicate thoughts and improve practices. The federal government’s interest in and support of service-learning can be seen in the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1990 as well as National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Jacoby, 1996) that have been already mentioned.

It is clear that service-learning is closely related to community service and has the same intention to address social needs that are not being met and prepare students for participation in a democracy. However, there is also a major difference between service-learning and community service, that is, the service-learning programs need to
fit into the mission and priorities of educational institutions, which is student learning and development. Therefore, service-learning programs need to have intentional learning goals and appropriate designs to achieve these goals. Deliberately designed, reflection is regarded as the benchmark that differentiates community service and service learning programs. Guided reflection helps students connect their service experience and learning outcomes (Jacoby, 1996). Another difference between service–learning and community service is “reciprocity,” which refers to “the exchange of both giving and receiving between the ‘server’ and the person or group ‘being served’” (Kendall, 1990, p. 22). Theorists believe that the lack of both giving and receiving can result in the sense of “paternalism” on the side of “the server” and the sense of dependence on the side of “the served” (p. 22). Reciprocity tries to avoid this result.

**Definitions and Types of Service Learning Programs/Courses**

Definitions of service-learning need to include purpose, pedagogy and content of the program. Jacoby’s (1996) definition of service-learning was quite inclusive:

Service-learning is 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)

This definition does cover the purpose, pedagogy and context of service-learning program. However, when the meaning of “student learning and development” is examined, people may talk about different things. Traditionally, “learning” usually refers to academic learning and “development” refers to students’ cognitive, moral or
psychosocial maturation over a period of time. These may be the meaning of learning and development in Jacoby’s (1996) definition. However, other documents use “learning” to comprise both learning and development (Astin, 1996). Similarly, Kendall (1990) used “learning” to represent intellectual, civic, ethical, moral, cross-cultural, career, personal development, and Eyler and Giles (1999) used “learning” to represent personal and interpersonal development, understanding and application of knowledge, improved critical thinking, perspective transformation and citizenship.

Well-rounded development is the purpose of many educational institutions. However, some people regard academic learning as the priority of educational institutions and not well-rounded development. Hence, this traditional understanding of learning sometimes constrains people’s thinking about service-learning within the narrow definition of learning academic content only. In order to make service-learning more legitimate in educational institutions, some people believe “service-learning should include a balance between service to the community and academic learning” and tend to define service-learning program as “attempts to link academic study with service” (Eyler and Giles, 1999, p. 4). Nevertheless, “non-course-based programs that include a reflective component and learning goals may also be included under broad umbrella” of service-learning (p. 5). Hence, there are two subtypes of service-learning, one is curricular-service-learning, and the other is cocurricular-service-learning.

In addition, the emphasis placed on service or learning can result in different kinds of service-learning programs. According to Sigmon (1994), service-learning programs can be classified according to the relationship between service and learning:
“service-LEARNING,” implies that learning goals are primary and service outcomes secondary; “SERVICE-learning,” implies that the service agenda is central and the learning secondary; “service learning,” means that the two are viewed as completely separate from each other; and “SERVICE-LEARNING” means that the service and learning goals are of equal weigh and “the hyphen is essential.” (p. 2, cited by Jacoby, 1996, p. 4)

While the optimal mix is the SERVICE-LEARNING and proposed by many authors (Eyler and Giles, 1999; Jacoby, 1996), the other forms are also acceptable.

**Outcome Domains of Service-Learning Programs/Courses**

The outcome of service-learning programs/courses can be for community partners and students who are involved. To the community, it usually refers to how the service-learning benefit the community members or community agencies that are involved in the service programs. To the students, it usually refers to how the service-learning influences students’ learning and development. Because there are various possibilities for student outcomes, it is necessary to find out what categories researchers are using when they talk about student outcome for service-learning experience.

In their book *Where is the learning in service-learning?* Eyler and Giles (1999) reported findings of a comprehensive study on 1500 students who took a survey and 120 students who were interviewed. In reporting their findings, the authors classified the outcomes of service-learning programs into four major categories: personal and interpersonal development, understanding and applying knowledge, development of critical thinking and problem solving, and citizenship development.

Under personal and interpersonal development, there are several sub-categories, which include respect for diversity, personal development, interpersonal development
and connection with community. The dimension of diversity includes appreciation of different culture and the reduction of stereotyping. The dimension of personal development includes self-knowledge, spiritual growth, reward of helping others, career benefits and careers in service, and change in personal efficacy. The dimension of interpersonal development includes working with others and change in leadership skills. The dimension of connections with others includes connection with community, among students, and with faculty. The survey data and interview data documented positive impact of service-learning programs on each of the above dimensions.

Understanding and applying knowledge is an extension of the traditional definition of academic learning, which is confined to acquisition of course content as demonstrated by grades on examinations. This dimension was measured by students’ self-report through survey and problem-solving interviews. The interview data appeared to support increased understanding of causal and solution complexity, better application of course knowledge, and strategic use of knowledge. All of these relate to cognitive development.

The development of critical thinking and problem solving means students’ cognitive development. Cognitive development may be possible because community problems are usually ill-structured problems, and, hence, according to Perry’s (1970/1999) and King and Kitchener (1994) theories students experiencing and reflecting on these problems could facilitate their cognitive development to higher stages. Although Elyer and Giles (1999) did not find impact of service learning on students’ critical thinking through an established assessment instrument, they did find
through their interviews that a third of interviewed students seemed to show more complex reasoning in understanding of the issues encountered at their service sites.

According to Elyer and Giles (1999), critical thinking also represents perspective transformation. Cognitive developmental theorists (Kohlberg, 1969; Kegan, 1994; Perry, 1970/1999) call perspective transformation a stage change. It is possible that service-learning experiences can help students experience transformation of basic meaning making structures because when they find that they can not explain the problem based on their current ways of making meaning. Hence, if students are ready for transformation, they can start to change the premises of their perception of the problem, such as, social norms, ideologies, and theories of the way society works. In Eyler and Giles’ study, perspective transformation was measured by looking at students’ systemic orientation to social problems, perception of the need to achieve social justice and political action. Both the survey data and interview data showed positive change on the above dimensions, that is, students’ explanation of social problem changed from individual orientation to systematic orientation, and began to emphasize the fundamental structural aspects of social problems. In addition, the suggested solutions to social problems also shifted from individual efforts to organized political action.

These findings may or may not indicate cognitive development. The authors may be confusing content to structural change. For example, from Kegan’s (1994) or Perry’s (1970/1999) point of view, there would be perspective change only if the student was a stage 3 and ready to move to stage 4. If the student were already at stage
4, this change would be a content and not structural change. Studies using established
cognitive development instruments need to be conducted. This study addressed this
issue.

The last category is citizenship. According to Eyler and Giles (1999),
citizenship has five elements, that is, values, knowledge, skills, efficacy, and
commitment, and these elements are imbedded in the personal and interpersonal
development, understanding and application of knowledge, development of critical
thinking and perspective transformation. Therefore, the outcome on these dimensions
will determine the development of citizenship because “active and effective
citizenship” is based on “the personal qualities and interpersonal skills and also the
understanding and cognitive development” (p. 163).

Kahne and Westheimer’s (1999) classification of the goals of service learning
also give some ideas of how to classify the outcome domains for service-learning
programs. Their classification has two dimensions: the first dimension is concerned
with the effect of the service learning on the service-provider, receiver, community or
society. There are two levels of this dimension, one is “charity”—which helps meet a
need by maintaining the status quo. The other is “change”—which commits to action
to try to change a given situation. Service-learning could affect either level; however,
these authors value and emphasize the second level. The second dimension of the
goals of service learning is the domains that the service learning program can affect.
They are moral, political and intellectual domains.
Depending on the position in the first dimension, that is, charity or change, each domain can have two levels. For the moral domain, the two levels are giving and caring. While “giving” refers to give something back to their school or community without necessarily understanding the people they are serving, “caring” emphasizes the understanding of the served and diminishing “the sense of otherness that often separates students—particularly privileged students—from those in need” (Kahne & Westheimer, 1999, p.32).

For political domain, the two levels are responsible citizen/civic duty and critical democrats/social reconstruction. The responsible citizen/civic duty refers to the practice of helping others in the community, and this approach is regarded as a conservative political posture that tries to minimize government as a agent of social change. In contrast, critical democrats/social reconstruction emphasizes critical examination of the root cause of the social problems as well as engagement in complex social issues.

For intellectual domain, the two levels are additive and transformative approach. While the additive approach emphasize activities that raise self-esteem, increase new experiences, demonstrate scholastic abilities, the transformative approach emphasizes the combination of service and critical social analysis through reflection, where students consider argument “that justify conclusions that conflict with their own predisposition and self-interest” and “from a variety of ideological positions” (Kahne & Westheimer, 1999, p. 37).
Comparing and combining Eyler and Giles’ (1999) categorization with Kahne and Westheimer’s (1999), the outcomes for service-learning classes can be grouped into five domains. The first domain is intellectual development or cognitive development, which includes students’ ability to make meaning of complex situations and to perspective transforming. The second domain is the academic learning, which includes not only acquisition of information and demonstration on examinations, but also the understanding and application of knowledge, with cognitive development implied. The third domain is personal and interpersonal development, which includes self-knowledge and self-efficacy development, tolerance, appreciation for other people, connection with other people, and leadership and communication skills. The fourth domain is moral development, which includes helping people in the community, caring about other people, and moral reasoning. The fifth domain is citizenship development, where the students form perspectives about social issues and take action according to their perspectives.

These domains are not clear-cut or independent. In fact, they are intertwined and influence each other. For example, as indicated previously, Eyler and Giles (1999) have claimed that intellectual, personal and interpersonal development are the basis of citizenship development. Rhoads (1997) also supported the importance of intellectual development to citizenship development. After reporting various achievements of students in terms of their personal, interpersonal development, he mentioned that “for the majority of students in this study who were interviewed formally or informally, connecting their participation in community service to larger social issues was not a
primary concern” (p. 200). He suggested that “to achieve social transformation Freire and others have spoken of takes the development of critical consciousness rooted in a concern for liberation from economic, cultural and political oppression” (p. 200).

In addition, within each domain, it is possible to see a developmental difference. For intellectual domain, it is the stage of cognitive development. For academic learning domain, it is the change from acquisition of knowledge to understanding and application of knowledge to ill-structured problems. For personal and interpersonal domain, it is the change from stereotype of others to tolerance and appreciation of others. For moral domain, it is the change from giving to caring. For citizenship domain, it is the change from charity to social justice both in perspective and action (Eyler & Giles, 1999). All of these domains imply the capacity for complex cognitive development on the part of the students.

Because intellectual and social responsibility developments are the foci of this study, I will now review the literature on studies of intellectual and social responsibility development.

**Impact of Service-Learning on Students’ Cognitive Development**

**Constructs and Assumptions of Cognitive Developmental Theories**

This study assumes, as Rodgers and Widick (1978) have claimed, “student development will be better served if it is based upon formal developmental theories rather than intuitive, implicit assumptions about human development” (cited by Rodgers, 1980, p. 10). Because a major focus of this study is on intellectual
development, the cognitive developmental family of theories will be reviewed along with the theory of Perry (1970/1999) in depth.

The basic assumptions and theoretical constructs underlying the cognitive developmental theories derive from Piaget’s work and have been summarized by Rodgers (1980, 1989, 1991) and Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker (1980).

The basic element of cognitive developmental theories is “structure,” which is “essentially a set of assumptions which act as a filter or set of lenses for defining how an individual will tend to perceive, organize, and evaluate experiences and events,” and “the basic structures of reasoning are called stages” (Rodgers, 1980, p. 14).

Rodgers summarized five characteristics for the construct of stage, they are:

1. Invariant Sequences – Stages are sequential, that is, persons develop through them one at a time and in the same order. No one can skip or jump over stages. Age of attainment of a stage can vary, as can rates of development.
2. Hierarchical – Stages are hierarchical; that is, the structure of each successive stage is more differentiated and integrated and incorporates and integrates the critical aspects of the preceding stages into its more complex mode of reasoning.
3. Universal (maybe) – Some theorists, for example, Kohlberg (1969, 1971), make a case for stages being universal. That is, the same invariant sequence applies to varying cultural conditions. Other theorists such as Perry (1970) do not make this assumption.
4. Qualitatively Different – Stages are qualitatively different as contrast to quantitatively different. That is, successive stages are not “adding more of the same” … but are changes “to a different thing.”
5. “How” not “What” – Stages are structures of “how we think” not “what we think.” (p. 14-15)

As regards to how developmental changes take place, Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker (1980) pointed out that “development is a product of the interaction between the person and the environment. Both a maturity or readiness within the
individual and certain elements in the environment are assumed necessary for growth to occur” (p. 91). The role of environment is emphasized “in creating dissonance or disequilibrium; the individual is confronted by environmental stimuli that cannot be handled by existing constructs, thus pushing him or her to accommodate and alter his or her cognitive structure to admit more complexity” (p. 91). The confrontation between one’s current way of thinking and a different and structurally more complex way of making meaning is the “cognitive conflict” which results the dissonance or disequilibrium. Disequilibrium is the “starting point of developmental change” (Rodgers, 1980, p. 15).

In order to deal with the dissonance or disequilibrium, an individual may assimilate or accommodate to achieve equilibrium. Rodgers (1989) summarized the processes of assimilation and accommodation as follows.

If a person assimilates, the conflict and confusion are handled by forcing the challenge to fit into the person’s current way of making meaning. The current structure is not changed. Instead, conflict and confusion are eliminated by interpreting the challenge in terms of current ways of making meaning and explaining it away. If a person accommodates, the conflict and confusion are resolved by beginning the process of changing the current way of making meaning to accommodate the challenge. Accommodation, therefore, is the name of the process of transition from one stage to a new stage of meaning-making. (p. 130)

Rodgers (1980, 1989) stressed the importance of students’ readiness to receive challenge and the appropriate challenges provided by the environment that will facilitate accommodation rather than assimilation. Based on “the literature on the conditions which seem to help accommodation or structural changes to occur,” Rodgers (1980, 1989) have concluded that four conditions are necessary for a
challenge to be appropriate. The first condition is an affective or involvement element. That is, “if the environmental challenge is about issues that are important to the individual person, accommodation is more likely” (Rodgers, 1989, p. 130). The second condition is the appropriate level of environmental challenge. That is, “if the environmental challenge is presented one stage above a person’s current way of making meaning, accommodation is facilitated” (p. 130-131). In contrast, if the challenge is two or more stages above a person’s level, there is some evidence (Rest, 1968; Rest, Turiel & Kohlberg, 1969) the person will assimilate, not understand, or ignore the challenge. If the challenge is at the same level as or below the person’s stage, then developmental change will not occur. There is no dissonance nor cognitive conflict. (Rodgers, 1980, p. 18)

The third condition is the consistency between the challenges and individual’s personality type. That is, “if challenges are presented in ways consistent with one’s personality type, accommodation is facilitated” (Rodgers, 1989, p. 131). The fourth condition is the prompt and appropriate support after the challenge. That is, “environment challenge will have more impact if they are processed in an atmosphere of support and feedback as soon as possible after the challenge (Blocher, 1978)” (Rodgers, 1989, p. 131). In fact, Rodgers believed that, Many experiences in our lives lose their developmental and learning impact because we do not take the time to reflect on their meaning. Hence, if a student affair staff member is attempting to facilitate cognitive structural development, he or she will try to provide an opportunity for students to process environmental challenges in an atmosphere of support and reflection. (p. 131) Hence, cognitive developmental theory agrees with service-learning literature in that reflection is needed for learning and change.
In summary, affective investment of students, plus one challenge, consistency between challenge and style of learning, and prompt and appropriate support and reflection are the four conditions for accommodation and structural change to occur along the cognitive developmental pathway. In fact, these conditions can be grouped into two aspects: one aspect is about the person, the characteristics of students, their affective investment, their intellectual level, and their learning style; the other aspect is about the environment, the challenge and support from environment. Therefore, in general, the interaction between the person and environment need to be compatible to achieve the appropriate ratio between challenge and support that “falls within an individual’s range of developmental dissonance” (Rodgers, 1991, p. 218).

Rodgers (1980, 1983, 1991) has elaborated on Sanford’s (1963) idea about challenge and support and described three different ratios of challenge and support that will result in different kinds of dissonance. The desired dissonance is called optimal or developmental dissonance, it is where “typically some tension and anxiety exist, therefore, the person is challenged to develop new skills, insights, differentiations, ways of making meaning, and also is supported to deal with difficulties and anxieties created by these experiences” (Rodgers, 1991, p. 218). However, the interaction between person and environment can be “overly challenging,” where

The degree of challenge in the environment compared to support for the person is over-balanced in favor of challenge. As a result, the person’s range of developmental dissonance shrinks and shifts downward. Typically the person polarizes, hardens his/her position, tries to flee the environment, and experiences high levels of tension and anxiety. This challenge to support ratio is not developmental. (p. 218)
Another situation is that the interaction between person and environment may be “overly supportive”, where

The degree of support in the environment compared to challenge is over-balanced in favor of support. As a result, the demands of the environment never challenge the person to develop. Typically, the person in this environment may become complacent or bored and may develop elitist attitudes. This challenge-support ratio is not developmental either. (p. 220)

These considerations are very important for instructors in designing courses and programs in order to advance students’ cognitive development. Depending on which kind of cognitive development is desired to be enhanced, the specific challenges and supports will be different. Some researchers and practitioners have developed model based on particular theories and applied the model to practice (e.g., Schmidt & Davison, 1983; Touchton, Wertheimer, Cornfeld, & Harrison, 1978; Widick, Knefelkamp, & Parker, 1975; Widick & Simpson, 1978). These will be reviewed after the review of the representative cognitive developmental theories in this family.

**Perry’s Developmental Scheme**

Perry (1970/1999) and his associates formulated a developmental scheme of college students’ intellectual development based on their studies of college students in 1950’s and 1960’s. The scheme has nine positions or stages of intellectual development, “the first five of which are considered to be cognitive-structural and the last four of which are considered to be existential and psychosocial (Rodgers, 1980; Brouhghton, 1975; King, 1982)” (Rodgers, 1989, p. 142). Although Perry (1970/1999) did not specify that the last four positions were not cognitive-structural, he did
acknowledge that “the development may be conceived in two major parts centering on
Position 5,” and his explanation was as follows.

The outlook of Position 5 is that in which a person perceives man’s knowledge
and values as relative, contingent, and contextual. The sequence of structures
preceding this Position describes a person’s development from a dualistic
absolutism and toward this acceptance of generalized relativism. The sequence
following this Position describes a person’s subsequent development in
orienting himself in a relativistic world through the activity of personal
Commitment. (p. 64)

The labels and descriptions that Perry (1970/1999) has given to each of the
positions are as follows.

Position 1 – Basic Duality. The student sees the world in polar terms of we-
right-good vs. other-wrong-bad. Right Answers for everything exist in the
Absolute, known to Authority whose role is to mediate (teach) them.
Knowledge and goodness are perceived as quantitative accretions of discrete
rightness to be collected by hard work and obedience (paradigm: a spelling
test).

Position 2 – Multiplicity Pre-Legitimate: The student perceives
diversity of opinion, and uncertainty, and accounts for them as unwarranted
confusion in poorly qualified Authorities or as mere exercises set by Authority
“so we can learn to find The Answer for ourselves.”

Position 3 – Multiplicity Subordinate: The students accept diversity and
uncertainty as legitimate but still temporary in areas where Authority “hasn’t
found The Answer yet.” He supposes that Authority grades a student based
upon “good expression” but remains puzzled as to standards.

Position 4 (a) – Multiplicity Correlate: The student perceives legitimate
uncertainty (and therefore diversity of opinion) to be extensive and raises it to
the status of an unstructured epistemological realm of its own in which: anyone
has a right to his own opinion. This relativistic view is set over against
Authority’s realm where right-wrong still prevails, or (b) Relativism
Subordinate: the student discovers qualitative contextual reasoning as a special
case of “what They want” within Authority’s realm.

Position 5 – Relativism: The student perceives all knowledge and
values (including authority’s) as contextual and relativistic and subordinates
dualistic right-wrong function to the status of a special case, in context.

Position 6 – Commitment Foreseen: The student apprehends the
necessity of orienting himself in a relativistic world through some form of
personal Commitment (as distinct from unquestioned or unconsidered
commitment to simple belief in certainty).
Position 7 – Initial Commitment: The student makes an initial Commitment in some area.

Position 8 – Orientation in Implications of Commitment: The student experiences the implications of Commitment, and explores the subjective and stylistic issues of responsibility.

Position 9 – Developing Commitment: The student experiences the affirmation of identity among multiple responsibilities and realizes Commitment as an on-going, unfolding activity through which he expresses his life style. (p. 11)

As indicated above, the cognitive positions of the scheme stop at position 5. Positions 6, 7, 8, and 9 describe the use of position 5 reasoning to make commitment in some content area, for example, to social justice. According to Perry (1970/1999), these nine positions “may be seen in three parts each consisting of three Positions,” and his explanations were as follows,

In Positions 1, 2, and 3, a person modifies an absolutistic right-wrong outlook to make room, in some minimal way, for that simple pluralism we have called Multiplicity. In Position 4, 5, and 6, a person accords the diversity of human outlook its full problematic stature, next transmutes the simple pluralism of Multiplicity into contextual Relativism, and then comes to foresee the necessity of personal Commitment in a relativistic world. Positions 7, 8, 9 then trace the development of Commitments in the person’s actual experience. (p. 65)

Rodgers (1980) has called the Position 1, 2, and 3 as Dualism, and Position 4 and 5 as Relativism. He believed that “the three positions within dualism are differentiated based upon how one accounts for uncertainty,” that is, the uncertainty is either not sensed, or accounted as “error committed by a ‘wrong’ authority,” or “experts do not know the answers yet” (p. 31). And the positions in Relativism are differentiated by “absence of criteria for making judgments,” “the use of discriminating but non-absolute criteria for making judgment in context,” and “the application of non-absolute criteria to questions of personal identity” (p. 31-32).
Although Perry’s scheme was developed based on studies of Harvard students of the late 50s and early 60s, many studies have been done based on Perry’s scheme since then. “Careful records have been kept that indicate that the model is useful with a wide range of diverse students. Its efficacy remains strong” (Knefelkamp, in Perry, 1970/1999, p. xv-xvi).

**Application of Perry’s Theory to Practice**

Efforts have been made to apply the cognitive developmental theories to practice in order to design appropriate environment for students at different stages to develop. These efforts have been based on the notion of person-environment interaction and creation of optimal and developmental dissonance discussed earlier. Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker (1975) and Widick & Simpson (1978) were the first to use Perry’s scheme to design a course and test the effect of the intentional design of the course. They followed Rest’s (1973) suggestion that “for developmental psychology to be a useful guide in educational programming it may be important to differentiate specific stage characteristics and provide a particular curriculum designed to match or include growth for a particular stage” (cited by Widick et al., 1975, p. 290).

Because both dualistic and relativistic students were present in their course, they set out to design different approaches to “provide sufficient challenge and support for students to attain outcomes of development and knowledge acquisition” (p. 291).

For dualistic students, “development involved increased cognitive complexity, particularly the capacity to view alternate explanations of an event as legitimate;” therefore, students need to be challenged by letting them “observe models of
relativistic reasoning; engage in activities in which they were able to adopt alternative points of view; and use concepts, theories, and examples in a variety of ways” (Widick, Knefelkamp, & Parker, 1975, p. 291). The strategies Widick et al. chose to challenge dualistic students were “(a) diversity of viewpoint in the course content and instructional methods and (b) experiential learning models” (p. 291). To present diversity of viewpoints, they selected books that had conflicting or paradoxical themes within or between books, and they also encouraged students in classroom to “identify divergent viewpoints among writers, students, and instructors” as well as paired students with different viewpoints to discuss their differences (p. 292). The experiential learning is important to dualistic students, because they have difficulty to deal with a situation in the abstract, and concrete experience will expose them to the relativistic world which will challenge them. The instructor assigned student to do role playing or interact with people in real world to give them personal experience. And students were always “confronted with the task of making sense out of certain … issues [involved in the experience and related to the course content],” and “in all experiential learning, reflection and discussion in class and through journal were central activities” (p. 292).

The supports that Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker (1975) gave to their dualistic students were “moderate degree of structure and a personal atmosphere in the classroom” (p. 292). The moderate degree of structure is needed because “dualistic students usually have definite expectations centering on the teacher’s role as an authority or expert” (p. 292). Hence, for dualistic students, “the instructor took full
responsibility for planning the class; moreover, expectations about performance requirements were conveyed consistently and in specific terms through handouts, study guides, and the provision of guidelines and due dates for papers and assignments” (Widick & Simpson, 1978, p. 39). A personal atmosphere in the classroom was set up for students because Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker (1975) believed that this environment “could allow [students] to test out their perceptions, be challenged without loss of face, and be able to risk trying out new ideas in the program,” and they continuously used activities “which build trust by self-disclosure” (p. 293).

For the relativistic students, the challenges and supports needed for development are different from dualistic students. Based on Perry’s nine position scheme, Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker (1975) used “intellectual and personal commitment” as the goal of development for relativistic students; therefore, they emphasized the importance to challenge students to make commitment. However, since the last four positions of Perry’s scheme has been regarded as psychosocial development rather than intellectual development, Schmidt & Davison (1983) and Rodgers (1989) have refined the model to reflect the intellectual development part of Perry’s scheme. According to Rodgers (1989), the challenges for relativistic students would be to “encounter two, three or more points of view on the topic under consideration,” and “use abstract or experiential learning when encountering these points of view;” and the supports are to let “student structure their own learning, with
authorities providing little structure and extensive freedom,” and to “build and maintain a personal atmosphere of collegiality in the environment” (p. 147).

Several studies have tested the effects of using above criteria in course designs (Touchton, Wertheimer, Cornfeld, & Harrison, 1978; Widick, Knefelkamp, & Parker, 1975; Widick & Simpson, 1978) many others have used it to redesign courses or programs (for example, Knefelkamp & Slepitza, 1976; Knefelkamp, Widick, & Stoad, 1978). Please refer to Rodgers (1989) for an extensive list. It has been shown that deliberately designed courses that match students’ intellectual developmental level have positive effect on students’ development. Widick et al. (1975) reported their results of their first attempt in using the model described above to a course that was focused on nature of identity and with literature and psychology as subject matter. The four units used to address the need of freshmen population who took the course was: “identity as reflected through significant others, identity as reflected in the individual’s relationship to society, identity as reflected in career, and identity as expressed in one’s purpose for existence” (p. 290). In order to give more information “about the individual’s movement along developmental lines,” they used two digits to indicate a person’s stage (p. 294). For example, “(3), 4” indicates that a majority of responses are rated at the four level with the remainder at the three” (p. 293). They found that from their ratings, “four arbitrary groups of student stages, which seem logically consistent with the Perry model emerges: dualistic [stages 1,1 to 3, (4]]; multiplicity-transition [stages (3), 4 and 4,4]; relativist [stages 4, (5) to 6,6]; and committed [stages 6, (7) to 9,9]” (p. 294). They also found that
The curriculum intervention caused movement upward along the developmental scale. In the pre-assessment (N=31), 32 percent of the sample were dualists; 48 percent maintained multiplicity; 20 percent were relativists; and none were committed. In the post-assessment (N=31), 3 percent were dualist; 29 percent maintained multiplicity; 68 percent were relativists; and none were committed. (p. 294)

However, in addition to different responses from students at different stages, the authors noticed that “the students responded to the four identity-theme units of the class in very different ways. Certain identity issues are in the foreground during the freshman years, whereas others have not yet become crucial” (p. 295). Especially, the authors were surprised to notice that “the students were not involved with the questions raised in the self and society unit. Almost all of them approached the concept of society in a dualistic manner: society was viewed as an impersonal ‘they’ that threatened the individual” (p. 295). The authors speculated that this was “contrary to, or perhaps as a result of, the experiences of the 60s” (p. 295).

Widick and Simpson (1978) reported the results of two studies on courses that used different developmental approaches. In one study, two kinds of treatments were given, one is dualist treatment, and the other is relativist treatment. At the pre-assessment before the treatments, students ranged from dualist to multiplicity to relativist under both treatments, while most students were rated as multiplicity, only a few were rated as dualist or relativist. From the post-assessment, stage change occurred in general, and “the greatest changes occurred in individuals rated at the strict dualistic positions” (p. 41). In contrast, the “movement in individuals at higher stages was less,” and it may be because “the college classroom may be too restricted an environment to have a major impact on life commitment” (p. 42).
In another study reported by Widick and Simpson (1978), three recitation sessions for a history course were used, with one session designed using the principles for dualistic students, and the other two sessions not. From students’ rating of the three sessions, it was clear that the experimental session was rated much higher than other two comparison sessions in following areas:

1. The instructor presented more than one view on the same issue.
2. The instructor presented material which helped you understand what it was like to live at the time.
3. The instructor seemed to be concerned with you as an individual.
4. I found material discussed in section was relatable to my own life.
5. I found the discussion section to be enjoyable. (p. 53).

In addition, the experimental session was rated as well structured as the other two comparison sessions. These student ratings showed that the design and implementation of the experimental session satisfied the principles for dualist students, which are diversity, experiential learning, high structure, and personal environment. The results of the pre-assessment and post-assessment of students’ developmental stages showed that while “all three sessions had students who gave evidence of increased complexity in their reasoning about values and knowledge,” the treatment session had the greatest number of individuals showing stage movement: “63 percent as compared to 57 percent in section 2 and 40 percent for section 3” (p. 54). However, section 2, one of the comparison section, “had individual students showing greatest amount of change,” and the author concluded that it might be due to the fact that the “history instructor who taught in the treatment section also taught section 2; analysis of classroom tapes indicated that he increasingly used ‘treatment’ methods in section 2 as the quarter progressed” (p. 54).
Knefelkamp and Sleptiza (1976) has adapted Perry’s developmental scheme into the content of career development. Their model has nine stages, and for each stage, nine “variables of qualitative changes” can be used to describe a student’s development in their view of “career, career counseling, and career decision making,” and these variables are: “(a) locus of control; (b) analysis; (c) synthesis; (d) semantic structure; (e) self-processing; (f) openness to alternative perspectives; (g) ability to assume responsibility; (h) ability of take on new roles; (i) ability to take risks with self” (p. 54). Based on a pilot study, they found students in a different class rank had different developmental stages and view issues related to career differently. The predominate stages for different class rank are as follows: stages 2 or 3 for university freshman and sophomores; stages 3, 4, or 5 for university seniors and first year masters students in educational psychology; and stages 6, 7 for advanced graduate students in educational psychology.

Touchton, Wertheimer, Cornfeld, and Harrison (1978) developed a course on career development based on Knefelkamp and Sleptiza’s (1976) model on career development. Three kinds of courses were offered to students most of whom were at dualists. The experimental group took the course designed using the career developmental model and “taught developmentally by instructor specially trained in developmental instruction;” the traditional group was “taught in traditional method by instructors having no knowledge of developmental instruction;” and the mixed group were “taught in traditional method by instructors knowledgeable about developmental theory and developmental design” (Touchton et al., 1978, p. 157). The pretest and
posttest of students’ developmental stages showed positive effect of developmental instruction: “in the developmentally taught experimental sections, 76 percent of the students showed some increase in complexity of thinking about careers, …; in the traditional sections, 41 percent of the students showed similar growth; and in the mixed section, the comparable figure was 65 percent” (p. 163). From another aspect, from pretest to posttest, in the experimental group, the percentage of dualist dropped from 71% to 21%, in the traditional group, the percentage kept the same at 47%; in the mixed group, the percentage dropped from 65% to 24%. These results supported the effects of developmental instruction.

**Impact of Service-learning on Students’ Intellectual Development**

Student intellectual development has been a focus of outcome studies on service-learning courses. Some studies found evidence of significant cognitive development, that is, service-learning can improve students’ development of higher order and complex thinking (Batchelder & Root, 1994; Osborne, Hammerich, & Hensley, 1998) and enhance students’ complex problem solving ability (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Eyler, Root, & Giles, 1998). These researchers developed or used different instruments to measure students’ complex thinking and problem solving ability. Among these were Responses to Situations (Batchelder & Root, 1994), Problem Analysis Interview (Eyler & Giles, 1999, based on King and Kitchener’s (1994) Reflective Judgement Model), and Cognitive Complexity Scale (Osborne et al., 1998).

Batchelder and Root (1994) found that the instrument used by previous studies on cognitive outcome did not “seem to capture all of the dimensions of complex
thinking that experts suggest are influenced by service-learning” (p. 343). Therefore, Batchelder and Root (1994) developed Responses to Situations (RS) to examine the effects of service-learning on students’ development of higher order and complex thinking. They compared service-learning students (n=48) with non-service-learning students (n=48) from courses which have similar content and taught by the same teachers. In addition, students’ pre-service-learning standing on each dependent measure was controlled statistically by the use of hierarchical multiple regression procedure.

The Response to Situations asked students to write for 30 minutes about how they would respond to two problem situations described on the instrument. One of the problem situations was related to their course, and the other was not. These situations cast the students in the role of a public authority asked to deal with a certain social issues. The responses of the students were scored on 8 dimensions constructed to reflect the higher-order, complex thinking: Complexity, Multidimensionality, Obstacles, Coping, Differentiation, Uses of differentiation, Uncertainty/Resolve, and Information-gathering. The analysis of students’ response to RS showed significant effect of service-learning on students’ complex cognitive variables, including a greater resolve to act in the face of acknowledged uncertainty (Uncertainty/Resolve), a psychosocial rather than cognitive outcome, and a greater awareness of the multiple dimensions and variability involved in dealing with social problems (Multidimensionality). These results suggested that “some of the complex cognitive variables described in the theoretical and anecdotal literature are affected in
measurable ways by service-learning” (Batchelder & Root, 1994, p. 352). Their measure is a face validity and not yet a established measure of cognitive development. As such, the results may or may not be valid.

In addition, Batchelder and Root (1994) also analyzed service-learning students’ journal entries for pro-social decision making, level of pro-social decision making, occupational identity development according to their scoring scheme. These, again, may be psychosocial not cognitive issues. Using t-test to compare students’ earlier journal entries and later journal entries, the author found significant increase on each dimension. However, the limitation for this result was that the control group did not keep journal entries, and there was no comparison made between the treatment group and control group.

Eyler, Root, and Giles (1998) also conducted a study to explore whether there was difference in complex problem solving ability between students that were highly involved in community service and service-learning (Expert) and those who were not (Novice). They interviewed 24 students from four institutions. Three students were not participating in service, seven were beginners or novice and seven were benchmark students who had been involved in extensive service and were leaders in community service. All seven students were involved in community service and a course-based service-learning program. The students in the first two groups were regarded as community service “Novice”, and students in the last two groups were considered community service “Experts.” In interviews, students were asked to “identify and analyze causes of a social problem that related to their community service and to
propose both a society-wide solution and a plan for individual action regarding the problem” (p. 92). Based on the literature of expertise/novice perspective of analyzing performance and skills, the authors analyzed students’ response for “dimensions along which problem-solving response of novice and experts students differed” (p. 92). Four dimensions differentiated novice and expert student responses to questions about community problems: (1) how elaborate the representations of community problems were and whether or not the problem was represented in historical terms; (2) attribution of the problems’ source/locus; (3) inclusiveness and depth of solution; (4) sophistication of procedural knowledge. Based on their findings, Eyler, Root, and Giles (1998) concluded, “service-learning is a pedagogy that exposes student to types of learning experiences that can foster the acquisition of more usable cognitive skills than does traditional classroom instruction” (p. 97).

Encouraged by the results from the above study, Eyler and Giles (1999) devised an interview protocol and conducted interviews with 57 students in six colleges or university at the beginning and end of the semester. The interviews were transcribed and scored by who was not involved in the planning or data collection process. They controlled for age, previous service, gender, and the pretest scores and found the following:

The involvement in what we called integrated service-learning—courses where the service experience was integral to the day-to-day activities of the course and where there was frequent reflection linking the two—was a significant predictor of the quality of problem analyses at the end of the semester compared with service that was more loosely connected to the class or with the analyses of students not engaged in service-learning. (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 74)
The quality of problem analyses was composed of Causal Complexity, Solution Complexity, Knowledge Application, and Personal Political Strategy. The first two could be cognitive; the second two are more questionable. The ability to understand and apply knowledge, as well as the ability to solve problems are valued and used to define academic learning by these authors. Given this definition, integrated service-learning experiences may have enhanced academic learning.

Osborne, Hammerich, and Hensley (1998) also found support for the effectiveness of service-learning experience on students’ complexity of thinking and writing. Four sections of a pharmacy communications class were randomly assigned to service-learning conditions or non-service-learning conditions. There were 93 students in the class and 92 of them attended the study, among which 48 students were in service-learning condition, and 44 students were in non-service-learning condition. The Cognitive Complexity Scale was used to assess “the degree to which a person feels he or she seeks out multiple explanations for the behavior of others” (p. 7). In addition, students’ written assignment work were rated by two naïve raters using a written protocol for defining the desired characteristics of written assignment: (1) complexity of communication, (2) integration of practical examples into communications, (3) sensitivity of communications, and (4) an awareness of diversity. The agreement of the two raters for each characteristic ranged from 89% to 95% based on 20 randomly selected evaluation of students’ written work.

The analyses of the responses for the Cognitive Complexity Scale found that the service-learning students showed significant positive improvement in comparison
to the non-service-learning students. While there was no significant difference between the two groups at pretest, there was significant difference between the two groups at the posttest at 0.01 level. The analysis of written assignment work also showed that although there was no difference at pretest, there was significant difference between two groups at posttest. For three of the four desired characteristics of writing skills, service-learning students scored significantly higher than non-service-learning students, all at 0.0001 level, and the only one left out was the complexity of communication. In conclusion, Osborne, Hammerich, and Hensley’s (1998) study provided evidence that is beyond students self-reports of the influence of service-learning experience on their academic learning and cognitive development.

In summary, these studies have provided some evidence that service-learning experiences are effective in helping students develop ability of understanding and application of knowledge, complexity of problem solving, complexity of thinking and writing. The main limitation of these studies is the use of ad hoc, face validity measures.

**Impact of Social Justice Education on Intellectual Development**

Adams and Zhou (1990, 1994) have also applied cognitive developmental theories to the design of a social justice education course and studied the effects of the course on students’ intellectual development. Because the course in their studies was a course of social diversity education and social justice education, the content of the course and a social justice emphasis are similar to some service-learning courses in this study.
The course studied by Adams and Zhou (1990) was developed to address the intergroup stresses among students “who bring their preconceived stereotypes, assumptions and beliefs to campus from their home communities” (p. 1). It was first developed for undergraduate Resident Assistants, and then became available to general student population on campus as an option for the diversity core of GEC. The goal of the course was for students to “unlearn their stereotypes and prejudiced attitudes, try on different cultural perspectives and develop strategies to intervene in harassing and discriminatory behaviors” (p. 2). Integrating cognitive development with the experiential aspects of social learning, the course content consisted of “social and cultural identity, social diversity and societal manifestations of oppression in the areas of gender, race, religion, sexual orientation, and physical/mental disability” (p. 3). The explicit learning objectives for the course were as follows:

1. **Awareness** of one’s own cultural values and perspectives and those of other social groups.
2. **Information** about the history, cultural values and social context of various social groups including one’s own.
3. **Understanding** of the principles of socialization and the dynamics of social oppression.
4. **Recognition** of real-world situations embodying differing social and cultural perspectives or manifesting social oppression.
5. **Interventions**, seen as skills on a continuum from non-collusion in socially insensitive situations to actions which educate others or transform oppressive situations. (p. 3)

Adams and Zhou (1994) believed that social justice classes involved students in emotional domain and cognitive or intellectual domain. Because students in these courses were asked to “relinquish outmoded and less complex thinking modes and to question inappropriate and stereotypic beliefs and attitudes” (p. 3), they experienced
periods of disequilibrium. Therefore, Adams and Zhou found that the social justice education and intellectual development had a very dynamic relationship. On the one hand, intellectual development depicted by Perry’s scheme was helpful in explaining “students’ initial resistance to multiple perspectives,” and “discomfort in the absence of certainties in social justice problem solving” (p. 10). As indicated previously, some Perry 4 or relativism may be needed for students to be comfortable and learn in social justice classes. On the other hand, Adams and Zhou also have seen the potential of social justice education in facilitating students’ intellectual development. Students were asked to “give up clear-cut societally-endorsed beliefs and stereotypes on complex issues of race, gender or sexual orientation,” (p. 3) and they were invited to become more complex in their thinking about these issues. In order to achieve this potential, their course design followed the principles of developmental instruction based on Perry’s Scheme and developed by Knefelkamp (1978) and Widick (1974) as reviewed earlier. These principles emphasize the balance between challenges and support that students at different intellectual level may need also as discussed in previous sessions. Because most of the students in the course were at multiplicity (position 3) level, the course design targeted position 3 students with moderate attention to position 2 and 4, and incorporated “experience-based learning” and balanced “challenges to student assumptions and established perspectives with support through peer affiliation and structured interactions” (Adams & Zhou, 1990, p. 9).

As part of a long-range exploratory study of the course effects, Adams and Zhou (1990, 1994) reported their results of the social justice classes on students’
intellectual development, moral development, attitudes toward homophobia, and learning styles. Expected results were found for every domain except for learning style. For the purpose of this study, results on intellectual development will be reviewed in detail. In their studies, they used MER to measure intellectual development.

Adams and Zhou (1990) described their 1988-1989 study of 219 undergraduates. One of the purposes of their study was to see whether students with application of learning to real-world in mind (Resident Assistants) had different outcomes from those who just took the course without intention of application (general student population). Three cohorts took the course: Cohort 1 consists of Resident Assistants, with nine months between the pretest and posttest; Cohort 2 consists of general student population, with three months between the pretest and posttest; and Cohort 3 again consists of Resident Assistance, but the time elapse between pretest and posttest is the same as Cohort 2. According to their experience, Adams and Zhou felt that domain 4 (Role of peer) and domain 6 (Nature of knowledge) were the most relevant to this course, hence they conducted separate analysis for these two domains. The results of MER showed that most of the students were at stage 3 (Multiplicity) at the pretest. At the posttest, all three samples showed modest increases in mean scores for Domain 4 and Domain 6, but the overall position scores decreased a little bit for Cohort 1, and increased for Cohort 2 and 3. For Cohort 2, the TPR mean score changed from 2.91 (N=67, SD=0.60) to 3.16 (N=62, SD=0.34); for Cohort 3, the TRP mean score changed from 3.11 (N=24, SD=0.34) to 3.33 (N=17, SD=0.32).
Percentage of students at each position at pretest and posttest were reported, but no paired t-test was performed to see whether the changes were statistically significant.

In another study, Adams and Zhou (1994) collected information on 165 undergraduates, who were either in Group 1, Resident Assistance, or Group 2, general student population. Similar analyses were used as in their study in 1994. The MER TPR mean scores for Group 1 (N=68) changed from pretest 2.84 (SD=0.32) to posttest 3.09 (SD=0.34); the TPR mean scores for Group 2 (N=97) changed from pretest 2.91 (SD=0.33) to posttest 3.22 (SD=0.36). They used t-test to analyze the MER pretest and posttest of the whole sample and found statistically significant course effects for the MER TPR (t=5.66, p<0.001). Therefore, it has been shown that social justice education with developmental instruction has moved students from dualism to relativism.

**Impact of Service-Learning on Students’ Social Responsibility Development**

**Different Kinds of Citizenship/Social Responsibility**

Because America is said to be a democratic society, citizenship education is also sometimes called democratic civic education. However, as Rhoads (1997) have pointed out, different visions of democratic society will end up different meanings of citizen and citizenship. This is why theorists and practitioners of citizenship education often find that

As long as we remain at the level of rhetoric we can get most educators to agree that teaching how to be a good citizen is important. But when we get
specific about what democracy requires and about what kind of school curricula will best promote it, much of that consensus falls away. (Westheimer & Kahne, 2003, p.2)

According to Mendal-Reyes (1998), the original meaning of “democracy” is “the rule of the people” and “from the perspective of citizenship, the main issue is ‘participatory’ versus ‘representative’ democracy” (p. 33). The “participatory” democracy is also called direct democracy where “the people rule themselves literally by making decisions concerning their collective lives” (p.33). This model is like a town meeting where everyone actively participates and votes. On the other hand, the “representative” democracy is also called indirect because the people select those who will be given positions of power. Mendal-Reyes (1998) believes that the representative model has more passive roles for citizens and citizenship education is more relevant for the potential representatives than the citizens. He continues: “although some form of representation seems inevitable in today’s large nations, most theorists of representative democracy neglect the critical question of how uneducated citizens can be expected to elect their leaders wisely and hold them accountable” (p. 33). Further, Mendal-Reyes claims that “American political history can be viewed as a struggle between these two models of democracy and corresponding approaches to citizenship and to citizen education” (p. 33).

Westheimer and Kahne (2003) have made efforts to group the different perspectives into three kinds of citizenships. The first kind is called “personally responsible citizen,” the second kind is called “the participatory citizen,” and the third kind is called “justice-oriented citizen” (p. 3). A personally responsible citizen may
donate food to needy people, the participatory citizen may organize a food drive, and a justice-oriented citizen will ask the critical question about the cause of the hungry and act based on the answers. This spectrum of citizenship is logically compatible with Delve, Mintz, and Stewart’s (1990) spectrum of the development of social responsibility. Different service-learning programs may have different emphasis on the kind of citizen they foster. A justice-orientation is political; the other two are more private and personal.

Some people propose that justice-orientation and political action should be the goal of community-service-learning programs (Barber, 1994; Berman, 1997; Kahne & Westheimer, 1999; O’Grady, 2000; Reardon, 1994; Seigel & Rockwood, 1993; Sleeter, 1996). Others believe that political action should not be the goal for service-learning, and they focus more on the development of personal responsibility, which is indeed the private part of citizenship. Still others avoid the concept of citizenship altogether and talk only about the goal of personal and interpersonal development (Boyte, 1991; Cohen, 1994; Conrad & Hedin, 1991; Marotta & Nashman, 1998; Schine, 1990; Serow, 1991; Serow, Ciechalski & Daye, 1990; Smith, 1994).

**Political definition of Citizenship and Desired Outcomes**

Kennedy (1991) believes that students who participate in service-learning will have or will develop a sense of social responsibility, that is, the responsibility to help others in the community and “give something back to America in return for all it has given us” (Kennedy, 1991, p. 772). However, some theorists are concerned about the narrowness of this “help others” conception of citizenship. Berman (1997), for
example, call this a narrow definition because it “focuses primarily on being a good person rather than being actively engaged in the political process, on protecting self-interest rather than promoting the common good, and on the individual as the locus of responsibility rather than institutional, systemic, or structural aspects of our political culture” (Berman, 1997, p. 174).

Kahne and Westheimer (1999) also believe that “citizenship in a democratic community requires more than kindness and decency; it requires engagement in complex social and institutional endeavors,” and it “requires that individuals work to create, evaluate, criticize, and change public institutions and programs” (p. 34). To them, there are two kinds of citizenship as previously mentioned, one that makes political change, and the other that values charity. The citizenship for change is to participate in political action and provide solution to structural problems. Citizenship for charity emphasizes the importance of altruism and the joy that come from giving to others. Charity also may be political in that conservatives may use this definition to help government out of social problems to maintain the status quo. “Social responsibility” or “civic duty” may be used by both groups in describing “citizenship.” Some mean personal responsibility and others mean social and political action.

To social justice service-learning educators, it is important that the students not only get firsthand knowledge of the community they served, but also get a “deeper understanding of the social, economic and political dynamics that contribute to increasing levels of social inequality” (Reardon, 1994, p. 52). They also think that there will be harmful result if the students do not get adequate opportunity to reflect on
social issues in their experiences because the students could embrace stereotypes without such reflection. Hence, if social justice emphases are left out of service-learning classes, this kind of education can too easily reinforce oppressive outcomes, especially for people of color (O’Grady, 2000).

Social justice education emerged from the civil rights movements of the 1960s with social justice as a moral and political goal, whether focused on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation or class. It increasingly emphasized “the role of oppression and social power play in perpetuating inequitable social arrangement” (O’Grady, 2000, p. 3). Hence, a social justice oriented service-learning class will focus on important differences in perspective and dialog between the server and the served. Sleeter (1996) hopes that such conversations and awareness lead to a shared action project leading to a more just community.

Barber (1994) agrees. Barber advocates education for social responsibility and political action. In order to foster students’ political responsibility, Barber suggests that the course content of service-learning program should focus on “ethnicity, religion, race, class, gender and sexual orientation in a community” (p. 91). Therefore, to Barber, citizenship is a political phenomenon and service-learning is a way to foster political citizenship and not charity. Barber wants service-learning to result in political sensitivity, political responsibility, and political action.

Seigle and Rockwood (1993) believe that development of social responsibility is based on the ability of the students’ critical thinking to examine complex social issues. Therefore, if instructors help students connect understanding of complex social
issues to their service involvement then the instructor will facilitate the development of the critical thinking abilities necessary to understand the controversial issues. In this study, I examined the question of whether service-learning classes in general and social justice classes in particular best foster complexity in thinking. Seigle and Rockwood also believe that “if these connections are undeveloped, students may misinterpret their experiences” (p. 65). For example, without complex thinking ability, service-learning may reinforce their negative assumptions about homeless individuals or the elderly. If students are not provided with an adequate background that helps them understand the issues leading to poverty and homelessness and if their complexity of thinking is dualistic, then negative stereotypes may result. The ability to think critically and complexly involves “an acknowledgement of the problematic and conditional perspectives found in an uncertain world,” and recognition of multiple ways of perceiving issues, solving problems, and answer questions which are all sensitive to context (p. 67). In terms of intellectual development as defined by the Perry scheme (1970), this definition means that students must have achieved at least some position 4 ability.

Other educators (Kahne & Westheimer, 1999; Martin & Wheeler, 2000; Maybach, 1996; Rice & Pollack, 2000; Wade, 2000) also strongly support the social justice perspective to service learning instead of the charity perspective. Maybach says, “service and giving must respond not only to the short-term needs of survival, as important as they are. Service and giving must also respond in a way that actually works to remove the barriers that keep these individuals in the margins of society” (p.
This is not an easy task to fulfill, however, as Wade emphasizes the difficulty by stating that most service-learning projects do not make difference in “the societal structures that lead to so much inequity in our country” (p. 97). Kahne and Westheimer also agree that “much of the current of service learning emphasize charity not change” (p. 28).

California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB) has taken on the social justice approach in their service-learning programs (Rice & Pollack, 2000; Martin & Wheeler, 2000). Their service leaning class requires students to “provide service to the community while examining issues related to multiculturalism and diversity, social power, privilege, and oppression” (Rice & Pollack, 2000, p. 116). Their hope is that if students are aware of the oppression and injustice in the lives of the people they serve, then they can consciously choose whether to work to end racism, classism, or sexism from an informed position.

To sum up, the social justice approach to service-learning education emphasizes the awareness of the existence of social justice issues, understanding of the root causes of social injustice or oppression, knowledge of how to address social justice issues, willingness to initiate or engage in efforts to change the social situation, and the cognitive complexity to reflect on multiple perspectives in subtle ways.

**Personal Definition of Citizenship and Outcomes**

There are also theorists who disagree with a political approach to citizenship education and service-learning. Conrad and Hedin (1991) explicitly divide advocates of community service into those who stress the “reform of youth” and those who stress
the “reform of education” (p. 745). In their opinion, the former refers to reform to promote social action, while the latter refers to reform to promote the personal, social, and intellectual development of students. Here they differentiate the role of citizen in their social life and personal life, and indicate the school-based community-service should be concerned more with personal development than social action.

Schine (1990) also rejects social justice goal and talks about the benefits of self-esteem and “a sense of accomplishment,” and career exploration. He says, “community service provides opportunities for career exploration and for learning the attitudes and behaviors of the world of work” (p. 6).

Boyte (1991) does not believe “that community service prepares a self-centered generation for citizenship,” although he acknowledges that “service involvement can produce a number of desirable educational outcomes: connection with other cultures, experiential learning, personal growth” (p. 766). He thinks the service does “little to connect students’ everyday life with the political process” or to teach students “the political skills,” which are the central parts of citizenship (p. 766). This is a criticism of class designs and outcomes and Boyte does not think service-learning has delivered on social justice outcomes. It is not a value position against social justice. This study will provide some evidence in Boyte’s criticism by comparing outcomes on both kinds of class design.

Boyte (1991) also finds that many young people who give service are only interested in the service as alternative to politics. These volunteers find that “service
meets their needs for personal relevance and a sense of membership in a community,”
but they “disavow concern with large policy questions” (p. 766).

Similar to Boyte (1991), Smith (1994) have found that there is discrepancy
between the values of national level service-learning theorists and policy maker and
the real perception of institutional organizers and student participants. While “the
theme of civic responsibility/civic participation/citizenship is the most frequently
articulated intended outcome by national policymakers,” students, faculty, and staff do
not share these values (p. 42). They regard civic responsibility and social justice as
political rhetoric and they remove it from purpose of community service. They
advocate improving personal connection, moral development or personal faith and
duty.

Studies of the motivation of volunteers (Marotta & Nashman, 1998; Serow,
1991; Serow, Ciechalski & Daye, 1990) indicate that personal aims motivate student
volunteers rather than social concerns. Helping others is viewed as a personal
competence just the same as the other competences, such as gaining good grades and
attending club activities (Serow, 1991; Serow, Ciechalski & Daye, 1990).

On the other hand, compared with 1980’s college student volunteers, Marotta
and Nashman (1998) found that the motivation of generation X is different. The
motivation of 1980s generation is more self-centered than generation X. The
motivation of X generation is more altruistic, which includes “concern for others less
fortune and an inner sense of charity toward others” (Marotta, & Nashman, 1998, p.
19). Similar to Serow (1991) and Serow, Ciechalski and Daye’s (1990) findings, both
generations do not regard social change as the purpose of community service. Hence, studies of the motivation of service participants indicate a discrepancy with many service-learning theorists; social justice is rejected by participant in favor of personal development goals. Nevertheless, many studies do indicate that service-learning experiences seem to influence the development of social responsibility and sometime for social change. I will now examine this literature.

Among these studies, some used an instrument that were based on Delve, Mintz, and Stewart’s (1990) Service Learning Model (Johnson & Bozeman, 1998; Kollross, 1997; Olney & Grande, 1995; Payne, 2000); others used an instrument based on Markus, Howard, and King’s (1993) study on students’ personal and social beliefs and values (Giles & Elyer, 1994; Hudson, 1996; Kendrick, 1996). There were also some studies based on self-developed instruments (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Myers-Lipton, 1998).

**Studies Based on Delve, Mintz, and Stewart’s Model**

Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) developed a Service Learning Model to map the outcomes of service-learning from external rewards to internal commitment to social change. The model depicted five phases for social responsibility development: Exploration, Clarification, Realization, Activation, and Internalization. These are discussed in detail in Chapter 1. Moving along these phases, the model assumes that students who are involved in the service activities will change from self-oriented to other-oriented, and begin to gain the sense of social responsibility not only in terms of helping others in need, but also in terms of changing social structure. In order to
measure students’ development along the phases in the Service Learning Model, Olney and Grande (1995) developed Scale of Service Learning Involvement (SSLI), which had three subscales: Exploration, Realization, and Internalization. They first validated the theoretical basis of Service Learning Model by administering SSLI and Scale of Intellectual Development, Defining Issues Test, and Measure of Moral Orientation to 285 sophomore in a mid-sized comprehensive university’s annual assessment day. At the same time, Olney and Grande conducted two contrast studies to support the construct validity of SSLI, that is, SSLI can be used to differentiate those who are more involved in the service from those who are not. One study compared the SSLI subscale scores of students with different degree of involvement in volunteerism. There were four levels of involvement: never (n=11), occasional (n=170), consistent (n=73), cause-oriented (n=30), with the “never” representing the lowest degree of involvement and “cause-oriented” the highest degree of involvement. Using the scores for Exploration, Realization, and Internalization as dependent variables, the author found, that there were significant differences among the groups. As expected by Service Learning Model, the scores on the Exploration subscale decreased across the four levels, and the scores on the Realization and Internalization subscales increased across the fours levels. Hence, their study “indicated that the SSLI could detect different levels of social responsibility development across groups who had varying degrees of commitment to volunteer service” (p. 48). Another study by Olney and Grande (1995) examined the relationship between phases of social responsibility and types of participation with a Center of Service
Learning. There were four types of participation: volunteer only (n=28), volunteer and for credit (n=33), for credit only (n=25), and none (n=197). They found that there were significant differences among groups. As expected by the Service Learning Model, students who had no experience with Center for Service Learning or volunteer only for credit had significantly higher scores on Exploration subscale than the other two groups. Also students who had experience with Center of Service Learning had higher scores than those who did not on the Realization and Internalization subscales. Their study supported the validity of SSLI.

While Olney and Grande’s (1995) study supported the validity of SSLI as to its ability to attribute different phases of social responsibility to people with different degrees of involvement in volunteerism and service-learning, they did not establish a causal relationship between service and social responsibility development. There is need to study whether service-learning leads to the differences in social responsibility levels. Do service-learning courses result in changes in social responsibility or do past service experiences or required or voluntary enrollment account for the results? Johnson and Bozeman (1998) and Kollross (1997) may have provided some evidence to support that service-learning courses do result in the development of social responsibility. These studies will now be reviewed.

Olney and Grande’s (1995) instrument, Scale of Service Learning Involvement, was revised into Scale of Social Responsibility Development (SSRD) and one of the three subscales changed the name from Internalization to Activation. Johnson and Bozeman (1998) used SSRD to examine the effect of service-learning experience on
students’ development of social responsibility. They contacted professors at seven higher education institutions to solicit participants for the study. In their study, the same professor had to teach two sections of the same course, with only one offering service-learning, or the professor could teach a single course for which students could choose a service or no-service assignment. The final sample was of 56 students, 25 who participated in service-learning projects (the experimental group), and 31 who did not (the control group).

The SSRD was administered to both groups of students at the beginning of the class and at the end of the class. The results are summarized in Table 3. At pretest, there was a significant difference between the two groups with control group having higher score on each of the three subscales. After the class, the experimental group increased significantly on each subscale, with 0.05 significant level for Exploration, and 0.01 significant level for Realization and Activation. On the other hand, control group only increased significantly at Activation scale at 0.05 significant level. Their results supports the proposition that service-learning experience result in the development of social responsibility as defined by Delve, Mintz, and Stewart’s (1990) Service Learning Model. However, they were consistent with Olney and Grande’s (1995) assumptions on Realization and Internalization but not on Exploration, because students also increased on Exploration rather than decreased as expected by Olney and Grande.
In both groups, however, there were significant increases on the Activation subscale. Johnson and Bozeman (1998) speculated that the professors were “committed to service learning and volunteerism, and most of the courses were in the social sciences (particularly sociology and psychology) with social-awareness emphases” (p. 9). Therefore, “simply taking these courses with these faulty members may have inspired at least minimal increases in social responsibility among all participants” (p. 9). However, the degree of increase in control group was less than in experimental group. This suggests that lecture on social issues is effective to arouse students’ awareness of social issues, the Activation phase. Service-learning experiences seem to enhance this learning more effectively.

Kollross (1997) used SSLI to examine students’ development of social responsibility as result of service-learning experience (see Table 4). Students (n=119) in four different courses took the pretest, but only 86 students took the posttest. Two courses (Sociology and Psychology) required service-learning, and two courses (Economics and Statistics) offered students the option to participate in community
service as extra credit. The author reported that there was no significant change for any of the four courses; therefore, the hypotheses that mandatory service-learning component would facilitate development of social responsibility was not supported. There were 60% of the students in these courses were foreign-born and did not have USA citizen status. This might be a hindering factor for this study.

|                          |  | Exploration |  | Realization |  | Internalization |
|--------------------------|  |            |  |            |  |                 |
|                          |  | Pretest    |  | Posttest   |  | Pretest         |
|                          |  | (Change)   |  | (Change)   |  | (Change)        |
| Social science (n=22/15) |  | 41.86      |  | 44.27 (2.41) |  | 59.05 61.20 (2.15) |  | 86.77 93.00 (+6.23) |
| Psychology (n=31/26)    |  | 45.67      |  | 42.89 (-2.78) |  | 50.74 51.46 (+0.72) |  | 79.55 76.65 (-2.9) |
| Economics (n=48/31)     |  | 47.67      |  | 49.29 (1.62) |  | 53.29 52.48 (-0.81) |  | 81.58 81.81 (+0.23) |
| Statistics (n=18/13)    |  | 48.94      |  | 49.92 (0.98) |  | 58.11 56.08 (-2.03) |  | 88.06 84.85 (-3.21) |

Table 4. Mean of SSRD Subscale Pretest and Posttest for Experimental and Control Groups from Kollross’ (1997) Study

There was an increase for Social Science courses on each subscale of SSLI, while for the Psychology course, there were decreases on two subscales and not much change on the third subscale. At first glance, this seems confusing. However, an analysis of course design may help clarify the comparison. Although both courses required service components, students who chose the social science were aware of the service component before they enrolled, while the students who chose the Psychology course were not. Hence, one was voluntary and the other was not. In addition, the content of the Social Science course was about Community Volunteering, and the
purpose of this class was “to help students find appropriate volunteer activities in the community, receive appropriate supervision for their work, and assimilate the experience into their career goals” (Kollross, 1997, p. 52). To sum up, Social Science class was not mandatory but voluntary, and the service activities were closely related to the course content. However, on the other hand, the service component in Psychology course was purely mandatory and students did not understand the connection between the service activities and the course content. The author said, “those students that did engage in service-learning in either the mandatory or voluntary classes exhibited mixed feelings on what connection service-learning had to course content. This was most prevalent in the psychology class” (Kollross, 1997, p. 99). Hence, voluntary and known service-learning, mandatory but unknown service-learning, and close connections between course content and service experiences may be important variables in studies of the impact of service-learning courses.

Further, the lack of significant finding for Kollross’s (1997) study was partly due to the small sample size (n=13 for the Social Science course). In fact, the pattern of the Social Science course was parallel with the service-learning students in Johnson and Bozeman’s (1998) study. On the other hand, the Economics and Statistics courses were parallel to the non-service-learning students in Johnson and Bozeman’s study because only 5-7 students in Economics course chose to volunteer and no students in Statistics course chose to do so.

In summary, both Kollross (1997) and Johnson and Bozeman’s (1998) studies appear to support the causal relationship between well-designed service-learning
courses and the development of social responsibility. Johnson and Bozeman’s study indicates that without service component, course instruction itself could enhance students’ social responsibility to some degree, but the combination of course instruction and service could be more effective for the development of social responsibility. The only contradiction between these two studies and Olney and Grande’s (1995) findings were that in the well-designed service-learning courses, the scores for Exploration were not necessarily going down. It may be possible that the students can develop their social responsibility along each phase at the same time.

Payne’s (2000) study was also based on Delve, Mintz, and Stewart’s (1990) Service Learning Model and provided another support for the influence of service-learning on students’ development of social responsibility. Based on Delve et al’s model, Payne (2000) developed Community Service Involvement Preference Inventory (CSIPI) to measure students’ preference of the ways to be involved in community service. The CSIPI had four subscales that were parallel with the phases in Service Learning Model. The four subscales were Exploration, Affiliation, Experimentation, and Assimilation. In order to see whether a ten-week service-learning class would influence students’ involvement preferences, Payne administered the CSIPI to 83 undergraduates that were enrolled in four sections of a service-learning course. Among 53 participants, Payne found that a significant change from pre to post test for two of the service involvement preferences. While the score for the Exploration significantly decreased after the service-learning class, the score for Assimilation increased. There was no change on the other two preferences. The results
from Paune’s study have shown that service-learning may be an effective way to change students’ interest in community involvement from self-centered reasons to becoming a “responsible citizen” (p. 43).

**Markus, Howard, and King and Related Studies**

Markus, Howard, and King (1993) explored the influence of service-learning courses on students’ personal and social beliefs. The beliefs and values focused on the importance of service, understanding the causes for social issues, self-efficacy to influence community and social issues. They randomly selected two out of eight sections of an American politics course titled: “Contemporary Political Issues” to have service-learning added to the course. These two sections were the treatment group (n=37). The other six sections were the control group. These sections used a traditional course format with lecture and discussion groups, and required students to write a longer paper instead of doing service (n=52). The course was about students’ roles as citizens in a representative democracy, the conduct of political campaigns, and important policy controversies of the day. The course was claimed to be aimed at a broad audience of undergraduates regardless of major; however, it was not clear whether it is a GEC course or a requirement for students in certain majors. The students were not aware of their status as treatment group members or control group members, and students in treatment group were required to participate in service experience but did not feel they were treated specially. Students in both groups were given a pre-test survey, and there were no significant difference between these two groups on their social and political beliefs and values. Therefore, the potential sources
of bias in the study were believed to be minimal and that any systematic differences observed in criterion measures were believed to be attributable to the presence and absence of community service component.

Comparing pretest and posttest results, the author found that among 15 items on personal and political beliefs and values, the students in the treatment group exhibited significant change on 8 out of 15 items while students in the control group only had significant change on 3 out of 15 items at 0.05 significant level. For the posttest-only items, the service-learning group scored significantly higher than non-service-learning group on 7 out of 9 items at 0.05 significant level. In addition, for the course evaluation items, the service-learning group scored significantly higher than non-service-learning group on 6 out of 8 items at 0.05 significant level.

Similar results were found by Giles and Eyler (1994) and Kendrick (1996). Giles and Eyler (1994) examined changes in social and personal responsibility as the result of a service-learning experience. There were seventy-two students in a course entitled “Community Service Laboratory” at Vanderbilt University who were surveyed using an instrument that partly was adapted from Markus, Howard, and King’s (1993) study. This course was one of the requirements of these students’ interdisciplinary major in Human and Organizational Development. Students were involved in values clarification and volunteer work in the community. There was no control or comparison group. The final sample was 56, and they found that for pre/post test comparison, 7 out of 13 items increased significantly at least at 0.05 level. They also found that 75.4% of the students changed their views of service clients from
negative to positive, and 75.4% of the students perceived that involvement exposure was the reason for them to change.

While Giles and Eyler (1994) only examined the service-learning group, Kendrick (1996) examined effects of service-learning on students in two sections of a same course: Introduction to Sociology. Students were given extra credit for participation in service-learning at 20 hours per semester (n=60). Students who selected non-service-learning were required to read the NY Times (n=63). He used the instrument from Markus, Howard, and King’s (1993) study and found that students in the service-learning section showed greater increases in beliefs and values than did the control section. On the pre/post-test comparison, out of 15 items, while the service-learning group had 5 significant positive changes, the non-service-learning group had only one significantly positive change and one significantly negative change at 0.05 significant level. For the posttest-only items, the service-learning group scored significantly higher on 7 out of 9 items.

There was one study that partly failed to replicate Markus, Howard, and King’s (1993) findings. Hudson (1996) examined the impact of service-learning on students’ attitudes, values, and learning. He incorporated service requirement in two sections of an American Public Policy course (n=32). The goal for this course was to develop citizen policy analyst and the service experiences was to put students in contact with the consequences of public policy. It is not clear whether students took this course as required course for a major or as an elective course. The students in these two sections comprised treatment group without knowing that it was a service-learning class until
the class started. This may be a confounding factor. While several students dropped the class because of this reason, most of them stayed. The comparison group was students enrolled in a European Politics course (n=19). Hence, the two courses were not the same content, and, hence, both the service-learning element and content differed. The author used the instrument developed by Markus et al. (1993). For the pre/post-test comparison items, paired t-tests on pre- and post-test scores did not find any statistically difference on any items on the survey either for the treatment group or comparison group. However, on the post-test-only items, students’ perceptions of how the course affected them on civic commitment were significantly higher for students in treatment group than the control group for all nine items at 0.05 level. One reason for the lack of significant finding from this study was explained by the author as the ceiling effect, that is, most of the students were already civic-minded and more than half of the students were seniors.

In summary, the studies that were based on Markus, Howard, and King’s (1993) study provided some evidence that service-learning courses were effective in fostering students’ civic responsibility, personal and social values, and self-efficacy to influence community and social issues. Especially when genuine control groups were used, the influence of the courses can be attributed to the combination of the service activities and course learning.

**Other Studies**

Several other studies on civic responsibility or citizenship development are worth attention (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Myers-Lipton, 1998). Eyler et al.
(1997) gathered data from over 1500 students at 20 colleges and universities, among which 1140 students participated in service and 404 students did not select service classes or options within classes. The outcome domains in their study included citizenship confidence, citizenship skills, citizenship values and perception of social justice. They developed questionnaires to measure these four outcome domains. However, no validity tests have been done to these measures. They used t-tests for independent samples to compare service and non-service students on pre-test measures, and found students who chose service-learning differed from those who did not in the target attitudes, skills, values, and understanding of social issues. Hence, there were significant impacts from possible motivational differences. The authors also found that while most background characteristics were not significantly related to outcomes, previous college service often made a difference and gender was often an independent predictor of outcomes with women more likely to show higher outcomes than men. In order to achieve group equivalence, they used hierarchical linear multiple regression to control the background variables and pretest measures.

After control for background variables and pretest measure through multiple hierarchical regressions, the authors found that both participation in service-learning and closeness to faculty independently increased students’ citizenship confidence, values, and skills. In addition, service-learning was also found to be predictive of a career of valuing people, of volunteering and of attempting to influence the political system. Service-learning was also predictive of students’ post-test assessments of their political participation skills, their tolerance for others, their ability to place themselves
in someone else’s shoes; and their ability to remain open to new ideas. Finally, service-learning may have also facilitated faculty-student relationships. Based on their findings, the authors recommended including service-learning in the core curriculum rather than keeping it a co-curricular option.

Myers-Lipton (1998) conducted a study of a two-year comprehensive service-learning program focused on the effectiveness of the service-learning program and students’ development of civic responsibility. The outcome domains in this study included development of civic responsibility, locus of control, and civic behavior. The treatment group was a highly selective two-year program for juniors and seniors with a focus on service and community action. They performed 6 hours community service per week in concert with four three-credit classes, four one-credit service-learning labs, and two month-long summer service-learning experiences. They performed a total of over 200 hours of service. Eleven students finished the course in 1993 and 14 students finished the course in 1994 (Community Service Learning group, CSL). A comparison group included students performing service that was not linked to course work (Service Non Learning group, SNL, 25 students for each wave) and another comparison group included students without any service experience (No Service control group, NSL, 150 students, random sampling).

Independent and control variables included sex, race, political orientation, parents’ education, and student group. A multiple regression indicated that 1994 CSL and SNL groups had similar levels of civic responsibility at pretest but the 1993 CSL group had higher pretest scores than the SNL group. Both waves of CSL and SNL
group scored higher than NS groups at pretest. These differences in initial attitude were controlled when analyzing pretest to posttest changes. Results of this analysis included the fact that CSL groups gained significantly at least at 0.05 level in their locus of control, civic behavior, and concern for civic responsibility scores over the study period, while the SNL and NS students’ scores on these scales stayed the same or declined. Perhaps because the service-learning program in this study was comprehensive and intensive, the small sample size did not prevent the author from getting significant results. In addition, this study may indicate the importance of offering continuing service-learning experience to students in order to get significant results.

Both Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997) and Myers-Lipton (1998) utilized vigorous statistical procedures to examine the influence of service-learning experience on students’ development of civic responsibility or citizenship. Therefore, their results provided the strongest evidence for the effectiveness of service-learning programs on civic responsibility development. However, one thing that needs to be considered is that the effectiveness of service-learning program on civic responsibility development is influenced by the connection between the service activities and course content, by previous experience with service, and by whether service experience are voluntary or required. Most of the positive findings related to civic responsibility were derived from service-learning courses that have the community or society as focus of the course content, such as, sociology, public policy, or even purely about community service or volunteerism. For these classes, it may be easier for students to understand
the connection between the service activities and the course content, and it is also
easier for the instructor to include reflection activities that help students understand
their experience in the light of social responsibility development. In fact, it seems
appropriate to say that civic responsibility is part of the course objectives and course
content. However, this is not the case for all disciplines, and for some courses, such as
English, civic responsibility is not regarded as a natural part of course objective but as
an add-on component. For other courses, such as psychology, the instructor’s design
may not focus on civic responsibility even though the discipline is about human
behavior. In these cases, the students may not be able to accept the service activities
easily or the focuses on civic responsibility. The instructors may also feel
uncomfortable and unprepared to lead students to think in terms of the development of
social responsibility.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter will focus on the methodology used in this study. Research questions and hypotheses will be followed by conceptual and operational definitions. Validity and reliability of instruments in the study will be covered along with the research design and procedures. Finally, analysis of data will be described.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following are the research questions for this study:

1. What are the outcomes of participating in service-learning courses on development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity?
   
   Hypothesis: Service-learning courses will result in a significant increase in social responsibility for students who participate.
   
   Hypothesis: Service-learning courses will result in a significant increase in intellectual development for students who participate.

2. Does a social justice focus in the designs of service-learning courses make a difference in terms of development of social responsibility and intellectual complexity?
Hypothesis: Courses that focus on social justice will significantly increase students’ social responsibility compared to courses that do not focus on social justice.

Hypothesis: Courses that focus on social justice will significantly increase students’ intellectual development compared to courses that do not focus on social justice.

3. Do students with different levels of previous involvement in volunteer work have different levels of social responsibility at the beginning of the courses and different outcomes on the development of social responsibility at the end of the courses?

Hypothesis: Students who have participated more in volunteer work prior to this class will have higher level of social responsibility on pretest and will significantly increase on development of social responsibility measured by SSLI.

4. Do students with different reasons for taking service learning courses have different levels of social responsibility at the beginning of the courses and different outcomes on the development of social responsibility at the end of the courses?

Hypothesis: There will be differences in levels of pretest and development of social responsibility outcomes among subgroups of students who are taking a service-learning course for different required and voluntary reasons.
5. What is the relationship between development of social responsibility and development of intellectual complexity?

Hypothesis: There will be a positive relationship between phases of social responsibility and Perry levels of intellectual development.

**Conceptual and Operational Definitions**

The major concepts used in this study are social responsibility, intellectual development, students participating in a service-learning course, levels of previous involvement in volunteer work, reasons for taking service-learning courses, and social justice focus of course design. The definition and operationalization of these concepts are as follows:

**Social responsibility** is defined as “a sense of the obligations of citizenship, awareness of social injustice and its complex causes, and dedication to working toward social equity” (Olney & Grande, 1995, p. 43). The development of social responsibility can be described in three phases. The first phase is Exploration, in which students participate in volunteer work mainly for fun or to be part of a peer group; the second phase is Realization, in which students begin to commit to an issue, site, or activity; and the third phase is Internalization, where students are aware of the complexities and importance of social justice issues and are committed to work toward social equality and equity. For more detailed descriptions, please see Chapter 1 (Context and Purpose of Study). In this study, social responsibility is operationalized and measured by the Scale of Service Learning Involvement (Olney & Grande, 1995, see Appendix A).
**Intellectual development** is defined as five positions of ways of making meaning of questions of knowledge and valuation as defined by Perry Scheme (1970/1999). Positions 1, 2, and 3 are called Dualistic because they assume absolute answers to questions of knowledge and valuation. Positions 4 and 5 are called Relativistic because they do not assume absolute answers. Positions 6, 7, 8, and 9 in Perry Scheme are psychosocial/existential descriptions of commitment in some content area such as social responsibility using position 5 thinking. These positions of intellectual development are operationalized and measured by Measure of Epistemological Reflection (Baxter Mogolda & Porterfiled, 1985, see Appendix B).

**Students participating in service-learning courses** are defined as students who enrolled and did not drop the service-learning courses. They took part in both the class and service activities all quarter. Students participating in service-learning courses were operationalized as the students who took following courses: 1) English Workshop; 2) Leadership in Community Service (two sessions); 3) Life Span Motor Development; 4) Consumer Housing in Community; 5) Reading Foundation; 6) Administration of Service Learning in Higher Education. Later on, these courses are referred to as Course 1, Course 2, and so on. The two sessions of Course 2 are referred to as Course 2-Session 1 and Course 2-Session 2.

**Levels of previous involvement in volunteer work** are defined as the frequency of participation in volunteer work prior to taking the service learning classes in this study. It is measured by question 71 of the SSLI, asking students to
mark their level of previous volunteer activity. Students chose the same response form a group (see Appendix A).

**Reasons for taking service-learning courses** are defined as the reasons why students decide to take a service-learning course. It is measured by question 72 of the SSLI, asking students to mark their reason for participation. Students chose the same response form a group (see Appendix A).

**Social justice focus of course design** is defined as the degree to which social justice is an intentional goal of the course and incorporated in readings, class activities, and/or assignments. This is operationlized by interview with the instructors (see Appendix C for interview protocol) and an analysis of course syllabus and other documents in terms of emphasizing social issues and injustice (e.g., racism, social class prejudice, structural prejudice), complexity of the causes of these issues, ways to make social changes to correct social injustice and dedications to act for social changes.

**Instruments**

Two instruments were used for this study in order to operationalize constructs in the research questions. These two instruments are SSLI (Olney & Grande, 1995) and MER (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1985).

**Scale of Service Learning Involvement (SSLI)**

The validity and reliability of SSLI (Olney & Grande, 1995) is described in Chapter 1. Context and Purpose of Study. It appears to be adequate to use this
instrument to operationalize the development of social responsibility depicted by Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) in their Service Learning Model.

**Measure of Epistemological Reflection (MER)**

Measure of Epistemological Reflection (MER) is a written instrument designed to assess intellectual development of Perry’s five positions of cognitive structural development (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1985). The MER asks the respondent to produce answers to a series of questions for each of the six domains of the Perry scheme. The six domains are: (a) the role of instructor, (b) the role of peers, (c) the role of learner, (d) evaluation in the learning process, (e) the nature of knowledge, and (f) educational decision making. Each domain starts with a general question that focuses on the domain content. Then three or four probe questions are used to solicit respondents’ justification and reasoning for their initial responses. It is the justification and reasoning that is then rated for Perry positions.

A standardized MER rating manual (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1988) is used by trained and certified raters. The MER rating manual is separated into six smaller manuals, one for each of the six domains mentioned above. In each small manual, reasoning structure and substructures are given for each position of Perry Scheme, and examples are given for each substructure. These structures, substructures and examples are derived from empirical studies. The rater chooses the position justification in the manual that matches the respondent’s produced justification or reasoning in order to assign a position rating for each domain. For example, for domain one, if a student’s response matches the 2nd Reasoning Structure under
Position 3, this response will be rated as 1.3.2. The first number represents the domain on which this rating is based on, the second number is the Perry position assigned to a response, and the third number is the reasoning structure the respondent has used under that position (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1988).

After each domain rating is assigned, a total protocol rating (TPR) is derived for the six domain ratings. Each domain is given a single rating. Most of the time, this rating will be whole number, but sometimes it can have plus or minus sign to represent transition. Based on the six domain ratings, there are two ways of calculating the TPR. One way is called modal TPR, which is used to describe respondent’s modal reasoning, “the majority of the person’s thinking” (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1988, p. 86) instead of the highest reasoning. The other way is called continuous TPR, which is the average of the six domain position ratings. The continuous TPR is more comprehensive and can be used in correlation studies; however, it violates theoretical assumptions that Perry levels are categorical data.

In order to calculate the modal TPR, the rater combines the six domain scores using rules in the rater manual. For example, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, will have 3 as modal TPR. However, any position ratings that appear twice or more will be included in the TPR. For example, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, will have modal TPR as 2(3). If the positions are evenly split between positions, each position can appear as a whole numbers in the modal TPR. For example, 3, 3, 3, 4, 4, 4 will have modal TPR as 3-4, and 3,3,4,4,5,5 will have modal TPR as (3)(4)(5). Based on these rules, the rater will be able to assign a modal TPR to a respondent.
The continuous TPR can be determined by calculating the arithmetic average of the ratable domain ratings. All the position ratings will be summed up and then divided by the number of ratable domains. The TPR is comprehensive because it allows rater to assign a number to transition and does not leave out the position of any domains. For example, a 2+ will be assigned 2.25. Therefore, the transition information will be included into the sum of domain ratings, hence, into the continuous TPR. In addition, even if a position occurs in only one domain, it will not be left out in the continuous TPR, as in the modal TPR. For example, 2,3,3,3,3,3 would be calculated as: (2+3+3+3+3+3)/6=2.83. Hence, 2.83 is the TPR and includes all domain scores. Baxter Magolda and Porterfield (1988) think that the continuous TPR can give researchers “more perspective than modal TPR in understanding a particular respondent’s thinking pattern” (p. 92).

The rating manual has been validated by several studies. On a sample of 752, the interrater reliability was 0.80 (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1985) and interrater agreement ranged from 70% to 80% with chi squares significant at p<0.001 (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1988). Validation study of MER also has been done by comparing the MER and a semi-structured interview. Significant correlation (0.93) was found between the TPR on MER and the interview (Baxter Magolda, 1987). The validity of MER has been shown by conducting analysis of variance by level of education. Significant differences (p<0.001) among first-year, fourth-year, and graduate students were consistently found in 3 samples of students (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1988). One sample consisted of 121 students enrolled in the College of
Social Work at a large Midwestern state university in spring 1983. Of the 121 participants, 30 were third-years, 22 were fourth-years, 64 were master’s degree students, and 5 were doctoral candidates. The researchers found significant differences among students with different educational levels (p<0.0001). Student-Newman-Keuls post hoc multiple comparisons indicated significant differences (p<0.05) between doctoral candidates, second-year master’s students, and the remaining participants, who were third-year undergraduate students, fourth-year undergraduate students, and first-year master’s students. Another sample included 180 students from a teacher education program. Among the 180 students, there were 1 first-year students, 21 second-year students, 113 third-year students, 31 fourth-year students, 5 master’s degree students, and one person who held a doctorate. The ANOVA based on educational level found significant differences (p<0.0001), and post hoc comparisons showed significant differences (p<0.05) between doctoral candidates, first-year master’s degree students and the remaining participants. The third sample was randomly selected from a large Midwestern state university as part of a dissertation study. This sample consisted of 130 students, among which there were 36 first-year, 28 fourth-years, 40 first-year master’s students, and 26 doctoral candidates. Significant differences (p<0.0001) were found across the groups, and multiple comparisons also resulted in significant differences (p<0.05) between graduate students, fourth-year, and first-year students.

In addition to the validity studies done during development of the MER, several other studies have used MER to explore college students’ intellectual
development in various settings (Adams & Zhou, 1990, 1994; Schilling, 1991; Thorndike, 1989). Thorndike (1989) studied the relationship between life events and students’ cognitive function measured by MER. He found that significant life events were associated with a higher level of cognitive functioning. Schilling (1990) investigated the impact of two different models of liberal education on students. One of the models was disciplinary-based general education, and the other one was interdisciplinary curriculum. MER was used to measure students’ intellectual development in a cross-sectional study. It was found that fourth-years in interdisciplinary program score significantly higher (p<0.05) than those in disciplinary-based program on four of the six domains of MER. Adams and Zhou (1994) employed MER to study students in a social diversity education class to see whether social diversity and social justice education can increase student’ intellectual development. They used the MER both at the beginning and end of the class over the semester, and found statistically significant course effects for the MER TPR (t=5.66, p<0.001). Therefore, MER appeared to be a useful tool for research on student intellectual development even over a short period of time.

Participants

The participants in this study were teachers and students in six service-learning courses offered at a large mid-western state university (one course had two sections). The courses were selected based on the academic level of participants of these classes and whether social justice was a focus in the course design. Preliminary analyses of syllabi and previous studies of these classes provided relevant information.
A detailed analysis and classification of each course is included in Chapter 4. Interviews with instructors are also included in the Chapter 4. The selection of first-year, third-year/fourth-year, and graduate student classes was done to cover intellectual development from the lower position (2) to the higher position (5) as measured by MER in order to make the data sufficient to examine the research questions. The solicitation letters and research consent forms are in Appendix D through G.

Based on the preliminary analyses of the six courses, they were put into two groups with different levels of social justice focus: “may have social justice” and “may not have social justice” (see Table 6). The group that may have social justice consisted of three courses: Courses 2, 4, and 6. Course 2 is offered as an elective class to students from first-year to fourth-year from different majors around the campus. Hence, their intellectual development may be mixed. Its content is about leadership in community service and social justice is probably a focus. Course 4 is offered by Human Ecology and focuses on housing issues in the community. It consists of mainly third-year and fourth-year students and deals with social justice issues. Course 6 is a graduate level course focusing on service-learning administration and probably has a social justice emphasis. Students who took this class are probably more complex in their intellectual development and commitment to volunteer/service learning activity than the other students. The group that may not have social justice focus consisted three courses: Courses 1, 3 and 5. Course 3 is required for fourth-year and third-year students who are learning life span motor development for their major. Students in this
class would be expected to have a medium level of intellectual development. This class probably does not have social justice as focus. Course 3 is offered by the English department and is a writing workshop. It mainly enrolls first-year and second-year undergraduate students, and it probably does not have a social justice focus. Course 5 is an education class concerns with teaching reading to elementary students; it has mainly third-year and fourth-year students and may not have social justice as a focus. In summary, the possible focus and constituencies of each class are listed in Table 5. A detailed analysis and classification of each course is included in the findings of Chapter 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May Have Social Justice Focus</th>
<th>May Not Have Social Justice Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Course</td>
<td>Status of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in Community Service (Two sessions) --Course 2</td>
<td>First-year Second-year Third-year Fourth-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Housing in Community --Course 4</td>
<td>Third-year Fourth-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Service Learning --Course 6</td>
<td>Master Doctoral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Participants of Study

In Table 6, numbers of students who were enrolled and who chose to participate in this study are listed for each course. The response rates ranged from 30.0% for Leadership in Community Service to 73.3% for English Workshop. The overall response rate for the seven courses/sessions was 41.1%.
Table 6. Response Rate for Each Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Participants (Percentage)</th>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Participants (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in Community Service (Two sessions) --Course 2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21 (30.0%)</td>
<td>English Workshop --Course 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Housing in Community --Course 4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
<td>Life Span Motor Development --Course 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Service Learning --Course 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>Reading Foundation --Course 5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design and Data Collection

This study draws on both quantitative and qualitative methodology. The quantitative methodology concerns research questions that use the MER (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1985) and SSLI (Olney & Grande, 1995). MER is a validated assessment tool that is based on Perry’s scheme of intellectual development and is a production instrument. SSLI has been created and validated to be able to measure levels of student social responsibility development. SSLI also collects information on student previous involvement in volunteer work and reasons for taking the service learning class. These two instruments were administered to students in these six courses in the first week and 10th week of the class in the Spring 2003 to collect
information on student intellectual development and development of social responsibility.

This is a quasi-experimental design because students can not be assigned randomly to different classes and no control groups are available. However, with a pre-posttest design, comparison between pretest and posttest can be made to see treatment effect, control of selection and mortality variables are provided, and conclusion can be reached about the differential effects of different kinds of treatments (Issac & Michael, 1995). The research design is summarized in Table 7. Limitations of this design involve self-selection, maturation, and effects of pretest. The effect of self-selection was taken into consideration in the SSLI. Question 71 and 72 from SSLI asked students to identify the levels of previous volunteer involvement and reasons for taking service-learning courses. The influence of these factors on students’ development was analyzed to address two of the research questions. The effects of maturation and pretest on MER appear not to be a concern. Previous studies have shown that usually college students will change approximately 1 1/3 stages over the four years. However, within ten weeks of period, changes appear not to be measurable unless the students are involved in a class designed specifically to promote intellectual development (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1988). The pretest effect is not a problem on MER, that is why there is only one version used for both pretest and posttest (Baxter Magolda & Proterfield, 1988). The effects of maturation and pretest on SSLI were not clear at the beginning of this study. However, the results of this study showed
that the scores of students in some of the courses did not go up after taking the service-learning courses. This may suggest that there is no maturation or pretest effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Course Design</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May Have Social Justice Focus</td>
<td>Course 2: Leadership in Community Service</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course 4: Consumer Housing in Community</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course 6: Administration of Service Learning</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Not Have Social Justice Focus</td>
<td>Course 1: English Workshop</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course 3: Life span motor development</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course 5: Reading Foundation</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Research Design

The qualitative methodology in this study included interviews and document analysis. Interviews were conducted with instructors about the foci of their class and their detailed design for achieving their intended outcomes. Document analyses were done with course syllabi, reading packages, text books, and handouts, to determine the focus of the course design. The syllabi for the six courses are in Appendix H through M. As indicated previously in the definition section, criteria for a social justice focus are deliberate social justice goals; the raising of social issues, such as racism, social class prejudice, structural prejudice; an emphasis on the complexities of the causes of these issues; an emphasis on ways to make social changes to correct social injustice; and an emphasis on dedication to act for social change. Qualitative methods are necessary in this project because designing a course is a meaningful process and “the word qualitative implies an emphasis on the qualities of entities and on processes and
meanings that are not experimentally examined or measured (if measured at all) in terms of quantity, amount, intensity, or frequency” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 8).

Data Analysis

Descriptive analyses were first used to see the demographic composition of the participants in this study, such as age, gender, rank, volunteer involvement, enrollment reason, for the whole experimental group as well as for each individual course. Detailed SSLI scores and MER scores were also given for each individual participant in this study.

Because the second research question concerns the impact of a social justice focus in course design, descriptions and classifications were given for all the courses studied. These classifications were based on a qualitative analysis of syllabi, textbooks, handouts, and interview transcripts with instructors using the four criteria for judging social justice focus in course design. Member-checks were done with some of the instructors but not all of them. This is a limitation of this study. Peer-debriefing was done with the advisor of this researcher. He read all the syllabi and interview transcripts and confirmed the classifications of this researcher.

In order to answer each of the research questions, MER scores and SSLI scores were analyzed. The MER were rated by a trained rater who rated all the responses. A second rater rated 20% of all the responses. The interrater reliabilities were as follows: exact agreement, 89%; within 1/3 stages, 95%; and within 2/3 stages, 100%. The TPR scores from MER were treated in two ways. The first way is to treat MER score as continuous normally distributed data, and parametric methods were used. Normality
test was run to see whether MER continuous scores were normally distributed, and the assumptions were satisfied. The second way is to treat MER score as categorical data, and frequency and cross-tabulation tables as well as histograms were used to show the patterns and/or changes of MER scores. There was not gender difference between male and female students on MER pretest or most past studies; hence, analyses on MER based on gender were not performed.

SSLI has 70 items that have been grouped into three subscales: Exploration (20 items), Realization (20 items), and Internalization (30 items). Responses to questions in the same subscale were added up to obtain a subscale score. Because the response for each question ranged from 1 to 4, the subscale scores ranged from 20 to 80 for Exploration and Realization subscales, and 20 to 120 for Internalization scale. Analysis on SSLI were based on these subscale scores. On SSLI pretest, there was significant difference between male and female only on Realization subscale; however, they did not change differently by taking the service-learning courses. Hence, further analyses were not performed based on gender.

The statistical significance level chosen for each hypothesis test was 0.05. When the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was significant at 0.05 level, the follow-up univariate tests were also performed using an alpha of 0.05. This approach was chosen because “if the multivariate null hypothesis is true, then this procedure keeps the overall alpha level under control for the set of t tests. The procedure has greater power for detecting differences than [other approaches], and this is an important consideration when small or moderate sample sizes are involved”
In this study, the sample sizes are small for most of the tests; hence, 0.05 was chosen for follow-up tests. In addition, when the sample size was smaller than 10, it is problematic to use formal test. Some analyses were performed when sample size was 8 or 9; however, the results were interpreted with cautions. When sample size was less than 8, formal tests were not performed. Based on these general considerations, the specific procedures used for each research question are as follows.

For the first research question, analyses for social responsibility development and intellectual development were done separately. First, for the development of social responsibility, individual courses were first combined to see the course effects on the whole experimental group. For each subscale, paired t-test was performed to see whether there were significant differences from pretest to posttest. In addition, for each individual course, same analyses were done on the pretest and posttest scores of SSLI to see the effect of each course on development of social responsibility. Second, for the intellectual development, two methods were used. Paired t-tests were performed for the whole experimental group and each individual course when the MER scores were treated as normally distributed continuous data. When the MER scores were treated as categorical data, frequency tables, histograms of percentage of each Perry position were constructed and compared between pretest and posttest. Tables for cross-tabulation of pretest and posttest as well as amount of stage movement for the whole group were also constructed to see students’ intellectual development.
For the second research question, the influence of social justice focus in course design on students’ development of social responsibility and intellectual development were examined separately. For development of social responsibility, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was first performed using social justice focus as an independent variable, and the three subscale scores from SSLI pretest as dependent variables in order to see whether there were significant differences among the courses with different social justice focuses at pretest. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed whenever the results from MANOVA were significant. Posttest scores for subscales of SSLI were then analyzed using Analysis of Covariate (ANCOVA) and pretest scores were used as covariates to make the groups statistically equivalent. In both analyses, follow-up comparisons were performed whenever the results of ANOVA or ANCOVA were significant. In addition, paired t-tests were performed on subscales of SSLI for each group to see whether there were significant differences from pretest to posttest. For intellectual development, the MER scores were first treated as normally distributed continuous data. One-way ANOVA was first performed to see whether the pretest scores were significantly different among the groups. Then ANCOVA was performed using pretest scores as covariates. Follow-up comparisons were performed when the results of ANOVA or ANCOVA were significant. In addition, paired t-tests were performed on MER for each group to see whether there were significant differences from pretest to posttest. The MER scores were then treated as categorical data. Tables for cross-tabulation of pretest and posttest
as well as amount of stage movement for each group were constructed to compare the effects of social justice focus in course design.

For the third and fourth research questions, analysis procedures were the same as in the analyses of SSLI for the second research question only with different independent variables. For the third research question, students’ levels of previous involvement in volunteer work was the independent variable; and for the fourth research question, students’ reasons for taking service learning courses was the independent variable.

For the fifth research question, the intercorrelations between subscales of SSLI and the MER scores were calculated to see the relationship between phases of social responsibility and positions of intellectual development. The Cronbach alphas and intercorrelation among SSLI subscales were first analyzed to see the reliability and convergent validity of SSLI. The MER scores were then treated as normally distributed continuous data, and Pearson correlation test was used to see the relationship between SSLI subscales scores and MER scores.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In this chapter, I will report the findings from this study. I first report the demographical information on the participants of this study, both as a whole group and as individual course. Then I will describe each course based on a qualitative analysis of the syllabus, handouts, textbooks, and interviews with instructors, and give my classification of each course based on the criteria of social justice focus of course design. Finally, I will address each of the research questions by using appropriate analysis of the data from SSLI and MER.

Demographical Information of Participants

Demographical information of participants as a whole group are presented in Table 8 through Table 12 and information on participants for each course are presented in Table 13 through 40.
### Demography of Participants as a Whole Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Session 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Session 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Age of Participants across Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Session 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Session 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Gender of Participants across Courses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Session 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Session 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Class rank of Participants across Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>Volunteer level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never participate</td>
<td>Volunteer from time to time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Session 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Session 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Volunteer Level of Participants across Courses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>Required course for major</th>
<th>Course on a list of elective courses required for major</th>
<th>Free elective for content</th>
<th>Free elective for service</th>
<th>Mount Leadership Society</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Session 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Session 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Enrollment Reasons across Courses
### Results of SSLI and MER for Individual Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Father’s Job</th>
<th>Mother’s Job</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Volunteer Level</th>
<th>Reason to Enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Psychology with minor in Dance (maybe)</td>
<td>Benefits Supervisor</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
<td>Automotive bodyman</td>
<td>Library page</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Animal science</td>
<td>Crane operator</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Explore</td>
<td>Sales and purchase</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Mid-state Medical Technician</td>
<td>Cincinnati Bell Technician</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Retired Electrician</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>HEC</td>
<td>Line Assembly (Honda)</td>
<td>ESL Teacher (Middle School)</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Agribusiness</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>House wife</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Owns photo shop</td>
<td>Special education teacher</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>Research scientist</td>
<td>Teacher at the university</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Demographical information for Course 1
Table 14. SSLI Scores for Course 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Exploration Pre</th>
<th>Exploration Post</th>
<th>Exploration Change</th>
<th>Realization Pre</th>
<th>Realization Post</th>
<th>Realization Change</th>
<th>Internalization Pre</th>
<th>Internalization Post</th>
<th>Internalization Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>-8.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>-12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>-17.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>-9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>-10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>107.00</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>-26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>-14.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>-13.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>-15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>-9.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>42.64</td>
<td>-5.91</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td>47.09</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>76.45</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. MER Scores for Course 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>MER Categorical Scores Pre</th>
<th>MER Categorical Scores Post</th>
<th>MER Categorical Scores Change</th>
<th>MER Continuous Scores Pre</th>
<th>MER Continuous Scores Post</th>
<th>MER Continuous Scores Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>+1/6</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>+1/3</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>+1/3</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>-1/3</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>+1/3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COURSE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1/3 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Movement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/6 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/3 stage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/2 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2/3 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5/6 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Stage Movements of MER Scores for Course 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Father’s Job</th>
<th>Mother’s Job</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Volunteer Level</th>
<th>Reason to Enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Clerk of Courts</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Chemical engineer</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Dental hygiene</td>
<td>Sales manager</td>
<td>Credit marketing manager</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Radiologist</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>Travel agent</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Business: Marketing</td>
<td>Entrepreneur (sells sailboats)</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Consumer Affairs</td>
<td>Sprint CS Switch tech.</td>
<td>Teachers Assistant</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Consumer Affairs</td>
<td>Factory employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>FRM</td>
<td>Professor at Music</td>
<td>English at High School</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Family Resource Management</td>
<td>RN</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Demographical Information for Course 2-Session 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Realization</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>-8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>-7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>-23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>-7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>-7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>43.41</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. SSLI Scores for Course 2-Session 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>MER Categorical Scores</th>
<th>MER Continuous Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>2-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. MER Scores for Course 2-Session 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1/3 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Movement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/6 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/3 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/2 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2/3 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5/6 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Stage Movements of MER Scores for Course 2-Session 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Father’s Job</th>
<th>Mother’s Job</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Volunteer Level</th>
<th>Reason to Enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Grounds Supervisor at Calvin College</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>African American African Studies</td>
<td>Telephone company worker</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Retired/Factory worker</td>
<td>Travel agent</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Consumer Affairs (College of Human Ecology)</td>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>Teacher-Home Economics/life planning.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>General Electric</td>
<td>Food service</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Pre-Health Information Management Systems</td>
<td>Clergy (Preacher)</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Human Ecology</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Photography (BFA)</td>
<td>Technical Writer</td>
<td>Adult Education teacher</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Demographical Information for Course 2-Session 2
| Code | Exploration | | | Realization | | | Internalization | | |
|------|-------------|--------|--------|-------------|--------|--------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|      | Pre | Post | Change | Pre | Post | Change | Pre | Post | Change | Pre | Post | Change |
| 2    | 45.00 | 36.00 | -9.00 | 44.00 | 56.00 | 12.00 | 63.00 | 80.00 | 17.00 |
| 3    | 38.00 | 39.00 | 1.00  | 53.00 | 48.00 | -5.00 | 99.00 | 93.00 | -6.00 |
| 4    | 38.00 | 44.00 | 6.00  | 47.00 | 41.00 | -6.00 | 84.00 | 77.00 | -7.00 |
| 5    | 33.00 | 40.00 | 7.00  | 50.00 | 57.00 | 7.00  | 83.00 | 100.00| 17.00 |
| 6    | 45.00 | 38.00 | -7.00 | 49.00 | 54.00 | 5.00  | 68.00 | 67.00 | -1.00 |
| 7    | 56.00 | 63.00 | 7.00  | 53.00 | 58.00 | 5.00  | 83.00 | 90.00 | 7.00  |
| 8    | 34.00 | 21.00 | -13.00| 57.00 | 55.00 | -2.00 | 92.00 | 85.00 | -7.00 |
| 9    | 44.00 | 45.00 | 1.00  | 61.00 | 60.00 | -1.00 | 92.00 | 91.00 | -1.00 |
| 10   | 45.00 | 51.00 | 6.00  | 50.00 | 57.00 | 7.00  | 84.00 | 94.00 | 10.00 |
| Mean | 42.00 | 41.88 | -0.12 | 51.55 | 54.00 | 2.45  | 83.11 | 86.33 | 3.22  |

Table 22. SSLI Scores for Course 2-Session 2

| Code | MER Categorical Scores | | | MER Continuous Scores | | |
|------|-------------------------|--------|--------|-------------------------|--------|
|      | Pre | Post | Change | Pre | Post | Change | Pre | Post | Change |
| 2    | 3-3 | 3(4) | +1/3   | 2.92| 3.33 | .41    | 3.00| 3.04 | .04    |
| 3    | 3-3 | 3-3  | None   | 3.38| 3.25 | -.13   | 3.04| 3.17 | .13    |
| 4    | 3(4) | 3(4) | None   | 3.00| 3.04 | .04    | 3.04| 3.17 | .13    |
| 5    | 3-3 | 3-3  | None   | 2.33| 2.33 | .00    | 3.04| 3.17 | .13    |
| 6    | 2(3) | 2(3) | None   | 3.04| 3.17 | .13    | 3.04| 3.17 | .13    |
| 7    | 3(2) | 3-3  | +1/3   | 2.66| 3.00 | .34    | 2.66| 3.00 | .34    |
| 8    | 2-2 | 3(2) | +2/3   | 2.16| 2.67 | .51    | 2.16| 2.67 | .51    |
| 9    | 2(3) | 2(3) | None   | 2.25| 2.29 | .04    | 2.25| 2.29 | .04    |
| 10   | 3-3 | 3(4) | +1/3   | 3.04| 3.33 | .29    | 3.04| 3.33 | .29    |
| Mean | 2.75| 2.93 | 0.18   | 2.75| 2.93 | 0.18   |

Table 23. MER Scores for Course 2-Session 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1/3 stage</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Movement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/6 stage</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/3 stage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/2 stage</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2/3 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5/6 stage</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 stage</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Stage Movements of MER Scores for Course 2-Session 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Father’s Job</th>
<th>Mother’s Job</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Volunteer Level</th>
<th>Reason to Enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Studies: Sport Performance and Coaching</td>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>Teacher: Bethel Park School District</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>Truck Driver, Farmer</td>
<td>Conservator Educator</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>ED PAES Sports and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>Owner/manager of small business</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>Owner, Bagel Pdlie Inc</td>
<td>Interior Designer</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>Computer Programmer</td>
<td>Chapter I teacher</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>Columbus Public Schools Marketing Teacher</td>
<td>Men’s Basketball Secretary at the Ohio State University</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>Mechanical engineer</td>
<td>Teacher's aide</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>President of Loans Huntington Banks</td>
<td>Counselor at PDHC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>Design/Remodeling Contractor</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Psychology/Pre-med</td>
<td>Manager/Computer Programmer</td>
<td>Art Consultant</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Sports and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>Circulation with Akron Beacon Journal Newspaper</td>
<td>Health and Phys. Ed Director at community center</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Demographical Information for Course 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Realization</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>-8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>-18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>-15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26. SSLI Scores for Course 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>MER Categorical Scores</th>
<th>MER Continuous Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>2-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. MER Scores for Course 3
### Table 28. Stage Movements of MER Scores for Course 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1/3 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Movement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/6 stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/3 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/2 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2/3 stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5/6 stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 29. Demographical Information for Course 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Father’s Job</th>
<th>Mother’s Job</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Volunteer Level</th>
<th>Reason to Enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Family Resource Management</td>
<td>Business Owner/President</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Family Resource Management</td>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td>Elementary School Librarian</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Family Resource Management</td>
<td>Marzettis</td>
<td>Meijers</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Family Resource Management</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Volunteer work/Hostess</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Family Resource Management</td>
<td>Engine builder</td>
<td>1st grade teacher</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Family Resource Management</td>
<td>Retired physician</td>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Family Resource Management</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Commissioner of trademarks for U.S.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Family Resource Management</td>
<td>Drug counselor</td>
<td>Director of curriculum for South Euclid Lyndhurst Schools</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30. SSLL Scores for Course 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Realization</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-1</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-2</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-3</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-4</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-5</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-6</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-7</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>-8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-8</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31. MER Scores for Course 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>MER Categorical Scores</th>
<th>MER Continuous Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-1</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-2</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-3</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-4</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-5</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-6</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-7</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-A-8</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Movement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1/3 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Movement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/6 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/3 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/2 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2/3 stage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5/6 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32. Stage Movements of MER Scores for Course 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Father's Job</th>
<th>Mother's Job</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Volunteer Level</th>
<th>Reason to Enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>HDFS</td>
<td>Chemical Engineer</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>HDFS: early Childhood Education</td>
<td>H.S. teacher</td>
<td>4th grade teacher</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Human Development and Family Science</td>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Middle Childhood Education</td>
<td>Special Education teacher</td>
<td>Medical Assistant</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>HDFS</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Jr. High School Science Teacher</td>
<td>Lab Tech at Hospital</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Bank manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Works at a college (Counselor)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Middle Childhood Education</td>
<td>Environmenta l Engineer</td>
<td>Research coordinator (medical)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Early Childhood Development (HDFS)</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33. Demographical Information for Course 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Exploration Pre</th>
<th>Exploration Post</th>
<th>Exploration Change</th>
<th>Realization Pre</th>
<th>Realization Post</th>
<th>Realization Change</th>
<th>Internalization Pre</th>
<th>Internalization Post</th>
<th>Internalization Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>-9.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>-7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>-8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>41.82</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>47.82</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>70.64</td>
<td>73.91</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. SSLI Scores for Course 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>MER Categorical Scores Pre</th>
<th>MER Categorical Scores Post</th>
<th>MER Categorical Scores Change</th>
<th>MER Continuous Scores Pre</th>
<th>MER Continuous Scores Post</th>
<th>MER Continuous Scores Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>+1/3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>+1/3</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>+1/6</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.0873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35. MER Scores for Course 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 5</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1/3 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Movement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/6 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/3 stage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/2 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2/3 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5/6 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36. Stage Movements of MER Scores for Course 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Father’s Job</th>
<th>Mother’s Job</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Volunteer Level</th>
<th>Reason to Enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Higher Education and Student Affairs</td>
<td>Retired, former professor and university administrator</td>
<td>Retired, former professor and university administrator</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Psychology and Communication Studies (currently in HESA)</td>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Higher Education and Student Affairs</td>
<td>Director of Computing at a university</td>
<td>High School Education</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Higher Education and Student Affairs</td>
<td>General manager of a manufactory company</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Higher Education and Student Affairs</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Personal and professional coach</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Higher Education and Student Affairs</td>
<td>Math professor</td>
<td>retired (was educational researcher)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Higher Education and Student Affairs</td>
<td>Sales person</td>
<td>X-ray technician/stay at home Mom.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Higher Education and Student Affairs</td>
<td>Senior Technological Applications Coordinator</td>
<td>Works with autistic children</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Higher Education and Student Affairs</td>
<td>Sales project engineer</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37. Demographical Information for Course 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Realization</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post Change</td>
<td>Pre Post Change</td>
<td>Pre Post Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.00 38.00 -1.00</td>
<td>41.00 47.00 6.00</td>
<td>77.00 88.00 11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.00 36.00 -1.00</td>
<td>50.00 53.00 3.00</td>
<td>86.00 94.00 8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.00 27.00 -9.00</td>
<td>53.00 51.00 -2.00</td>
<td>94.00 102.00 8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.00 39.00 15.00</td>
<td>43.00 44.00 1.00</td>
<td>79.00 90.00 11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.00 33.00 -5.00</td>
<td>50.00 60.00 10.00</td>
<td>76.00 100.00 24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38.00 33.00 -5.00</td>
<td>59.00 59.00 .00</td>
<td>98.00 109.00 11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.00 37.00 4.00</td>
<td>58.00 66.00 8.00</td>
<td>100.00 107.00 7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.00 39.00 3.00</td>
<td>49.00 54.00 5.00</td>
<td>87.00 94.00 7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>44.00 39.00 -5.00</td>
<td>58.00 62.00 4.00</td>
<td>64.00 75.00 11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>36.11 35.67 -0.44</td>
<td>51.22 55.11 3.89</td>
<td>84.56 95.44 10.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 38. SSLI Scores for Course 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>MER Categorical Scores</th>
<th>MER Continuous Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post Change</td>
<td>Pre Post Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3 3-3 None</td>
<td>3.25 3.21 -0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-3 3(4) +1/3</td>
<td>3.21 3.38 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(4) 3(4) None</td>
<td>3.29 3.29 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-4 4(5) +1/3</td>
<td>4.08 4.29 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-3 3(4) +1/3</td>
<td>3.29 3.46 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4-4 4-4 None</td>
<td>3.88 4.08 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4-4 4(5) +1/3</td>
<td>3.87 4.25 0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4-4 4-5 +1/2</td>
<td>4.08 4.50 0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3(4) 3-4 +1/6</td>
<td>3.38 3.50 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.59 3.77 0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 39. MER Scores for Course 6**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1/3 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Movement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/6 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/3 stage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/2 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2/3 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5/6 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40. Stage Movements of MER Scores for Course 6
Course Descriptions and Classifications

Criteria for Social Justice Focus of Course Design

In this chapter the following criteria from Chapter 3 were used to evaluate whether a course, or the degree to which a course, emphasized social justice in its design:

1. Emphasis on existence of social issues and injustice such as racism, social class prejudice, and structural privilege;
2. Emphasis on complexity of causes of these issues;
3. Emphasis on how to make social change to correct social injustice;
4. Emphasis on dedication to act for social change.

Therefore, in following sections, I first describe the academic content and service component based on the syllabus and interview for each class, and then I analyze the syllabus and interview transcripts for evidence of social justice focus of course design in terms of its academic content, service component, course objectives, reading assignments, writing and other assignments or activities, as well as instructor’s perception of course achievement. The degree to which the evidence can speak of the focus of course design will be determined by its explicitness and the weight it puts on each of the four criteria. The specific questions used to analyze the syllabus and other documents as well as the interview transcripts are as follows.

1. What is the academic content or subject matter of this course? What is the service component of this course? What are the objectives or goals of this
course? Are any of the four criteria included or mentioned in the instructor’s syllabus or instructor’s response in interview?

2. What are the reading assignments for this course? Are there any segments or parts in the readings that are explicitly or implicitly related to each the four criteria?

3. What are the writing assignments and other assignments or activities for this course? Are there reflection journals or essay/paper assignments that involved students to think about things that are related to each of the four criteria?

4. What is the instructor’s perception of the achievement of the course goals? Are they related to each of the four criteria?

In all of these courses students were doing service at locations that were culturally different from themselves, and there were social issues and injustice associated with each site. Hence, for all these courses, there was some exposure to social issues and injustice inherent in each student’s service experience. I took that as a given in each course, the classification of a course was based on the classroom part designed by the instructor.

Overall, based on the analysis done in this session, the six service-learning courses can be grouped into three different levels of social justice focus of course design. The first level is called Non Social Justice Focus (NSJ), that is, there is almost no social justice focus in the course design. This group consists of Course 3 and Course 5. The second level is called Moderate Social Justice Focus (MSJ), that is,
there is some coverage of social justice in the course design according to my criteria. Course 1 was the only course considered to be MSJ. The third level is called Strong Social Justice Focus (SSJ), that is, there is strong emphasis on, and thorough coverage of social justice in the course design. This group consists of Courses 2, 4 and 6.
Description and Classification of Course 1

Based on the syllabus, handouts, and interview with the instructor of COURSE 1, the course description and objectives, reading assignments, writing and other assignments or activities, and instructor’s perception of achievement were described and evaluated against the four criteria of social justice focus of course design. Table 41 is the summary of the evaluation, and following sections give detailed information that is the basis of the evaluation. Based on this summary, this class was classified as Moderate Social Justice Focus, which falls in the between of strong social justice focus and non-social justice focus of course design. Because it extensively covers criteria #1 and #2, but appears not cover criteria #3 and #4 very much; it is not a class that has been designed fully to reflect the social justice focus of course design based on my criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Course Description and Objectives</th>
<th>Reading Assignments</th>
<th>Writing and Other Assignment</th>
<th>Instructor’s Perception of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of social issues and injustice</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of causes of social issues</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to make social change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication to act for social change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41. Summary of Course Design by Social Justice Focus for Course 1
Course Description and Objectives/Goals

In the syllabus

According to the syllabus, this course is about literacy, knowledge, and community. It is designed to give students practice “in the kinds of critical thinking, learning, reading, writing, listening and discussing skills that are essential to academic inquiry.” The syllabus says that,

Since no one lives in a vacuum, how we learn and what we learn depends largely on the communities with which we interact and the varying literacies those communities value. Our knowledge base—and the kinds of knowledge we value—can therefore be said to be contextual, that is dependent on and relative to our unique learning experiences.

Because community plays such an important role in acquisition of literacy and knowledge, the class is designed to investigate the connections between literacy, knowledge, and community, and to identify patterns among these three variables and how they influence the ways people learn.

According to the syllabus, one way of helping college students to learn literacy, knowledge, and community is to form literacy partnership with elementary school students, and this is the service component of this class. The college students,

Work one hour each week outside of class onsite at Trevitt Elementary with one or more first grade student on activities the college students or children’s teachers have planned as a way of helping the children prepare for Ohio’s Fourth Grade Proficiency Test.

The goal is for college students to make connections between their work at the University and what they experience and learn as a Literacy Partner at Trevitt Elementary’s after school program.
The syllabus explains the benefits of the literacy partnership as a “win-win” situation.

The college students’ activities with the children will help the children improve their literacy skills, and the children will help college students to think more consciously about their own reading and writing habits and how they acquired them, the kinds of knowledge that are important in a given situation, and how multiple literacies allow people to interact among many different kinds of groups with relative freedom. Therefore, the college students will not only have the satisfaction of knowing that they have been a role model for their partner(s), they will have created real experiences from which they can learn about society, its expectations, and assumptions, and about the highly varied contexts in which people live.

To sum up, there are three main ideas in course goals in the syllabus: a) literacy skill and writing of children; b) literacy skill and writing of college students; c) awareness of multiple literacies in different communities or cultures and how that affects knowledge. Hence, at least the syllabus goals emphasize some awareness of cultural and social differences on literacy and knowledge.

**In the interview**

When asked about the goals for this service-learning course, the instructor elaborated on the importance of connection and involvement with community. On the one hand, “the students go to the site and do the work and come back and reflect on their experiences, so [the service site] is used as a text for [college students] to write about in the classroom.” The instructor also talked about how the elementary school classroom experience can help to get students involved in the community, kind of outreach to community, create partnerships with public schools in the way that allows the college students to be role models for the school and then to also help Travett accomplish some of the goals that they want to accomplish in terms of getting the students prepared for that fourth grade proficiency test.
For the instructor, community involvement is the important thing because when the students get connected and see how other people are living, it motivates continued volunteering and makes them part of the larger communities and not just of OSU.

Therefore, the instructor emphasized the importance of this course in helping OSU students “practice their readings and writing skills for college” as well as encouraging OSU students to “make connections in the community, so they can hopefully continue with their volunteering.” Hence, there is an emphasis on literacy, community connection and service that she hope will continue after the course.

Conclusion

Overall, the syllabus and interview underscore some awareness of social issues (criterion #1) but nothing in the other criteria.

Reading Assignment

In the textbook

The syllabus introduces the reading materials as “two very different texts.” One book is named Help America read: A handbook for volunteers (Pinnell & Fountas, 1997), which “is a resource book that discusses how students learn about reading and writing, and it offers suggestions [college students] can use to help Trevitt students achieve their goals.” The other book is named Holler if you hear me: The education of a teacher and his students (Mitchie, 1999), which is “a collection of stories about teaching and learning taken from the author’s experience as a teacher and learner in an urban school.” I will describe each book respectively.
help America read: A handbook for volunteers

According to the introduction of the textbook Help America read: A handbook for volunteers, the book “contains everything the volunteer need to make the most of their time tutoring children,” including:

1. Ten specific ways of working with children, with guides and suggestions for each.
2. Many book lists, including multicultural titles, at several grade levels.
3. Concrete suggestions, without assuming that the volunteer know how to perform basic teaching tasks.
4. Sample lesson plans.
5. Time management tips.
6. Basic information on phonics and fluency in reading and writing.
7. Guidelines for working with individuals as well as groups.

Although Help America read mentions that the volunteers are providing a needed service, it basically is a training manual that teaches volunteers how to become an effective tutor. It does not talk about why these needs exist as well as any social injustice that are related to this social phenomenon.

Holler, if you hear me: The education of a teacher and his students

Holler, if you hear me is one book of a series called Teaching for Social Justice Series, and in the Series Foreword, there is heavy emphasis on social justice. For example, it starts with statement of what Teaching for Social Justice means.

Teaching for social justice might be thought of as a kind of popular education—of, by, and for the people—something that lies at the heart of education in a democracy, education toward a more vital, more muscular democratic society. It can propel us toward action, away from complacency, reminding us of the powerful commitment, persistence, bravery, and triumphs of our justice-seeking forebears—women and men who sought to build a world that worked for us all. (Mitchie, 1999, p. xiii)
Therefore, this series focuses on educational practice concerned about democracy and social justice. The Series Forward insists that,

> Education is where we gather to question whether and how we might engage and enlarge and change our lives, and it is, then, where we confront our dreams and fight out notions of the good life, where we try to comprehend, apprehend, or possibly even change the world. Education is contested space, a natural site of conflict—sometimes restrained, other times in full eruption—over questions of justice. (p. xv)

In this book, there are also many places where the criteria for social justice focus of course design are present. There is (a) an emphasis on social issues and injustice such as racism, social class prejudice, and structural privilege; (b) an emphasis on complexity of causes of these issues; (c) an emphasis on how to make social change to correct social injustice; and (d) an emphasis on dedication to act for social change.

An example for criterion #1 is that the author talked about issues of race and class, and compared the situation of his hometown with Chicago where he worked as an elementary teacher. According to Mitchie (1999),

> Charlotte, North Carolina in the early 1970s was a place of court-ordered desegregation, but also a place of tentative reconciliation between blacks and whites. Due to white flight, [the neighborhood] became integrated almost overnight. I walked to school and played ball with as many blacks as whites, [and] had a lot of friends of both race, …. While Chicago was certainly one of the nations’ most diverse cities, it was also arguably the most segregated. In many sections of the city, the ethnic and color lines clearly marked one neighborhood from the next. Poverty seemed both more severe and more widespread than anything I’d seen before. … It was not surprising that many of the city’s public grammar schools were essentially single-race institutions, with almost all their students coming from poor or working-class families. (Mitchie, 1999, p. 3)
An example for criterion #2 is that the author interviewed one of his student, Tavares, who expressed his disappointment with the government. In their conversation, Tavares believed that if the government really wanted to minimize drugs and guns, they could. Tavares felt mad at the government because they claimed that they don’t have money for certain things in the budget on the one hand, but they spent $7 million upgrading a new fighter jet on the other hand (Mitchie, 1999).

An example for criterion #3 is that the author recalled one of his teaching experiences where his students took initiative to “put the school administration and teachers on trial for what the students considered unfair double standards: despite a school rule forbidding food or drinks in class, several teachers apparently thought they were above the law” (Mitchie, 1999, p. 7). To the author, although he had in mind “some of the larger problems that affected students—discrimination, police brutality, erratic city services,” he still loved his students’ action because it also focused on unfair treatment.

An example for criterion #4 is that the author talked about his teaching students about media-related gender issues by showing them how “females are underrepresented to a pathetic degree” and how “language and positioning are used in magazines ads to convey messages about power and control” (Mitchie, 1999, p. 110). However, although the author had hoped “all this would rattle the kids’ sense of fairness, or maybe even make them angry,” the author noticed that his students did not seem to care because they felt powerless. So he started to teach against the sense of powerlessness.
To sum up, the author of the book talked frequently about the social issues, such as, poverty, social class, race, gender, crime, etc. There are also discussions on some causes of these issues, ways to make social changes and dedication to act for social changes.

**In the interview**

When asked what reading assignment has been used to help achieve the course goals, the instructor first confirmed that Help America read is “a text that really kind of training tutors and how to work with young readers.”

According to the instructor, the author of Holler, if you hear me, is a “white guy from south who gives up job in broadcasting to be a substitute teacher in a south side Chicago school.” Therefore, this book was chosen because it could be used to demonstrate how “everybody is a teacher, and everybody is a learner.” Particularly, in this book,

The teacher and students were each becoming literate in the other’s culture. Students were learning about school culture, [the author] was learning about Mexican American culture in Chicago. They are all kind of looking for a way to talk about their identities in a lot of ways. [In addition, the instructor believed that] in a lot of ways, [college] students are doing that and [children] at the service sites were doing that, they are trying to find out what it is to be a student. They don’t know how to do school, they are really trying to define that out, and so the OSU students can help them, because they have been through the system. But at the same time, the OSU students are trying to figure out, since most of them are Freshmen, they are trying to figure out how to do college in the same way the little kids [try to figure out] how to do elementary school.
Therefore, one major purpose of choosing the *Holler, if you hear me* is to show multiple literacies in different communities or cultures and how that affects knowledge. Hence, the interview did emphasize some awareness of cultural and social difference on literacy and knowledge.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the reading assignments satisfy all of the four criteria of judging social justice focus of course design with the first criterion being covered the most extensively and the other three criteria less extensively.

**Writing and Other Assignments or Activities**

**In the syllabus and handouts**

According to the syllabus and handouts, the writing and other assignments or activities for students in this class are: three major writing assignments, weekly journal writing and classroom discussion, and various other assignments and activities described by handouts.

**Major writing assignments**

According to the syllabus, there were three major writing assignments in this course. First, the students were asked to write a “literacy autobiography,” where the students needed to “explore the people, places, and things that have influenced their becoming a ‘literate’ person in society.” Second, the students were asked to “research and write about a topic in public education,” which required students to “gather a substantial amount of objective information on their topic and incorporate it into a
conventional academic argument.” Finally, the students were required to do a group project focusing on their literacy partners.

Among the three major writing assignments, the second one is related to education and social issue. The requirement of “analysis of an issue relative to public education” is as follows: students “might research, for instance, trends in service learning, the history of the state’s requirement for proficiency testing, ‘tutors’ in public school, or arguments on the value of cooperation between schools and communities.” Students were asked to “relate what they discover to the experiences they’ve had as a literacy partner and give reasonable evidence of that success (or need for improvement).” This assignment satisfied both criterion #1 and #2, because it asked students to research on issues within public education as well its complexity.

**Journals writing and classroom discussions**

In addition to major writing assignments, students were also required to write two journals each week. One journal each week was “a consideration of students’ reading assignments for the week,” a second provided “a personal reflection about students’ experiences with their literacy partner each week.” The syllabus requested that students’ journals “should be reflections, where they analyze and evaluate the text/session, rather than a simple summary of what they read or what activities they did with their partner(s).” The syllabus also persuaded students that their journals “are places where they will practice developing their ideas, a number of which may find their way into their final project.”
Students’ written responses to each reading assignment were also scheduled to be discussed in the classroom. In addition, students were asked to go to class “with a written question or comment about something that seemed significant to them in the assignment.” The instructor used these as springboards into discussing the reading.

Because one of the two textbooks, *Holler, if you hear me* is full of social issues, it is very possible that the reflection journals and discussions on the reading assignments have covered social issues, which satisfies criterion #1. The reflection on personal experience with tutored children on service sites also will be helpful in students’ understanding of different culture issues, which also satisfied criterion #1 and maybe criterion #4, because students may become more committed while reflecting on their own experience.

**Other assignments and activities**

Eight handouts were used by the instructor in the class. Three of these handouts are mainly focused on reading, writing, literacy and tutoring, the other five are related to social issues. Among these five handouts, the first one is about the definition of service-learning. In the handout, service-learning is defined as “an effective teaching/learning strategy that intentionally integrates academic learning and relevant community service.” The handout also followed Ernest Boyer and called service-learning as a “scholarship of Engagement” that hopefully promotes the “development of cognitive complexity, citizenship skills, social responsibility, and active learning while responding to pressing issues and needs in the larger society.” Finally, the handout emphasizes that,
On surface, many service learning classes may simply seem to be a way that universities and teachers enlist a captive audience-namely students—to perform “feelgood” publicity stunts for institutional or scholarly praise and recognition; however, well-designed service learning courses create “win-win” situation where learning and social change are generated not just by theory but by human interaction.

This shows that this department is hoping to offer service-learning courses that address social issues and make social changes; however, it is not clear whether each service-learning class can be classified as well-designed course with these goals in mind.

The second handout is a guidance for in-class group work, which asked students to log on Columbus Dispatch website to find a series of articles that focus on a variety of issues in the Columbus City Schools, including funding, teaching, and testing. The students were then asked to choose one article to read and give reason of their choice as well as how this article connected their work at Trevitt.

The third handout asks students to complete sentences stems with at least 6 responses, and the sentences stems are “people think public education is…” “public education really is …” “some big myths about public education include …” “teaching is …” “teaching should be …” “learning is …” “learning should be …” and “what most people miss about the point of an education is …."

The fourth handout is about issues of poverty and children’s situation in America. It asked student to check a list of items to see whether students know how to do things that people live in poverty have to do. It also give statistics about what is happening to children every day in America, such as, number of children die from child abuse, number of children murdered, etc.
The last handout is the Quiz on one of the reading material for this course, *Holler, if you hear me*. On this quiz, students can choose one from three questions to write an essay response, and the last question quoted the author of the book from its

Afterward, which has following statement

> At the core of [teachers’] work is the belief, despite the distressing signs around us, that the world is indeed changeable; that it can be transformed into a better, more just, more peaceful place; and that the kids who show up in our classrooms each day not only deserve such a world, but can be instrumental in helping to bring it about. Their voices are abiding reminders that there is something to hope for in spite of the hopelessness that seems to be closing in around us—something tangible, something real, something in the here and now….

The quiz then asks students,

> What is it about the children whom he has taught that allows Michie (and many other teachers) to keep believing that no matter who the child is, no matter where he or she comes from, s/he deserves an opportunity for education? Michie believes, moreover, that there is hope for changing the world in those children. Using specific examples from the book, show how Michie’s experiences may have led him to write his statement?

To sum up, the assignments described above have covered criterion #1, #2, and #4. The handout of definition of service-learning claimed that service-learning courses should be agents of social change; the handouts on Columbus Dispatch activities, children and poverty issues and understanding of public education raised awareness of social issues and social injustice as well as its complexities; the Quiz on the major reading assignments pointed out the necessities and difficulties of social change but also provided example of people who are dedicated to social changes as the author of the book.
In the interview

Major writing assignment

When asked about writing assignment, the instructor described the three major writing assignments she had her student to do, which confirmed my judgments of these assignments based on the syllabus. The only thing that stood out in the interview about these assignments was that the instructor felt that there was something missing in students’ work of their final project. According to the instructor, most of her students connected their final projects directly to their tutees and “focused on the personal connection more than looked at the service experience as a tool to help them learn in a way they wouldn’t get through traditional classroom.” Because their experience “breaks them out of that, here is the teacher, here are the students, and the teacher lecture to the students kind of mode, and it really does reinforce that collaborative learning environment.” Therefore, the instructor felt that she might “need to treat that a little more formally in the class, so they can have a better understanding of what they have just been through.” Hence, in the instructor’s mind, “collaborative learning environment” was a very important objective that should be achieved by the service-learning strategy in this class; however, it may need to be supplemented by more structural traditional learning activities.

Journal writing and classroom discussion

When asked about students’ journal writing, the instructor described the requirement of the journal writing and gave some examples of how the readings and the journal writing would be good springboard of discussion. These confirmed my
judgment based on the syllabus. In addition, the instructor told me that usually she “simply asked for gut level response, just a reaction paper really, what they thought about, what they read, what we talked about that day,” and there were no specific reflection questions to which students need to respond. Therefore, students’ reflection journal and discussion on the readings may or may not be related to the four criteria and is unstructured. Specific questions may be needed.

In addition to discussion on the readings in the classroom, the instructor told me how they spent time during class time. Usually they did not spend time on a lot of lecture but on discussion. They spent a day each week on the book, on the reading, and the other two days were used to prepare for Travett, to debrief and reflect about it, or to do other activities.

When asked what kind of activities she used, she told me that they spent “a lot of time on Travett, talking about the students and really how college students can help them. The class really gets together, discusses ways to deal with behavior problem.” These discussions were important because college students went to service site and though they were going to teach reading and writing. In fact, they were actually helping elementary students to “learn how to sitting in their seat sometimes for extended period of time.” Therefore, the discussion gave college students the chance to talk about “how learning to do school is a lot more than just learning the subject material.” According to the instructor’s account, the class spent a lot of time on how to do the tutoring in Travett.
Other assignments and activities

After I saw the handouts on poverty, public education and children’s issues as well as the Columbus Dispatch assignment, I asked the instructor how she saw these issues fit into this class, and why she addressed these issues in the class. She told me that,

Travett is in a working class urban neighborhood, so a lot of kids they are working with are living in poverty conditions. They are not always living with their parents, so their experiences are very different sometimes from the experiences of the students who come to my classroom. So it is a way to kind of preparing them for that. And to also take a look at some of larger issues of public education, because the course kind of focus around working with public school.

Furthermore, the instructor hoped that,

Because eventually the students are going to be adults with kids out there, many of their kids will have to go through public school system. Maybe in some way down the road, they will be able to make better choices because some of the information we talked about in the class.

In addition, the instructor also believed that it was also a way to prepare students to do “research and inquiry, the work in academy,” because students were “looking at the context of these two situations. One is to write research paper, the other is to work with children.” In order to “construct an academic paper based on some of those things,” students can “use the service site, they can go on the internet, they can bring in another sources to help support what they are trying to find out more about.” Because college students “got that personal investment with [elementary] students, and they are experts, most of them come through public education system, so they formed some opinions,” the instructor believed that this is a good way to “foster the spirit of inquiry.”
To sum up, the reason that the instructor chose social issues and social injustice was that these are the issues that exist within the settings where the college students provided service. The instructor wanted to prepare her students to do a better service. In addition, because students were involved with these issues on their service sites, the instructor thought these would be a context for students to research on and write academic paper about. Finally, the instructor also wanted her students to be prepared for their adulthood as future parents as well as be aware of larger social issues. Therefore, these conversations suggests that the writing and other assignments or activities for this class heavily covered criterion #1, but not much on other criteria.

**Conclusion**

According to the syllabus, handouts and interview on writing and other assignments or activities, the instructor has introduced social issues through multiple approaches: one of the three major writing assignments is directly related to social issues that are involved public education; journal writing and classroom discussion are on the major reading assignment which is full of social issues; the handouts about poverty and children’s issues; Columbus Dispatch activity; quiz on Holler, if you hear me which addresses social issues. Therefore, the students have been exposed to social issues, complexity of these issues to a very high degree. However, the instructor did not give students specific questions to write about in their journals; therefore, it is not clear, what the instructor expected students to reflect about on the text book in journals. In addition, the primary reasons that the instructor chose all these social issues for
students to learn about was to prepare students for their services and to create context for student to do academic inquiry paper, as well to be aware of the larger social issues.

**Instructor’s Perception of Achievement of Course Goals**

**In the interview**

When I asked the instructor how the service component of this course helped her achieve the course goals, the instructor thought that the service experience helped students to understand the influence of cultural and life experience on literacy acquisition, motivated students to do more volunteer work, and led students to look at the larger social issues and the complexities of these issues. The instructor believed that,

> The fact that this class has service component really helped to keep my students motivated, they were interested in the work they were doing at the site. They started to care the kid so they wanted to know more about the theme of issues in public education or literacy acquisition, things like that. So they were really motivated to do that. They want to go back, they want to give, and they want to work in community.

In talking about students learning about the influence of cultural and life experience on literacy, the instructor believed that the service experience helped because the class talked about

> Roadblocks to learning and highway to learning, things get in the way of learning. Somebody is banging beer bottles on the wall when you trying to figure out how to read and write, it is very difficult. Or your family move three times during an academic year, and you are in three different schools, and you are first grader.

In addition, the instructor believed that the service experience got students “to think about literacy in a way they haven’t thought about before.”
It broadened them to include getting information that you can use the ways that are useful to you, to help you achieve your own goals. Instead of that function of literacy, the ability to read and write, versus, how can I get useful information in order to accomplish my goals so we are able to talk about that in terms of what their own college goals are.

In talking about how students looked at public education differently after this class, the instructor mentioned that,

One student said that he had thought a lot of this stuff when he was coming through school when he was in high school. He never thought about it from the administration side of things, so because we went to look at Columbus public Board of Education site, and we look at the issues in Dispatch, he was able to see, how tough school administrator have it, because sometimes they can’t get the funding they need because the funding depended on taxes. So it was a lot more complicated than he had ever thought.

In addition, although students knew about property taxes, they did not realize that,

Some school districts are just, you have so many money per pupil to spend. Some of the inner city schools [don’t have the money] and it has to do with basically social economic status, so they start to realize that it is really a complicated way to fund education. They start looking at that going, “that is just not right,” “why it can’t be a little more equitable,” “why it can’t be more the same,” “I thought all kids have the same kind of opportunities.”

When I asked her that in addition to talking about the inequality between schools, whether she also talked about why and what can be done to solve this problem. She told me that,

Yes. Even the fact that the Ohio Supreme court has decided that the way that schools are funded is unconstitutional, and this has been going on for seven or eight years on the state. And the legislator still haven’t figured out what to do with it to really make school funding a little bit better. So students get really fired up about that, “why haven’t they figured it out yet,” then we get into this whole political thing about why the politician, what they are really doing, and they are trying to get reelected, they want to keep their jobs. We go into those kinds of things too.
Conclusion

From the instructor’s account, the service experience of the students in this class has not only made students learn about literacy acquisition, more willing to volunteer to help, but also more aware of many social issues that are related to the living situation of the children from the service sites as well as public education. They also have chance to discuss that with their classmates and the instructor in the classroom. However, although their discussions may have touched the social injustice issues and the complexities of the social problems, the instructor did not seem to emphasize how to make social change to correct social injustice as well as dedication to act for social change. For example, when they talked about why the Supreme Court could not make a case to make the school funding evenly distributed, the students were fired up by the inconsequence, but were not given information on the effective ways to make social change. Therefore, the class achievement may cover a lot of criterion #1, some of criterion #2, but only a little of criterion #3.
**Description and Classification of Course 2- Session 1 & 2**

Based on the syllabus, handouts, and interviews with the instructors of Course 2-Session 1 & 2, the course description and objectives, reading assignments, writing and other assignments or activities, and instructors’ perception of achievement were described and evaluated against the four criteria of social justice focus of course design. Table 45 is the summary of the evaluation, and following sections give detailed information that is the basis of the evaluation. Based on this summary, this class was classified as having strong social justice focus in course design, because it covers all of the four criteria to a very extensive degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Course Description and Objectives</th>
<th>Reading Assignments</th>
<th>Writing and Other Assignment</th>
<th>Instructor's Perception of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social issues and injustice</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of causes of social issues</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to make social change</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication to act for social change</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42. Summary of Course Design by Criteria of Social Justice Focus for Course 2-Session 1 & 2
Course Description and Objectives

In the syllabus

According to the syllabus, this course focused on leadership in the context of both service and community involvement. An analysis of the communities in which the service occurs was required along with active participation in the service setting for a minimum of three hours a week. The purpose of this course is to prepare students for a lifetime of engaged, responsible, and active community involvement and leadership.

The syllabus also emphasizes that “the core of the learning experience in this course is community involvement” and “the question of leadership for what purpose will be critically examined through the lens of service and community.” Students were asked to analyze and their own leadership responsibilities, community involvements or lack thereof, and their current and future service commitments.

There are eight primary objectives for this course, which are:

1. To gain an understanding of leadership, community involvement, and the "common good"
2. To understand and utilize concepts informing leadership practice such as self-knowledge, vision, common purpose, commitment, followership, collaboration, empowerment, inclusiveness, controversy with civility, social change, etc.
3. To develop leadership skills and competency through application of leadership concepts in a community setting
4. To understand a community issue from multiple perspectives
5. To integrate service/community involvement experiences with readings on leadership, community, and service
6. To understand and distinguish between community-identified assets and needs from externally defined needs; and to address needs as defined by community agencies through direct service
7. To understand and describe connections and inequities related to power, privilege, community resources, and social justice
8. To develop a personal philosophy of service and community leadership through critical analysis of social issues, reflection, and community involvement

Among these eight objectives, many of them met the criteria for judging social justice focus of course design. Objectives 1, 4, and 7 met criterion #1, which emphasized social issues and social injustice; objectives 4, 7, and 8 met criterion #2, which talked about complex causes of social issues; objectives 3 and 6 met criterion #3, which talked about ways of making social changes; and objectives 4 met criterion #4, which emphasizes personal commitment that can be achieved through reflection.

Each student was asked to select from a list of 5 service sites at which a minimum of 3 hours/week of involvement at the site was required. Discussion groups comprised of all the students at each community service site constituted a central component of class. Each group was facilitated by a site leader/teaching assistant who acted as a liaison between students and their community service site as necessary. The five service sites were as follows:

1. After School Academic Success (ASAP)
2. HOSTS at Medary Elementary School
3. Boys and Gils Club at Medary Elementary School
4. Neighborhood Services, Inc.
5. Project OpenHand – Columbus

All these service sites are involved with social issues related to their services; please see Appendix for detailed description of each service sites.

To sum up, from course goals, objectives, and community service sites selection, this course has met all four criteria for judging social justice focus of course content.
In the interview with the first instructor

When asked about the course goals, the instructor elaborated as follows:

One of the major goals is to help students reconceptualize leadership in terms of thinking about how leadership advances the common good, what is the purpose of your leadership beyond holding positions, to sort of interrupt their notion of leadership for self-interest purposes, how do we connect leadership to advance the work on social justice issues, so it is sort about leadership for social change, that is what it is really about.

One of the other goals of the class is to connect students with social issues that are happening in the local community, and help students begin to find a way to connect their own capacity with making a difference, which includes having them have to deal with themselves in terms of their own identities of race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, they sort of need to confront who they are in the world, and how their identities have help shape the way they move in the world, and that might be different from the people at their service site, and how does that inform them about social issues, and that kind of stuff.

I asked the instructor to explain more about some of the terms she used in her discussion of course goals, terms such as common good, social justice, and social change. The instructor responded as follows:

Well, in terms of common good, I think the way we talked about it, it is a pretty ambiguous terms; it advances doing work that contributes to making the world a better place for people, or issues beyond your immediate scope, to sort of thinking outside of yourself, and advancing doing work that helps make the world a better place more than just you and your little community.

What we mean [by social justice issues] in our class is sort of issues that unfairly disadvantaged people based on things that are beyond their control. So sort of their class status, race, ethnicity, religion, etc., those issues that place people at the bottom end of power differential. And social change is to advance social justice, which means work that addresses that power differential, that says, we recognize that the world is set up to benefit the few with the expenses of many, we need to flip that, we need to make that right again, so helping those people who don’t have a voice, and that sort of bring in justice, to sort of bring the society in balance. I think that is how I would best describe it.
The instructor also illustrated why reconceptualization of leadership in terms of leadership for common good and social justice and the development of self identity are important to this class.

Reconceptulizing leadership is important because … helping people reconceptualize means that we sort of examine where our self-interest is, and what is not good about that, what’s the purpose of your leadership, and then everybody have an ability to make change by leading one way or the other. It is not about people taking control. It is about getting people together and move in a direction, and anybody can do that. So we can get students to think about that, it changes the way they think about being citizens in the world.

She emphasized that our society is unbalanced. Injustice exists and conversations about injustice do not take place very often. In this course this is a central focus of conversation. Because

There are all sorts of people doing things for their own self-interests, and it’s not getting to a very good place, and it’s not what I would think that Boyte would say it is the purpose of higher education in terms of connecting people with being good citizens. That is not what we are after, so it is really directly connected to, if being a good citizen means working on issues that are injustice all over the places.

She emphasized that the course has students start with self examination. The design of course assumes that is where the conversation must start.

People make judgments about why issues exist in this world, and those judgments are necessarily shaped by your life experiences. If you don’t examine how being middle-class, white, female, Christian, if you don’t examine how all those things affect your attitude about issue X, you are going to be moving in a direction that is very filtered, very prescribed, and probably harmful. Because you are not thinking about how being non-Christian in this society affects your access, about how being non-white affects access, how being lower-class affects access, you think everyone is just like you.
This instructor heavily and explicitly emphasizes social issues and social
injustice, complexity of social issues, ways to make social changes, and commitment
to make social changes. All four criteria for a social justice focus are present.

**In the interview with the second instructor**

In the interview with the instructor of the second session, this instructor elaborated on her goals as follows:

For this course in particular, this course is to help students understand service and leadership based on the theories that are used in the class, so I think a lot of students are familiar with leadership concepts and service concepts, but this class is exposing them to theory and encouraging them to relate that theory, and also getting them to look at service not only from their perspectives but also the perspective of the agency, the people who use the service, the taxpayers, other outside sources involved, and really get them to look at the social justice issues revolving around the course and different ones they encountered in the community agency they go to.

When asked about her definition of social justice, she told me that

**Social justice issue in [the] world is the problem we have in society that needs to be rectified in some way. [It] is caused by forces in society that really are inevitable, but yet it is causing these problems, you need to find a way to help them.**

When asked what kind of social issues were involved in this class, the instructor told me the following:

There are a variety of them, it depends on the agency [the students] go to. But there are hunger, homeless, poverty, lack of school funding, nutritional problems especially associated with HIV/AIDS patients, for some of the agencies they go to, illiteracy. There are all sorts of social justice issues that they may be exposed to that they’ve never been exposed to before.

When asked why it is important to make students aware of social justice issues, the instructor told me that by becoming aware of social issues and ways to try to solve them, the students can connect leadership with solving social problems. If students are
going to be a really truly good leader, they need to not only find ways to be good
leaders for their own purposes, but also for society’s purposes. She added that the
course tried to help the students find something that they are passion about and
become committed to that.

To sum up, the second instructor also believes that social justice should be tied
to leadership, and her class also appears to meet criteria for social justice focus of
course design.

**Conclusion**

Based on the syllabus and two interviews with two instructors, this course
appears to meet all four criteria of social justice focus of course design.

**Reading Assignments**

**In the text**

There are two textbooks and one reading packet for this course. The two books
are, *Finding your voice: Learning to lead… anywhere you want to make a difference*
(Matusek, 1997) and *Writing for change: A community reader* (Watters & Ford, 1995).
The reading packet contains forms and handouts as well as four readings. I will
evaluate each of these reading assignments respectively.

**Finding your voice**

In this book, the author disagrees with the idea that present and future leaders
will come only from the world of business or government. Leaders can come also
from “the nonprofit world, the homemakers, nurses, artists, schoolteachers, students,
volunteers, small business people—regular people, who are making impressive strides
toward improving our communities” (Matusek, 1997, p. xiii). Therefore, this book addresses “regular people,” who may not have positions or titles that bring power; but “who are eager to learn more or need to be encouraged to learn more about leadership and followership” (p. xiii). The author hopes that as people read this book, they will discover the self they want to be—or the self they already are—but most certainly the author hopes that people will find their voice and be the self they are meant to be.

In order to help or encourage “regular people” to become citizen leaders, the book includes two parts. The first part is to help people “understand that everyone has the potential to make a difference,” and the second part introduces “essential elements of leadership and followership” as well as “a practical set of tools and examples” for people to use to become effective leaders, that is, to act for social change (Matusek, 1997, p. xiv-xv).

The first part of the book reconstructs the term leadership, helps students discover a passion, examines the bond between leadership and followership, and examines how transcend one’s own agenda so as to support and serve others through leadership. The second part of the book focuses on building power through including others, the need for good communication and listening skills, ethics in decision making, resistance to social change, and the need to commit and take action on their passion.

Therefore, basically, this book encourages people to become leaders and teaches people how to do so. It does encourage people to make a positive contribution to the society and use a lot of examples of citizen leaders who used their leadership to
make the community better. In addition, some of the chapters both encourage changes and teach how to do so. Therefore, when this book is used by instructors who claimed leadership for common good and social justice, the ways to make change and the commitment to action will become pertinent to the criteria of social justice focus of course design. This book meets the criteria #3 and 4.

**Writing for change: A community reader**

This book “has been designed to inform students and to help them reflect on issues that they face as members of their communities” (Watters & Ford, 1995, p. xi). It was used by this class due to its heavy emphasis on community. And the reason that the authors of this book emphasized community is explained in the Preface of the book:

> We all live in communities. As citizens we have an interest in addressing those social problems that undermine the well-being of our communities: homelessness, health care, family policy, educational reform, and environmental protection. As a nation, and as individual citizens, we need to inform ourselves and to think critically about these issues. In our families, our schools, in the work place—at political forums, social groups, religious congregations—we make decisions that help to shape and define our lives. (p. xi)

Therefore, this book is “an issue-oriented reader that provides thoughtful readings on community” (Watters & Ford, 1995, p. xi). Sixty-four readings were grouped into six themes, and the instructors of this course chose fifteen readings for the students to read. Among these readings, three concern Family and Community, three concern Individual and Community, four concern Education and Community, three concern Social and Economic Struggles in the Community, one concerns Health and Community, and one concerns Nature and Community.
All of these readings are about social issues in the society, and how people combat inequality and unfairness. The social issues covered are race, gender, social class, and similar issues. For example, Martin Luther King’s Letter from Birmingham Jail is one of these readings.

To sum up, this book also meets all four criteria for a social justice focus of course design.

Reading packet

There are five articles in this packet. The first one of them is about how to look at community from asset perspective rather than problem perspective. The second one is a commencement address of Jerrey Adler (1991) at University of Maryland, in which, the speaker addressed the importance of taking action and becoming an agent of change. After recalling her voluntary experience as a homeless, she reflected as follows:

Ten hours on the streets forced me to do some thinking. Thinking about myself, about homelessness, and about the society in which I live. The juxtaposition of human conditions shocked me – surrounded on campus by opportunity and hope, yet aware of the reality that existed for some beyond the campus gates. I struggled to understand why and how our society could tolerate such human suffering. In a nation which prizes itself as the wealthiest and freest in the world, people starve, people freeze to death on street corners. Homeless men, women, and children: they bear the right to free speech, only there is no one there to listen; they possess the right to assemble, only there is no place to go. It became clear to me then, and remains clear now: our nation is neglecting our most precious resource, its people. I kept thinking somebody should do something about this homeless problem. Then it dawned on me, I am somebody. (Adler, 1991, used by Course 2 reading package, p. 25-26)

The third article in the package is about “white privilege” which describe how much privilege a white person can have compared to other races. The fourth one is an article
about “relational leadership model,” in which, leader and follower are exchangeable and complement to each other. The last one is about “leadership for social change,” where the author believes that the purpose of leadership should be for social change. Therefore, these readings cover all the criteria for a social justice focus in course design.

**In the interview**

The instructor did not talk a lot about the readings in interview, but one instructor’s comments confirmed my judgment of the readings. She said that,

All the readings either address the leadership theory we advanced, which is Relational Leadership, …. All of the essays they read are about life experiences…, and hopefully challenge students to think differently because these people telling their stories. Some stories may be similar to stories that students have, but probably most of them aren’t.

**Conclusion**

From the texts of the reading assignments of this class, it is clear that they meet the criteria for a social justice focus of course design.

**Writing and Other Assignments**

**In the syllabus**

Students in this class were required to complete service-learning agreements, reflective reaction/question sheets/cards each week, three essays, one letter to their community service site and two presentations.

**Service-learning agreement**

Each students was asked to complete service-learning agreement through a discussion with their site supervisor. This agreement articulates and describes their
service and learning goals for their involvement at their community service site and the activities they will be engaged in during their time there. This assignment may or may not relate to the criteria depending on each student’s choice.

**Reflective reaction/question sheets/cards**

Students were encouraged to keep a personal journal during the course as a way for them to reflect on and make meaning of their service experience at their community site, in class discussion, and through the readings. Students were asked to include “meaningful reactions and insights they have drawn from the previous week’s reading, service, and class involvement along with questions that have emerged.” In their reading packet, Reflective Questions were provided to students based on the reading and themes of each week. For example, for week 6, the theme is, Leadership for a Purpose, and the Reflective Questions for this week are as follows:

1. What are the social issues being addressed by your community service?
2. What are some of the things you have learned about the complexity of the specific social issue being addressed?
3. What purpose did leadership serve in Maya Angelou’s essay? Whose purpose did the leadership serve?

Therefore, not only the readings cover social justice issues, the reflective questions also deliberately ask students to respond to these issues in their journals or discussions.

**Three essays**

Students were asked to write three reflective essays which should reflect an integration of their service-involvement, class discussions, and reading. The theme for the first essay is “Who Am I?” In this essay, students were asked to “discuss who they are in terms of the communities in which you are a member.” More specifically,
students were firstly asked to “think about and describe who they are in terms of race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, ability/disability, religious background, national origin, etc.” Students were secondly asked to discuss “groups/communities that are or have been different for them” as well as their feeling and thinking when they “interacted with others different from themselves.” Thirdly, students were asked to examine the influence of stereotypes on “their sense of others as different and of their sense of self as different,” as well as the impact of non-noticed “privilege or oppression” on “how they experience the world.” At last, students were asked to discuss their self-evaluation as regards to leadership as well as their passions.

The second essay asked students to use the “Relational Leadership Model” to reflect on the process of working as a group in preparation for their in-class presentation. Basically, students needed to “constructively critique their own and their group’s performance in preparing for the presentation and during the actual class time.”

The theme for the last essay is “Now What?” Specifically, students were asked to discuss “how they practice their leadership and for what purpose,” “what they stand for,” as well as “their commitments and responsibilities - as they have been informed by their learning in this class - to them self, to others, to a specific organization(s) they are a member, and to the various communities of which they are a member, or not.”

To sum up, among the three essay assignments, essay two is mainly focused on the leadership model; however, essay one and three are related to social issues and commitment to make social change.
Letter to community service site

At the end of quarter, students were asked to write a letter to their community service site supervisor about what they have learned from this experience after volunteering on a consistent basis for approximately 9 weeks, including what they have brought to – and taken away – from their community service site. This assignment may or may not related to the criteria depending on whether students will include social issues into their letter.

Two presentations

Students were required to do two group presentations, one is in the middle of the quarter, and the other is at the end of the quarter. In the first presentation students were asked to address the particular issue about which their site is focused (i.e. AIDS, literacy, youth development, poverty, hunger, etc.). Specifically, in their presentation, students need to answer questions like “What is the issue? Investigate why the agency you are working with exists. What is the need for this organization? Why does this need exist?” In addition, students were asked to “consider these questions from multiple perspectives: their own, an agency staff member’s, a person who uses the agency’s services, a tax payer, a class member not involved at your site, and others.” At last, students were asked to discuss “what would need to happen for this organization to no longer be needed by the community?” The second presentation focused on “what the group has learned from working at this service site,” as well as “individual learning and insight.” Students were asked to display their learning “creatively through lecture and visual aides.”
To sum up, the first presentation is heavily focused on social issues, causes of social issues, ways to make social changes, which satisfied the first three criteria for judging social justice focus of course design. The second presentation may or may not related to the criteria depending on what the students would choose to present, but it is very possible that students’ presentation were related to the criteria since the readings and emphasis of the instructors for this class.

**In the interview**

In the interviews with the two instructors, their discussions of students’ writing assignments and activities confirmed my judgment about them. In addition, one instructor said that her students “do research on social issue, and work together to do a presentation on it, which points all sorts of issues about what’s hard about working together, what’s hard about being relational, that’s all tying together.”

Another instructor talked about how the classroom time was structured. She told me that during the first hour,

We do lectures to try to add meaning to the readings, sometimes we break into small groups and have them exchange discussion questions about the readings, sometimes we do activities that trying to get them see other points of view and hearing other’s voices. One of the thing we tried to do in the class is to expose them to voices that they may not heard before, like voices of the poor, voices of the oppressed, voices from folks that are dealing with AIDS/HIV, those are some of the examples. We really tried to get them to hear others’ voices. And some of the activities that we do try to really get them to do that, to hear other people’s opinions, to hear others’ voices.

The second hour of the class they meet in small group by those site agency to talk about what they experienced that site that week and also to do different activities that help them get the concepts from the class and help them relate the concepts from the class and readings and service site to make those connections.
To sum up, the instructors have tried to arouse students’ attention to various social issues and the complexity of these issues through their assignments and class activities, this met the criterion #1 and #2 for social justice focus of course design.

**Conclusion**

From analysis of syllabus, handouts, and interviews, the writing and other assignments and activities for this class heavily covered all criteria of social justice focus of course design.

**Instructor’s perception of achievement**

When asked about how the service components helped them to achieve their course goals, the two instructors talked extensively about their perception of the achievement of this course.

**In the interview with the first instructor**

The instructor first talked about how the service component helped students to reconceptulize leadership. She said,

> Being on the community informs them about leadership that seeks to advance the common good, because they are working with the site leaders in the community, so they get to pick people’s brain who are doing the work, …, so the site leaders in the community are really important, as well as the people at the site who may not be officially leaders. It helps them think about leadership in a different way. Because they don’t hold up a leader, the head of the food pantry as a leader for social justice for this world, we hold up the president of USA, we hold up the Mayor, we don’t hold up someone like Barbara. So that’s really important.

Secondly, the instructor also talked about how students’ service experience made them feel different, hence think more about their identities. The instructor said,

> The service stuff is really the key to all of it, because they feel different, they are sort of fish out of water, they are seeing things they never thought about
before, … . At the service site, …, first time they are in the numerical minority, …, they perceive having vastly different life experiences, whereas on our college campus, normally they feel very comfortable. …, and that forces them to ask questions about why I am different, which then forces questions about, I might be white, I might be middle/upper class, I might be Christian, I might not have HIV/AIDS.

Thirdly, the instructor talked about how this class made students to think about social issues and social justice questions, the complexity of these issues, the ways to make social changes. She said,

Connecting students with that [service] work necessarily forced them to ask the questions about why the [service] work has to be done at the first place, so why do we have the need for food pantry, why are people hungry, why aren’t there jobs out there that provide enough money, so asking those questions then help students connect with work that would advance social justice. Because in a just world, their economy would support people such they wouldn’t need to have emergency food assistance.

The instructor also talked about her students’ commitment to these social issues. in their letters to the service site, students often talked about not realizing that they could do something “about what happens in the society, the issues that are hurting people in the society,” and “now they understand that they have a role, they can do something even that is little.”

As to whether her students made connection between their service work and social justice, the instructor had some hesitation. She said: “Yes, I think it does largely. Certainly there are students that don’t get the points at all. They [some of them] begin to see the need to expand beyond themselves, and the sentiment about ‘well, now I might be able to do something’.”
To sum up, this instructor perceives lot of achievements related to each of the first three criteria of social justice focus of course design, but less achievement related to the last criterion.

**In the interview with the second instructor**

In the interview with the instructor of the second session, she also talked about how this class changed students’ ideas about leadership, opened the eyes of the students to various social issues, and helped students relate what they were doing with social justice.

Firstly, the instructor talked about how the service component helped her students learn about the leadership model that this class introduced to them.

A lot of them have said, that they realize that leadership involves more of a group effort than they ever realized before. I think a lot of students were taught that to be a leader, a lot time that focuses on you and how you lead a group and how what you do to really make and shape the group. I think that a lot of students learned that it is better to lead as a group, come up with a consensus and then move forward with your ideas as opposed to just being your ideas and you imparting that to everyone else. I think a lot of them realize that to have a better sense of diversity in this world will help them understand different people better, and the more people you can relate to, the better you will end up being, because you are able to put yourself in someone else’s shoes easier where you can understand where they are coming from, it enables you to lead them better.

Secondly, the instructor talked about how this class opened students’ eyes about various social issues. She said,

I think it [the class] really opens their eyes to the different things that are going on in the world, and I mean the social justice issues that are going on. A lot of these students have never been exposed to poverty at the level that it occurs, …. They have no idea the nutritional needs that folks living with HIV/AIDS encounter. They have no idea of the lack of school funding that exists in the school, in the Columbus area. They have no idea of the poverty and hungry issues that homeless people within the city area living with, they have no idea...
about a lot of these things because they live in this university society where their needs are met and they have roof on their heads.

The instructor also believed that her students had become more committed to community service. She said,

They say, they never realized how much difference they could make doing services. I think they have more of a commitment to doing community services in the world. That is what I heard from a lot of students, like “you know, before I took this class, I knew doing service was good, but now that I have had a consistent place to go every week and can see a progression in what I am doing. Like they are working with a child at school, they can see the child has really improved from week 2 when they start to see them in week 10. Suddenly, they realize that they can make a difference. I think a lot of them come back with realization that “you know, hey, I can make a difference.” A lot of these folks, I think, have done community service, but it is just two hours here, and two hours there, it’s never been consistently, so the consistency has made them realize how valuable services and how much they can really make a difference.

However, as to whether students made connection between their service work and social justice, the instructor responded with hesitation.

I think that would be the ideal, but I don’t know if all the students make those connections. …. I think some of them get it, I think some of them do not get it. I think of them said “I am worried about the leadership model, and I am doing this service, and as long as I do that, I will get a good grade in the course.” Then I think other people make the connections, they suddenly see that “Oh, what we were reading about in the theory we were talking about, this is how I can apply it to my agency.” I think some of them had seen the big picture. Some of them, I don’t think they have seen the picture.

To sum up, similar to the instructor of first session, this instructor has seen a lot of achievement related to each of the first three criteria of social justice focus of course design, but less achievement related to the last criteria.

**Conclusion**

According to the instructors, the service components has not only help their students learned about leadership theory and skills, but also has helped them develop
awareness of social issues, learn about causes of these issues and ways to make
changes, as well as develop commitment to social change. However, both instructors
expressed their hesitations that it is possible that some students did not get these
developments. To sum up, both class sessions met the four criteria of social justice
focus of course design.
**Description and Classification of Course 3**

Based on the syllabus, handouts, and interview with the instructor of Course 4, the course description and objectives, reading assignments, writing and other assignments or activities, and instructor’s perception of achievement were described and evaluated against the four criteria of social justice focus of course design. Table 42 is the summary of the evaluation, and following sections give detailed information that is the basis of the evaluation. Based on this summary, the classification of this class was in the category of non-social justice focus of course design. Because it does not cover any of the four criteria except a little bit coverage of criterion #1 in its reading assignments and writing and other assignments or activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Course Description and Objectives</th>
<th>Reading Assignments</th>
<th>Writing and Other Assignment</th>
<th>Instructor’s Perception of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social issues and injustice</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of causes of social issues</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to make social change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication to act for social change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43. Summary of Course Design by Criteria of Social Justice Focus for Course 3
**Course Description and Objectives/Goals**

**In the syllabus**

According to the syllabus, this course is about the continuous process of motor development and behavior across the lifespan. Students in this class will develop “skills in observation and analysis of locomotor, non-locomotor, and manipulative skill sequences,” discuss “the phylogenetic and ontogenetic factors mediating human growth and development,” and “relationship among growth, maturation, motor performance, and the persons’ context.” Students will also discuss “developmental considerations with respect to planning and directing movement experiences for individuals across the lifespan” as well as “individual and gender differences” with respect to movement settings.

The service-learning experience is described as “a mandatory part of the course” and “consisting of weekly instruction in a community-based early childhood motor skill program or a senior recreation center. Academic concepts learned in class will be applied and utilized in the service-learning setting.” In particular, in the early childhood motor skill program at Hubbard Elementary, students “will instruct motor skills to pre-kindergarten children. The focus of the program is on fundamental motor skill development. Students will directly teach small groups of students under the supervision of a Teaching Assistant & Professor.” In the Senior Recreation Center, students “will work with seniors who attend the senior recreation center. Instruction may range across personal training in the weight room, assisting with strength and
conditioning classes, walking programs, or other related activities. Students set weekly hours with the center.”

Overall, in the syllabus, the objectives of this course are as follows:

1. Identify and apply models of motor development to lifespan movement.
2. Explain the principles of motor development and apply them to the learning and teaching of motor skills across the lifespan.
3. Identify the interaction between the social and cognitive domains and the potential influence on motor development.
4. Identify the movement characteristics and basic skills of individuals from birth through late adulthood.
6. Demonstrate how to use appropriate instruments of motor skills to specific age groups.
7. Discuss the influence of aging on motor skill performance and the implications to movement programming for the elderly.
8. Discuss the impact of physical growth and biological maturity on the motor performance of children, youth, and adults.
10. Develop skills in synthesizing research material in a written, scientific form.
11. Synthesize class content and make applications to the field settings in which the students are enrolled.
12. Conduct a senior or child study applying concepts learned in the course.

In addition, the syllabus also provides students the Guidelines for involvement with the service learning experience. Most of the guidelines are about how students should dress and behavior at the service sites, such as, “students must dress professionally and appropriately for their physical activity setting,” “students must attend the program at their designated time each week,” and “students should act respectfully and responsibly in the setting.”

To sum up, none of the course description, service component description and guidance as well as the course objectives explicitly focuses on any of the four criteria.
The only exception would be the discussion of gender difference, which may or may not relate to social issues and social injustice, the criterion #1.

**In the interview**

When asked about the goals for this service-learning course, the instructor’s responses confirmed my conclusion based on the syllabus because the instructor was most interested in teaching students motor movement and development of children and elder people. She told me that,

> In senior center, UGS (undergraduate students) learn about how the seniors are moving, how much they are deeply scared of movement, or how can they use the machines. If they are in the areas, actually they can apply what they learn in the classroom. If the UGS go to the child lab, we learned a lot of areas, not only movements development, but also cognitive area and social development, nine features, so they learn a lot of specific areas, some areas, they really do not have any experience, because it is not available. Motor development is too much, because students have to learn reflex, rudimentary movements, how to teach applying task analysis and so on, they have to learn about movement skills from the infant to the death. They leaned a lot, but they could only apply to children and seniors.

**Conclusion**

There is no explicit evidence either in the syllabus or in the interview that the instructor has social justice as a focus for this course.

**Reading Assignments**

**In the text**

The major textbook for this course is named *Human Motor Development: A Life Approach* (Payne & Issacs, 2002). This book is written for undergraduate students whose majors are related to motor development, the working definition of which is “the study of the changes in human motor behavior over the lifespan, the
processes that underlie these changes, and the factors that affect them” (Payne & Isaacs, 2002, p. 3). The topics in this book includes: factors that affect development, physical changes across the lifespan, movement across the lifespan as well as how to assess motor development and implement a program.

According to the authors, this book is “influenced by the philosophy that movement impacts and is impacted by social, cognitive, and physical changes in our development. Therefore, separate chapters are allocated to each of these areas of development and how they interrelate with human movement” (Payne & Isaacs, 2002, p. xvii). One of these chapters focuses on social learning theories and socialization where some sections raise gender and age-related issues. However, most of the book does not cover social issues, the causes, or social changes. The following are the most relevant and brief coverage of gender and age issues from Chapter 3. Motor and Social Development.

When the authors discussed the relationship between “gender role identification and movement activity”, they talked about gender typing as follows.

Even though many behaviors once commonly accepted for only one gender are now acceptable for both, many human characteristics are still considered masculine or feminine. For example, 50 percent of college students asked to describe the ideal sex role for children in their care responded by citing dominance, aggressiveness, achievement for boys, and deference, nurturance, abasement for girls (Hamilton, 1977). Similarly, Michael (1970) states that aggressive behavior is acceptable in boys and men. In fact, they may be scorned if they are excessively dependent, whereas the opposite is true for girls and women. This gender typing often produces rigid concepts regarding individuals’ abilities and behaviors and no doubt affects decisions concerning their involvement in movement activity. Gender role conflict is often experienced by girls who seek to participate and boys who do not. Unfortunately, both cases may lead to emotional distress and limit potential by

The authors also talked about social learning and ageism as follows.

Actually, social roles and expectations are learned in adulthood, just as they are in childhood and adolescence. …The individual may be well aware of the need to continue vigorous movement to avoid regression both motorically and physiologically, but society expects adults to become increasingly sedentary with age. In fact, society is often exceptionally protective of the older adult. Unfortunately, stereotypes concerning the aged in the United States are often negative to the extent that they can be referred to as ageism. Ageism is based on a person’s relatively old age rather than race or gender. Like racism or sexism, ageism can lead to discrimination that can become so severe that discriminating members of society avoid or exclude the older adult. This avoidance or exclusion may indicate society’s aversion to the aging process and subsequent death of older adults. This form of discrimination obviously inhibits the older adult’s attempts at becoming an active participant in society. Many older adults are “forced” into a life of inactivity despite attempts to interact, and as a result, their movement capabilities as well as many other behaviors continue to regress. (Payne & Isaacs, 2002, p. 60)

**In the interview**

The instructor did not talk about the text book as a focus but refer to it as she mentioned some concepts taught in the class.

**Conclusion**

In the textbook, when it introduces social learning theory, it talks about the social influence on people’s learning of their social roles in physical activities. In addition, it also talks about social expectations of people with different gender and age regarding the types and levels of physical activities certain people should be involved with. The textbook used “ageism” to refer to the discrimination of the society toward aging people. Gender and age are social issues; however, this coverage is brief and there is no coverage in depth of causes, social changes or individual commitment.
Writing and Other Assignments

In the syllabus and handouts

According to the syllabus and handouts, the writing and other assignments for students in this class are: journal writing, toy assignment, final paper and presentation.

Journal writing

Students in the course were asked to “maintain a weekly journal that they will bring in class to discuss the relative topic.” However, the journal writing is unstructured because no specific questions were used to structure students’ journal writing. Therefore, students’ journal may or may not cover social issues.

Toy assignment

Students were asked to visit a local toy store section in a department store or a toy store to “examine gender-role stereotyping and ethnic stereotyping with respect to the packaging and marketing of toys to children of a specific gender and ethnicity.” Students were also asked to consider the impact of stereotyping on promotion of movement and motor development. In particular, students were asked to,

Fill out information on a data sheet about 5 different types of toys: (1) sports toys, (2) construction toys, (3) sedentary games, (4) make-believe domestic role, and (5) video games. The information include, (1) key marketing phrase (2) color of packaging, (3) age, gender and ethnicity of children pictured or describe pictures on box, (4) what group of children do you think this toy is being marketed.

In their assignments, students also needed to answer following questions:

1. What types of gender and ethnic specific trends did you find for the five categories of toys? Explain your thoughts for each of the 5 toy categories. Provide evidence for your discussion using the data collected in the chart.
2. What role do you think toys play in socializing children into selected choices of activities at home? How do you believe the marketing of toys
facilitates or retards the motor development of specific populations of children? Were you surprised by what you found out during this assignment? If not, why not. If yes, at what were you surprised?

3. You have been assigned to a presidential “Think Tank” on changing the way children’s toys are marketed. How would you change the marketing of toys for children if given the opportunity?

This assignment does help students to process social issues, like gender and race issues, in respect to the impact of stereotyping on promotion of movement and motor development. This covers criterion #1 of social justice focus of course design.

Final presentation and short paper

For their final presentation, students worked as a group of three. Each student answered three questions on one page in a short paper, and then all three students in a group provided a fourth page of answers and how they proceeded to the final answer provided. The questions for the short paper are as follows.

1. Child Lab/Senior Center Experience
   - What did you learn from the child lab/senior center experience? (List three examples with explanation)
   - What is the most useful of information you got form the child lab/senior center relative to your career?
   - How could the child lab/senior center change for the better to enhance your learning experience?

2. Class Experience
   - What are some great concepts that you learned from the lecture? (List three examples with explanation)
   - What’s the most useful of information you got form the lectures/books relative to your career?
   - What concepts did you want to learn more about from the lectures/books?

3. Rationale for learning in the motor development classes
   - Who needs to learn motor development during a person’s lifespan (List three people with explanation)
   - Why is it necessary for them to learn about motor development?
   - What rationales exist for you to learn motor development during a person’s lifespan?
To sum up, among the three questions for the final short paper and presentation, the first question asked students to reflect on their service experience. The second question is focused on classroom learning. The third question is focused on the subject matter of this class, the motor development. However, none of these questions raise social issues explicitly. If students choose to reflect on social issues, it might happen.

**In the interview**

**Journals**

When I asked the instructor whether she gave any questions for students’ journal writing, she told me that she did it last quarter, but this quarter she changed, and didn’t use any questions this quarter. Because she found that when she gave questions, “some students were using questions, and wrote only answers to respond questions last quarter.” This quarter, the instructor did not use questions, and found that,

Some students described setting, and how UG students teach, how children perform motor skills, how children process learning perspective. Additionally, they wrote how they can improve the teaching. Some good students are actually applying what they learned in the classroom to the lab and wrote down reflections.

As responses to students’ journals, the instructor usually gave very detailed feedback.

According to the interview, the journal is unstructured and students’ journal are mainly focusing on motor development of children or elder people that students helped at their service sites as well as applying their learning in classroom to their service. It is not clear whether some students reflect on social issues. If some students choose to do so, it might happen.
Other assignments and activities

When I asked the instructor whether she and the students talked about students’ experience in the classroom, the instructor told me that sometimes, her students were “more likely frustrating with younger children” because they thought the children didn’t want to learn and they did not have patience. Therefore, her students believed that this experience helped them clarify their career direction, that is, they “don’t want to teach children at elementary school.” After telling me this story, the instructor started to regret that she forgot to tell her students that “the children in the elementary school are highly risk children because their social economic status (SES) is very low, so the child came from this school not behavior in usual way.” On the other hand, the instructor mentioned that “if you go to the Riverside school, the children there perfectly interact well and behavior well.”

When I asked further information about the difference between the elementary school the college students went to and the Riverside school, the instructor told me that,

The school we are going, they even do not have any courts, it is very poor area, so many single parents, a lot of African American, downtown area. The children have not been learning about their behavior, so the [college] students were suddenly shocked.

While at the Riverside, “they are very wealthy, and the PE teachers already have equipment and gyms.” And this was why this class did not choose Riverside school to do the service because “they don’t need it.”

When I asked the instructor, whether her students had chance to talk about all these issues, she told me that she did not realize that some student was frustrated by
working with elementary children on their service site until that student mentioned that in his/her final presentation. However, the instructor believed that this was only the “worst case,” because some students did develop “patience, and start to know how to deal with different kind of children, such as, aggressive, not listening to teacher and cry.” She hoped that in future she would remember to “mention this to the UGS that children from different schools are different culture, behavior and so on.”

It is clear from the conversation with the instructor that social issues or social justice issues are not one of her focus of the class. Although she is aware of some social issues around the service sites where her students went to do the service, she did not intent to prepare her students for that, and only realized that she forgot to do so when her students brought that up.

**Conclusion**

From the syllabus and the interview, the writing assignments and other assignments and activities at best only cover the criterion #1 because of the toy assignment and some of the questions for the final presentation and paper. The journal writing is mainly focus on applying readings of motor development to service sites activities. In the classroom discussion, the instructor did not intend to talk about social issues around service sites.
Instructor’s perception of students’ achievement

In the interview

When I asked the instructor how the service component helped her achieve her class goals, she believed that this class helped students develop career skills and clarify career choices. She told me that,

The students like it a lot. Some of them want to be a teacher, so they began to realize what a teacher has to do, how to do a therapy, how to manage a class, or how to motivate children, how to write a lesson plan. They have to consider a lot of things which I previously mentioned, what they learned, all of other stuff they are thinking too. These classes help them develop/concentrate their career choice they have made.

When I asked her what she meant by “other stuff”, she told me that,

Some of them, they go to a senior center, they learn, the diversity is working, so they are not only learning about fitness machines, they also learn to consider other stuff, such as attendance, or budgets of a commonly ignored participant. Some of them, they choose to go to certain areas, they think about how we could make improvement so senior can participate more, so they can be more aware of this.

To sum up, the instructor believed that the service experience helped college students learn about human movement in a real life situation. In addition, the instructor also believed that this class helped students realize diversity issues in the society related to motor movement or development. This may be related to social issues and covers criterion #1. However, there is no evidence that this class cover in depth causes of social issues, ways of social changes, and/or dedication to social changes.
**Description and Classification of Course 4**

Based on the syllabus, handouts, and interview with the instructor of Course 4, the course description and objectives, reading assignments, writing and other assignments or activities, and instructor’s perception of achievement were described and evaluated against the four criteria of social justice focus of course design. Table 43 is the summary of the evaluation, and following sections give detailed information that is the basis of the evaluation. Based on this summary, the classification of this class was in the category of strong social justice focus of course design because it covers all of the four criteria to a very extensive degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Course Description and Objectives</th>
<th>Reading Assignments</th>
<th>Writing and Other Assignment</th>
<th>Instructor’s Perception of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social issues and injustice</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of causes of social issues</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to make social change</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication to act for social change</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44. Summary of Course Design by Criteria of Social Justice Focus for Course 4
Course Description and Goals/Objectives

In the syllabus

According to the syllabus, this course is about “production and allocation of housing and current consumer problems” which “includes service-learning experience related to data collection and analysis and neighborhood development.” The service-learning project for this course is described as follows.

To work with a group of residents from the Weinland Park neighborhood in a neighborhood development process. The residents who were invited to join the group were identified as leaders and as residents committed to the future of Weinland Park neighborhood. The group of residents and OSU students will work through a study of community development implemented in a Boston neighborhood. The group will look for similarities and contrasts between the two neighborhoods and for ideas and strategies that might be useful in Weinland Park. The group will seek to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats or challenges for the neighborhood and think about ways to build on strengths, take advantage of opportunities, reduce weaknesses, and deal with threats. The ultimate goal of the course is to develop community development goals and strategies for achieving goals. Students and residents will produce a report documenting their discussions, decisions, and plans.

Overall, the course objectives are as follows.

1. Understand importance of housing in US society.
2. Identify institutions and special interests involved in the production, maintenance, regulation and distribution of housing.
3. Compare and evaluate alternative solutions to housing problems.
4. Collect, interpret, and report housing data.

To sum up, this course is about housing problem in US society as well as its underlying policies issues and other forces behind this problem. It also stresses neighborhood development and demands that the students get involved in developing a plan for community development. Therefore, this course covers the four criteria of
social justice focus of course design to some degree when housing problem is regarded as a social issue.

**In the interview**

When I asked the instructor about her course goals for this service-learning course, she elaborated several things that went beyond the syllabus and made social justice an explicit focus. First, she told me that she wanted “students to learn about and understand problems that are encountered by at least one segment of the society, mainly low-income people; problems that are encountered within a specific city, inner city neighborhood.” In addition, she also wanted her students to understand that the problem of inner city neighborhoods “also raises the scope of housing policy that has contributed to the current situation, policies that are current in place to try to address some of the housing problems that existed.” And then at last, she wanted her students very specifically in this course to “look at a community-based neighborhood development or neighborhood-based community development process, where the people who live in the neighborhood are very involved in defining goals, and trying to improve their neighborhood and achieve their goals.”

When I asked the instructor why this class chose the low-income, inner city housing as a context, she mentioned about three reasons: (a) given their major focus as on families and studies of families and consumer economics, “it is imperative that students have some exposure to problems of low-income families,” in addition to how to get housing in very high income areas; (b) most of her students have never thought about or have never been exposed to low income families and their housing problems;
(c) when students realize this problem exist, then they need to learn possible ways to address those problems.

As to why she chose the approach of “neighborhood-based community development,” the instructor responded that one reason was that this current approach to the housing problems fits with service-learning.

It certainly facilitates students’ interacting with people in the community, so the students are not only reading in a text book about a particular problem and how it is addressed, they are talking to people who are dealing with these problems on a daily basis and interacting with those people about what they think about it, what they do, what they are actually doing, so the students are getting real world experience that they can play on top of what they are reading in the text book. The textbook gives them some information, and going out to community gives them a context, or those aspects they learned in the book.

As to the nature of the service the students have done, the instructor told me that her students met with a small group from people who live in the community every week to discuss some aspects of community development. Then based on these conversations the students decided on three topics they thought were important, which were, child care, transportation, and employment opportunities. Each group wrote proposal for at least two different programs that could be developed and related to each of those topics.

**Conclusion**

In the syllabus, there is explicit discussion of housing as a social problem, as well as housing policies, and solutions to housing problems. In the interview, the instructor elaborated that this class was about the housing issues that faced low-income people in inner city neighborhood, public policies that influence inner-city
housing, and how the community tried to solve social problems. Therefore, the course covers all the four criteria used to judge a social justice focus.

**Reading Assignment**

**In the syllabus**

Four books or documents were listed as required readings for this course, these are, *Streets of Hope: The fall and rise of a Boston neighborhood* (Medoff & Sklar, 1994), *The encyclopedia of housing* (Van Vilet --, 1998), *The use of oral and written history to build community identity and pride in the Weinland Park neighborhood* (Solove, 2002), and *University District Code Enforcement: An Assessment and Recommendations for Improvement* (The University District Code Enforcement Task Force, the University District Organization, and the City and Regional Planning Program at the Ohio State University, 2003). I evaluate each book or document respectively.

**Streets of hope: The fall and rise of a Boston neighborhood**

According to the Introduction of this book, it is about “an extraordinary story of community rebirth shaped by the dreams of ordinary people of different races and generations” (Medoff & Sklar, 1994, p. 1). The community described in this book is the Dudley Street neighborhood, which is the “Long Boston’s most impoverished area” and as “an inner city neighborhood, like so many around the country was treated like an outside city—separate, unequal and disposable.” However, the book describes how the resident-led Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI) has rebuilt the
community “with the power of pride,” and “a unified vision of comprehensive community development” (p. 1).

Throughout this book, there are many places that talk about social issues and social injustice, complexity of causes of social issues, ways to make social change to correct social injustice, and dedication to act for social changes, which are the four criteria of social justice focus of course design. For example, in Chapter 1 of this book, there are extensive discussions on social issues and social injustice as well as the complex causes of these issues. The social issue is the disparity between inner city neighborhood and suburban. According to this chapter,

The Dudley population is poorer and younger than that of Boston as a whole. Unemployment is at least twice as high and per capita income is half that of the larger city. Dudley’s official poverty rate—more than one out of three residents—is nearly twice Boston’s average. Over a third of Dudley residents are under 18 years old. One out of two Dudley children lives below the official poverty line—a line set well below what is actually needed to buy adequate food, housing and other necessities. (Medoff & Sklar, 1994, p. 3)

As to how this neighborhood came to this situation, this chapter describes how this pattern is repeated nationally, that is,

A thriving urban community was trashed and burned. It was redlined by banks, government mortgage programs and insurance companies in a self-fulfilling prophecy of White flight, devaluation and decline. While tax money subsidized the building of segregated suburbia and upscale “urban renewal,” inner city neighborhoods like Dudley were stripped of jobs, homes and government services. (Medoff & Sklar, 1994, p. 1)

From Chapter 2 to Chapter 9, the book focuses on how the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI) rebuilt the community by utilizing different ways of making social changes and gathering dedicated people to act for social changes. These chapters also describe in detail how the DSNI rebuilt the community neighborhood.
Beginning in the 1980s with a “Don’t Dump on Us” campaign to clean up the vacant lots and close down illegal trash transfer stations, DSNI organized hundreds of residents, forged a new sense of neighborhood identity and power and forced city government to respond. DSNI then turned the traditional top-down urban planning process on its head. Instead of struggling to influence a process driven by city government, Dudley residents and agencies became visionaries, created their own bottom-up “urban village” redevelopment plan and built an unprecedented partnership with the city to implement it. DSNI made history when it became the nation’s first neighborhood group to win the right of eminent domain and began transforming Dudley’s burnt-out lots from wasteland to wealth controlled by the community. Launched with the strong backing of the local Riley Foundation, DSNI developed a growing network of public and private sector supporters. (Medoff & Sklar, 1994, p.4)

To sum up, this book covers all the four criteria for a social justice focus of the course design.

**The use of oral and written history to build community identity and pride in the Weinland Park neighborhood**

In an honors thesis (Solove, 2002), the history of the Weinland Park area, an inner city neighborhood of Columbus is described and analyzed. The study was based upon interviews with ten residents and census data between 1940-1990. This neighborhood is characterized by a high rate of poverty, unemployment, and low-income.

Solove (2002) concluded that Weinland Park area had been a good place to live in the past; however, there were four factors that contributed to the current situation of this neighborhood. The first factor is the population which changed from stable to transient. A transient population resulted in less responsibility and connection among residents within the community. The second factor is the proliferation of Section 8 government subsidized housing in the 1980s, which resulted in new
residents. Some of these residents did not care about the community and committed illegal activities. The third factor is an increase in the number of absentee landlords who do not take care of their properties as needed. The fourth factor is the illegal activities of drug dealing.

At the end of the thesis, several factors that might be useful for the development of this neighborhood are suggested. Among the suggestions are increased supports from the city government and service, motivating the residents to stay in the community by creating sense of hope, and encouraging internal leader and community members to take charge.

To sum up, this thesis identifies social issues affecting this neighborhood and the historical and political factors behind these issues. It also generated ideas for making changes in order to create a better community. Therefore, this document met all the criteria for a social justice focus.

**University District Code Enforcement: An Assessment and Recommendations for Improvement.**

This document is a report studying solution to code enforcement problems that are of concern to University District residents, produced by the University District Code Enforcement Task Force, the University District Organization, and the City and Regional Planning Program at the Ohio State University (OSU) (The University District Code Enforcement Task Force, et. al, 2003, p. 1).

There were four primary code enforcement issues that have been identified through focus groups with University District residents. These issues are trash, parking,
graffiti, and exterior appearance. There were 35 percent of 902 residential properties in the district which showed evidence of one or more of these four enforcement issues (The University District Code Enforcement Task Force, et. al, 2003).

This report also examined “current city code and enforcement policies” and “identified changes needed in order to strengthen the quality of the University District neighborhoods,” and the codes and policies of other cities in order to identify potential policy alternatives. Additionally, this report incorporates solutions suggested by University District residents, and finishes with proposals for both short term and long term solutions to each of the four code enforcement issues (The University District Code Enforcement Task Force, et. al, 2003).

To sum up, this document is focused on “code enforcement policy” to improve the “appearance of the residential neighborhoods” and “the livability of the area” (The University District Code Enforcement Task Force, et. al, 2003, p. 2). This document did not try to address the complex causes behind these issues or ways to change the issues in the sense of its root cause; therefore, this document met the criterion #1 but not #2, 3 or 4.

**The Encyclopedia of Housing**

This book is used by students in this course to check the terms and concepts that appear in reading assignments and class discussions. According to the editor, this book has taken a multidisciplinary approach and used languages that are understandable to people from different disciplines, researchers or practitioners, and experts or lay people.
The assumptions and the approach this book takes to present information concerning housing may be helpful in judging whether it has a social justice focus. According to the editor, housing not only addresses basic human needs, but also “is inextricably connected to questions of redistributive justice and, thereby, to political and economic processes in the wider community and society at larger” (Van Vilet --, 1998, p. xx). In fact, this book has entries about social issues that are related to housing, such as discrimination, redlining, and the homeless from different perspectives. Hence, this book covers social issues and governmental policies related to housing; however, it does so using various perspectives and does not explicitly support any point of view. Therefore, this book met criterion #1 for judging social justice focus of course design.

**In the interview**

When I asked the instructor about the reading assignments, she gave very good summaries of the required readings for this course. She said,

Students read a text book called Streets of Hope. It is really not a textbook, it is a book that is an account of a community development process in a neighborhood in Boston, and each chapter deals with a different aspect of that process, like, planning, organizing, support from the government, funding, actually developing the plan, so each chapter deals with a different aspect, and they read that. In addition, the textbook talked about a process in Boston, to supplement that, they read an account of a collection of oral history for the Weinland Park neighborhood. And this year a study that has been done of Code Violations in Weinland Park neighborhood. So they had those three pieces and then in addition to that, we have supplemental, like I have transparency about data about the neighborhood that I showed them in class.

When I asked the instructor how these readings related to her course goals, she told me that,
The textbook obviously provided them with information related to housing, and housing policy, the role of government in improving housing or in neighborhood development. Also the textbook provided the students with information of how community take control of his own development. And then the other materials gave students background on this neighborhood we are working in. So they were able to see how Weiland Park was similar to the neighborhood in Boston, how it was different, and then think about how some of the ideas that were used in Boston in that neighborhood might or might not work in this neighborhood in Columbus.

When I asked the instructor why “this class is a housing class, but it is also considering some other issues in the neighborhood,” she told me that,

Housing is more than a structure, because house is physically located somewhere. In another word, we take this household, and we move it to a different neighborhood, let’s say we move it to a very low-income neighborhood, it would be a very different house, because where you live. It might be the same house, it might look exactly the same, but the experience of living in that house would be very different, because where you are. So when you are studying housing, you don’t just look at the structure, you look at where it is, and everything around it. They called it a bundle of attributes.

In summary, according to the interview, the reading assignments were used to show students the housing problems, housing issues in low-income neighborhood as well as background information of the neighborhood where the students did their service. Because the nature of housing issues, the instructor believes that it is a necessity for her students to be aware of the social issues around housing as well as how to address these issues. Therefore, the reading assignments cover all four criteria of social justice focus of course design.

**Conclusion**

From both interview and one of the major textbooks—Street of Hope—it is clear that the reading assignments are not only about the social issues that are around the inner-city neighborhood, but also the causes of these social problems, as well as
how to address these social issues to make social change. In Oral and written history, historical and political factors were explored related to an inner-city neighborhood’s situation. In the other book, Code Enforcement, other issues, like trash, parking, etc., are not explicitly related to social structure or political power hence can not be regarded as social justice issues. In the Encyclopedia of Housing, social issues were covered but without explicit stance on political perspective. In overall, the reading assignments met all of the four criteria.

**Writing and Other Assignments**

**In the syllabus and handouts**

According to syllabus and handouts, students in this class were asked to do the following assignments: weekly writing of definition and events based on textbook, one assignment on service site, one assignment based on reading, two reflection papers, and final report on the service project.

**Define terms or list events from textbook**

Students were asked to give written definition of some terms and find out five events and dates about the neighborhood from the book Streets of Hope. The terms from the book may not be defined, therefore, students were asked to look on their own for definitions. Then they had discussion every week about how the words were used, and what the implications were from the readings.

**Assignment on service site**

This assignments asked students in this class, who attended the Godman Guild Annual Meeting, to “engage at least one person who is a resident of Weinland Park in
conversation.” Students were asked to “introduce themselves as a student enrolled in a class meeting at Godman Guild and working with a group of residents to develop possible activities for the neighborhood.” The suggested questions used by students in their conversation with a resident are as follows.

1. What is the major focus of activity in Weinland Park? May include concerns or activities.
2. What kinds of activities are you or your friends involved in? What kinds of activities do you wish were available?
3. How do you typically hear about community activities? Who do you hear it from? Do you always know what’s going on?
4. Students from another course at OSU talked with residents from the whole University area and learned that people had four main concerns about code enforcement—problems with trash, parking, graffiti, and exterior appearance of housing. Are these concerns in Weinland Park? Which of these is of greatest concern to you? Do you have other concerns?
5. What would you like for Weinland Park to look like/be like in ten years?

This assignment addresses some of the social issues facing the neighborhood. It satisfies criterion #1.

**Writing assignment on readings**

Students were asked to write at least a two-paragraph answer for five questions and include references to the Dudley Street experience and connections to their observations/reading and their discussion about the Weinland Park neighborhood. The questions are as follows.

1. Describe characteristics of the Dudley Street neighborhood. How is the decline of Dudley Street explained by Medoff and Sklar? What policies/factors contributed to the decline?
2. What is community organizing? What are potential benefits of community organizing? What strategies are used in community organizing?
3. What is the significance of the carpet in Nelson Merced’s request? How do you think the story would have changed had Riley funded the carpet?
4. What are advantages and disadvantages of a grassroots organizing approach to address housing/community problems?

5. Describe each of the following elements and describe their significance in the success of the Dudley Street initiative: leadership, funding, public support, timing. Which elements appear to be present in Weinland Park? In what way?

6. Discuss the dual processes of planning for short term success and long term vision—how are these concepts accomplished, why is the combination desirable? How could this be implemented in Weinland Park?

7. Discuss the significance of the power of numbers and the importance of building personal relationships in the Dudley organizing plan. How could lessons learned by transferred to Weinland Park?

8. Describe the process and discuss the significance of the “Don’t Dump on Us” campaign.

This assignment asked students to analyze the community development of the neighborhood in the textbook and its connection to the neighborhood they provided their services. It covers all the criteria.

**Midcourse reflection paper**

In the middle of the quarter, the instructor asked students to write a reflection paper based on following questions:

1. Big Picture:
   * Compare the picture of Dudley Street painted in the text with the picture of Weinland Park you have formed from observation, information provided in the history and code report, and conversation/discussion. What are similarities? What are differences?
   * Include some discussion of factors that contribute to urban neighborhood decline and draw on info from the history and code report and from discussion and class information to connect these factors with Weinland park.

2. Smaller Picture
   * Describe your interaction in class with WP residents or participants at the Godman Guild meeting. Compare that interaction with other impressions collected about Weinland Park.
   * What problems have you discovered in WP? What assets have you uncovered?
3. Evaluation

- Is the project that we have planned for the quarter useful to your learning? To your personal development? In what way(s)?
- Is the project potentially useful to the neighborhood? In what way(s)?
- How does the project relate to course concepts?
- How can the learning experience be improved?
- What questions do you have?

This assignment asked students to analyze the factors that contributed to community decline, the problems in the community, and plan projects to address these problems. Hence, it satisfies all the criteria.

**Final reflection**

Students were asked to write a final reflection paper at the end of the quarter, and following questions were provided to students as a guide for their writing.

1. Reflect on our class interaction with representatives of the Weinland Park neighborhood and lessons learned from those persons and your work in developing proposals for action in Weinland Park. Link what you have observed to our class reading and discussions.
2. Describe the current state of the Weinland Park neighborhood. Include data and examples to document your discussion.
3. Design a ten year comprehensive plan for Weinland Park including all the necessary elements for wholistic community development. Your plan can draw on ideas from Dudley Street, our class discussion, and your research for the class project.

This assignment asked students to develop understanding of the community as well as future plans for the community and their personal earning. It satisfies criteria #3 and 4.

**Final report on service project**

The Final Report for this class is the report from each of the three groups working on different topics that address the needs of the community. In the report, students were asked to
Discuss the topic and provide some rationale for the importance and need for resources related to the topic area; present at least two proposals for addressing the topic, describing the suggested program and how it would work, resources needed, benefits; describe barriers to its success and possible ways to overcome barriers; next steps in developing the idea; and possible funding sources.

To sum up, most of the writing and other assignments asked students to make connections of the readings with the neighborhood with which they were working. Students were asked to evaluate the situation of the neighborhood in terms of its problems and strength, factors that influence its development, as well as develop plans for its development. In addition, because the readings are focused on social issues, complex causes, ways to make change and dedicated people working on social changes, it is legitimate to say that these writing assignments reinforce the focuses of the reading assignment. Hence, the writing assignments cover all the four criteria for social justice focus of course design.

**In the interview**

In the interview the instructor talked most about the service project her students had done for the community. As mentioned above, in this service project, the students were divided into three groups to work on the three topics generated by the whole group, which were child care, transportation, and employment opportunities. Students made out a plan on how they could get started and thinking about it. Each group did a proposal, and presented it to a group of neighborhood residents.

As an example, the instructor elaborated the ideas of “ambassador program” that was generated by students who worked on the topic of “employment opportunities.”
This program would employ a person on each block who is a representative of the community. These ambassadors would be paid and their job would be to present information or distribute information to all the people in their block about activities that are going on in the neighborhood, and new program of state social service agency. They might collect information for social service agency about people who are thinking about particular topic. If somebody in the neighborhood has called their ambassador and said, we really have a lot of problems of trash, then the ambassador might work with the whole group of ambassadors, so maybe this whole group together would really do some investigation and learn about what can we do to reduce this trash problem.

Finally, the instructor mentioned that although she was not sure what will happen next, but the idea was that she would probably talk to the residents about which (if any) of the ideas to pursue. Then, they need to implement the ideas selected, probably with the aid of another service-learning class.

From the interview, it is clear that this course has focused a lot on finding solutions to issues and problems concerning the neighborhood they were working with. In addition, the instructor is very committed to this cause as her statement disclosed. Therefore, the assignments of this course satisfied all four criteria of social justice focus of course design.

**Conclusion**

The writing and other assignments asked students to compare the neighborhood in the textbook and the neighborhood they are working with in terms of their problems and assets, history, and of factors that contribute to urban neighborhood decline, which are involved with social justice issues as the reading assignments has suggested. The assignments also asked students to find out ways to deal with these problems as well as make plan for future. Therefore, these assignments cover the four criteria of social justice focus of course design.
**Instructor’s perception of achievement**

**In the interview**

When I asked the instructor how the service component helped her achieve her course goals, she said that first of all “by virtue of being involved in the service, the students get really engaged in the subject matter.” She continued,

They are going to use this information in a project; they really do read the book. When I asked questions in class, they can respond. And when they write, it appeared they read their book. If all the class was assigning a reading, answering these questions, coming to class, it would be a very different class.

In addition, the instructor also believed that the service experience of students fulfilled the “idea of learning by doing” because they went and saw the problems described in the readings. They talked to the people, and the problems and possible solutions came alive. In addition, the students’ prior beliefs and stereotypes often changed.

When I asked the instructor that in addition to help students see the reality, whether the service experience also helped them to critique the policies, the instructor told me that it did in a way. She believed that she had not

Really quite achieved that yet, but it certainly does plant a seed or increase [students’] awareness that policies that have been put into place by the federal government have not necessarily worked very well. And it may give [students] some awareness that they come away with about why [the policies] haven’t worked very well.

The instructor gave me two examples of how and why the federal government policies did not work very well. Urban renewal, for example, does not work well.

The idea of urban renewal sounds like probably a good idea, that you go in, that you have an area of the city that is very depressed, that has no employment, the people have low-income, it’s run down, there is no maintenance, there are
abandon building, there is trash. With urban renewal, the idea is that you go
down, you knock all that down, and you build new modern structures. Well,
OK, on paper, that sounds wonderful, because then they talk about what this
place looks like now, how much better it is, blar, blar, blar. But what they
don’t tell you is, what happen to people that were living there. So one critique
of Urban Renewal is that, it is “Negro Removal”, because often time, the areas
for urban renewal were area where there is very high African American
population. So what they do is to knock down all that housing, put up new
housing that is for upper-income or higher-income people. So the population
that have been there was displaced, they have to go somewhere else to live in
the city. So it didn’t really solve a problem, it moved problem around. So I
think students can see that.

**Conclusion**

From the perspective of the instructor, this class not only helps students see
reality but also helps students learn how to critique public policy in a way. These
satisfy the criteria #1 and #2 of social justice focus of course design.
**Description and Classification of Course 5**

Based on the syllabus, handouts, and interview with the instructor of Course 5, the course description and objectives, reading assignments, writing and other assignments or activities, and instructor’s perception of achievement were described and evaluated against the four criteria of social justice focus of course design. Table 44 is the summary of the evaluation, and following sections give detailed information that is the basis of the evaluation. Based on this summary, the classification of this class was in the category of non social justice focus of course design because it does not cover any of the four criteria except a limited coverage of criterion #1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Course Description and Objectives</th>
<th>Reading Assignments</th>
<th>Writing and Other Assignment</th>
<th>Instructor’s Perception of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social issues and injustice</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of causes of social issues</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to make social change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication to act for social change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45. Summary of Course Content and Focus for Course 5
Course Description and Goals/Objectives

In the syllabus

According to the syllabus, this is a foundation class in reading.

This course provides Early and Middle Childhood preservice teachers with an understanding of the reading process and contemporary theories and issues of literacy learning. This course presents a cognitive-constructivist view of the reading process and a social-constructivist view of teaching and learning. Through this lens, students are regarded as active participants in the learning process, and teaching and learning are socially situated activities occurring in a community of practice or culture. Major themes woven throughout the course include a child-centered philosophy of the teaching of reading and the importance of carefully planning instruction for minority students and other diverse learners with varying literacy backgrounds. An emphasis is placed upon the ways in which effective teachers empower students to become literate within the context of research-based, authentic reading and writing practices.

The course objectives of the students in this course are as follows:

1. Display an in-depth knowledge of the reading process.
2. Articulate knowledge of a social-constructivist view of teaching and learning and apply this knowledge to a range of teaching-learning situations in reading
3. Display knowledge of a range of instructional and assessment approaches for fostering and promoting children’s reading development
4. Make informed judgments about the use and effectiveness of technology to assist children’s reading development
5. Demonstrate an awareness of the needs of children for whom reading presents many challenges

None of the criteria for social justice focus in course design are emphasized in the purpose and objectives of this course.

The community service in this course is a course requirement. The students were asked to perform at least 25 hours (approximately 3 to 4 hours per week) of community service in University District School. Arrangements have been made for student to work at one of many possible school sites. If students were already engaged
in a community-based volunteer effort in reading or if they work with children in reading on a regular basis, they may be able to use that experience to fulfill this course requirement.

The instructor hoped that her student would “have the opportunity to work with children in one-to-one, small-group, and whole-class settings and engage children in a range of activities that foster literacy development.” The syllabus asserts that “students’ service in schools is a core learning experience in the course and is designed to help students make connections between theory and practice, as well as provide students with practical experience with children as readers and writers.”

To sum up, none of the course descriptions, including the service component explicitly focuses on any of the four criteria. The only exception would be the discussion of the “importance of carefully planning instruction for minority students and other diverse learners with varying literacy backgrounds,” which may relate to social issues and social injustice, the criterion #1.

**In the interview**

In the interview, when asked about the goals for this service-learning course, the instructor elaborated on each of the course objectives in her syllabus as well as the importance of these objectives.

Firstly, the instructor told me that one of the big goals is to teach “college students to understand the whole reading process, basically how to teach reading to children.” This objective is important because

These college students are future teachers and they are the ones that are going to be teaching students to read, so they have to know, have an understanding of
how children starts out in the very beginning stage as emergent readers up to the point where they become more sophisticate readers. …. So it is kind of an evolving thing as they go through these developmental stages in learning to read, that’s pretty critical.

Secondly, the instructor talked about the “social constructivist of teaching and learning” and the fact that she wanted her students to use social constructivist in the reading process. The basic idea behind social constructivist is

For the children to be active participants and doing a lot of hands-on kind of reading activities. So the children develop strategies to use when they are reading rather than be passive and sitting there have teacher put this information into their heads. They have to focus on the meaning of what is in their reading, and learn how to use these techniques and strategies and make them their own.

The social constructivist view of teaching is important, because the kids need to be actively involved in their getting the meaning when they read, and so the college students have to be aware of that kind of theory of reading, that view of reading because those are the kind of classroom settings the instructors want the college students to develop when they become teachers and have their own classrooms.

Thirdly, the instructor talked about her “focus on technology and how to use technology in teaching reading.” She said,

Because course technology is changing and evolving all the time, so it is really important to have an understanding of how technology impacts reading and I think technology is one way we can really reach out the struggling readers too, because sometimes they can respond better to computer than they do other kinds of reading support, so sometimes computers can be very useful helping kids that are struggling to read. So that is an important one.

Fourthly, the instructor talked about helping college students “develop an understanding the needs of all young children who are learning to read, how some struggle more than others in the learning to read process, how to identify these struggling readers, and support them the way they need to be supported.” The instructor gave me some reasons for struggling readers:
For example, they might be English as a second language, so maybe that is going to impact their understanding of the English language that might be a factor in hindering their reading process or progress. Other kids maybe don’t have parent who have read to them at home, so they have never been exposed to books. Other children may have some kind of learning problem, they just struggle from the start to learn to read, maybe they can’t learn to spell out a word, maybe they have a fluency problem or something like that.

When I asked about the service sites for this class, it seemed that the instructor was not very aware of the social issues around these service sites. Because the schools were chosen by service-learning coordinator and not the instructor, the instructor did not know how the schools were selected. When I asked whether these schools were urban schools or rural or suburban, the instructor told me that she thought most of them was urban because “there are a lot of them that are in campus area, but a few of them are farther out.”

To sum up, among the five course objectives that the instructor talked about, only the one focused on “the needs of all young children who are learning to read” could be regarded as related to social issues, because it takes into consideration of cultural difference and family difference in terms of their influence on children’s reading ability. This satisfies criterion #1, however, there is no coverage of criteria #2, 3, and 4.

**Conclusion**

There is no explicit evidence either in the syllabus or the interview that the instructor used social issues or social justice issues as focus for the class. However, there are occasions where the syllabus and the instructor talked about needs of
minority students and diversity as well as how to help struggling students to learn reading. These may satisfy criterion #1.

**Reading Assignment**

**In the text**

Two books were required texts for this course; they are *Teaching reading in the 21st century* (Graves, Juel, & Graves, 2001) and *An observation survey of early literacy achievement* (Clay, 1993). I evaluate each of them respectively.

**An observation survey of early literacy achievement**

According to the introduction, the book provides for the systematic observation of children’s responses to classroom reading and writing in the first years of school. The book is intended for the following:

1. Classroom teachers who want to be careful observers of children learning to read and write. It will help to monitor the progress of children in any kind of beginning literacy programme.
2. Teachers who work individually with children having temporary difficulties with literacy learning.
3. Administrators who require teachers to give them easy to read accounts of individual progress made by children between two points of time
4. Students of emerging literacy behaviors who are training themselves to be observers of learners
5. Researchers probing how young children learn about literacy.

In this book, observation is employed as an instructional tool, because

If we attend to individual children as they work, and if we focus on the progressions in learning that occur over time, such observations can provide feedback to our instruction. Observations which lead us to our instruction are particularly appropriate in the formative stages of new learning, as in beginning reading, beginning writing and beginning mathematics. (Clay, 1993, p. 3)
To sum up, this book is basically a book about how to conduct classroom observation in order to improve instruction. Nothing is related to the four criteria for social justice focus of course design.

**Teaching reading in the 21st century**

This book is written for undergraduate students who will become teachers of reading to elementary or secondary schools. The topics in this book include: reading and learning to read, reading instruction, emergent literacy, word recognition, vocabulary development, comprehension of text, independence in reading, teaching for understanding in content areas, writing and reading, reading instruction for English-language learners, classroom assessment and classroom portraits.

Basically, this book teaches pre-service teachers about the reading process and reading instruction to prepare them for their future work. Most of the book does not cover social issues, the causes, or social changes. However, several sections in the book briefly cover social issues. These are brief sections about reading proficiency in USA, teaching English as a second language, and social constructivist view of teaching and learning. Some examples are as follows. In responding to criticisms of US students’ reading skills, one of the authors’ concerns is the disparity among students from different social economic status, because

> The data indicate that certain groups of US students are not as well prepared for school as others and will need help in becoming proficient readers. Most notably, students of poverty—students whose preschool and out-of-school experiences have not prepared them for middle-class schools—are likely to need particular assistance. The reading proficiency of students attending schools in disadvantaged communities lag very significantly behind that of students attending schools in advantaged communities. (Graves, Juel, & Graves, 2001, p. 22-23)
At another place, the authors claimed that “today, many less-advantaged students lack the reading proficiency of their advantaged counterparts. The country cannot survive this discrepancy; we must close that gap” (p. 34).

In talking about the cognitive-costructivist view of reading, the authors of this book said that,

The cognitive-constructivist view of reading emphasizes that reading is a process in which the reader actively searches for meaning in what she reads. This search for meaning depends very heavily on the reader’s having an existing store of knowledge, or schemata, that she draws on in that search for meaning, and the active contribution of the reader is significant enough to justify the assertion that she actually constructs the meaning she arrives at in reading. (Graves, Juel, & Graves, 2001, p. 2)

Therefore, constructivists emphasize how the social world influence the meaning students derive from their experience. Based on this idea, this book allocated a section called “special needs and special talents” in each chapter to talk about anything “can be done to ensure that all students—who school is easy and those for whom it’s a challenge—achieve their highest potential” (p. 34). The author emphasized that,

Different children will arrive at kindergarten, first grade, and every other grade with dramatically different schemata—varied knowledge about the world, about different types of text, about the content of specific subjects, and about school and how it functions. For example, many children who come from the East Coast will have little knowledge of the desert South-west, children who come from other cultures may lack the American cultural knowledge assumed by some narratives, and children from affluent suburbs may have little understanding of inner-city issues. If all children are to succeed, we must take advantage of the varied schemata, and do everything possible to make school relevant to the lives of all children. (p. 34)

The author continued to claim that,
Because most teachers come from mainstream, middle-class backgrounds, recognizing and understanding the differing prior knowledge of students who come from non-mainstream and non-middle-class cultures is particularly problematic and particularly important. Even small differences in background knowledge can sometimes interfere with learning. But many cultural differences are not small. … To be effective in the diverse classrooms of today’s schools, teachers must recognize, understand, and build on the cultural background and practices that children with different backgrounds bring to school. (p. 34)

In talking about learning to read English as a second language in the United States, the authors claimed that “American schools have always been populated with children from diverse linguistic backgrounds, and teachers have had to confront the challenges of linguistic diversity for many years” (Graves, Juel, & Graves, 2001, p. 464). In addition, they briefly reviewed the opposing positions of one nation/one language versus strength in diversity.

To sum up, although there are several places in the textbook talked about influence of cultural diversity on learning to read as well as disparity in reading proficiency among students from different social and economic status, there is no discussion on complex causes of the social issues. However, this textbook does support the idea that teachers should try to change current situation by paying attention to the needs of students from different background and use strategies to make kids fulfill their potential. Therefore, this textbook satisfies criterion #1, 3, and 4 to some degree.

**Conclusion**

One of the major reading assignments, *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*, is mainly a tool for college students to use when they learn how to teach
reading. The other textbook, *Teaching reading in the 21st Century* talked a lot of theories, instruction principles, background information, history and teaching pedagogy. In this second book, the cognitive constructivist is used as a guide for teaching to read. Because this point of view stresses that the teacher needs to take into consideration the background of the students, cultural diversity is an important factor for reading teachers. In addition, when talking about English as second language students, the book talked a little bit about the relationship between language use and immigration, which brought about some issues related to equal treatment to different language. The authors also mentioned several times about the discrepancy in reading proficiency among students with different social class background. The book also talked about the necessity and strategies to take care of special needs of students. Therefore, the reading assignments of this course cover criteria #1, #3 and #4 to some degree. However, no efforts have been made to look into the causes of these phenomena in terms of social structure or political power; therefore, the strategies of making change are limited to classroom activities and individual students rather than in-depth changes of social structures.

**Writing and Other Assignments or Activities**

**In the syllabus**

**Dialogue journal**

The students were asked to reflect upon their school site experiences and keep a dialogue journal. Each week, students needed to provide the date, location, and times of their school visits, a brief statement about the activities in which they participated,
and their reflections of those experiences (approximately 2 pages typed). According to the syllabus,

The purpose of this journal is to prompt [students] to make connections between the literacy theories discussed in their OSU class and the teaching/learning practices seen in their community service placement. Particular attention should be given to the challenges they encounter and the insights they gain into a social-constructivist view of teaching and learning, to link instructional approaches and assessment, to focus on the needs of struggling readers, and the use of technology to support individual students’ reading development.

The students had the opportunity to share and discuss their journal entries and service learning experiences with others in their OSU class. Students were asked to have at least 7 entries total. Because the questions to guide students mainly focused on reading instruction, and there are no questions to guide students to reflect on the social issues around the schools, these dialogue journals may or may not related these social issues depending on what students chose to write.

**Observing and recording a child’s oral reading**

The students were required to take a running record of a child’s reading at their school site, assess his/her comprehension, and record the results. Upon completion, students need to write a report describing their interpretations of the students’ scores based upon their emerging understanding of the reading process. Students were asked to make references to information gleaned from class readings. This assignment is not related to any of the criteria of social justice focus of course design unless observation scores are interpreted in terms of background differences.
**Professional reading**

Students were required to select an article on some aspect of reading from a refereed journal to read, summarize, and present to the class. After reading the article, students were also required to prepare a one-page handout for the members of the class. This assignment is not related to any of the criteria of social justice focus of course design.

To sum up, there is no explicit evidence for social justice focus in any of the writing and other assignments and no criteria has been met. However, in their journal writing, students may or may not reflect on the social issues they have experienced on their service sites.

**In the interview**

In the interview, the instructor elaborated on students’ journal writing as well as how she spent time with her students in the classroom. As regards to journal writing, the instructor emphasized that the dialogue journal that her students had to keep help students make connection between what they covered in the class, what they talked about in the class, and what they were seeing in the classroom setting with actual young children who were learning to read. As to how to make the connections in the journal writings, the instructor told me that she tried to have her students make some kind of social constructivist kind of observation such as, what kind of activity they saw the kids doing, how the teachers were supporting them in this groups, what kind of hands-on activities the young children were doing in their readings. In addition, the instructor also asked her students to do reflection on what went on compared to their
class discussions, whether they agree or gain any kind of insight about what worked, and what didn’t work in terms of the class discussion that week.

In the classroom, the instructor usually spent some time on lecture, some time on whole class discussion and some time on small group activities. The lectures were based on the textbook; the instructor used the textbook to really identify what she wanted to cover in each class session. In the discussion, the instructor used the questions in the Reflection and Application section at the end of each topic in the textbook as discussions questions. These questions are closely related to what is in the textbook. In addition, students also made connections to what they were seeing in their classroom setting when they went to do their school visits. The small group activities were designed by the instructor to have her students to

Do maybe the same kind of activity they would do with children, and have them actually walk through that whole process and do the activity just like they were a child in a classroom. So it is all part of that social constructivist kind of thing, where you actually have them do the hands-on activity, to actually have them experience what is they are doing with the young students so they can get first hand taste of what that’s like.

To sum up, the instructor did not focus on social issues or any other issues that satisfy the criteria of social justice focus of course design in students’ assignments or activities. However, because the classroom discussions and dialogue journals were partly based on students’ service experience, social issues may or may not come up.

**Conclusion**

The instructor did not try to emphasize topics that met the criteria of social justice focus of course design in students’ writing or other assignments and activities. Students’ journals and discussions were mainly focused on how to teach children to
read as related to the theories or techniques taught in the textbook and in the classroom. However, it is possible that their discussions and journals cover some social issues related to their service sites.

**Instructor’s Perception of Achievement**

*In the interview*

When I asked the instructor how the service component were related to her course objectives, she told me that it helped her students develop better understanding of the theories and concepts in the textbook as well as gave her students some sense of teaching in real life situation. In talking about how the service experience helped students develop better understanding of her teaching, the instructor told me that I think everything is about making those connections. When I’m teaching and instructing, then it gives them a chance to go in and look for exactly what we were talking about, so they can see it in action in the classroom. I think it is very critical and helping me accomplish the goals I set up for my course for them to be able to develop this kind of understanding. Otherwise, you just talked about it, they don’t see it. This way, they actually experiencing what it is I am teaching about.

In talking about getting some sense of teaching in real life situation, the instructor told me that,

Mainly they [college students] were working with those students who were really struggling and they could see first hand, the frustration the classroom teacher had, because she is teaching seventh or eighth grade, but it is like she is working with first or second grade readers in some cases. How do you accommodate all these different students in your classroom, you have some that are excellent readers and reading where they should, and then you have others that can’t read the same books. For those students, we have to meet their needs too, and how do you do that.

However, because this is “the first reading class the college students took and it is just kind of introduction to how to teach reading, they don’t at this point have
much experience,” the instructor noticed both excitement and frustration among her students. Some times, the college students got out there, they really helped a student, they just felt great about it, because they thought they were making a difference to this child’s life. But other times, they were frustrated, and kind of scary, because they realized that when they get out and teach, they are going to be dealing with this sort of issues. According to the instructor, her students reflected a lot on that in their journals, like “I am feeling like I am not able to help these students,” “I don’t know enough yet about it.” But the instructor believed that “putting them into school really gives them a different view of what goes on in daily classroom that the teacher has to deal with.”

When I asked the instructor why there were slower readers, the instructor said that,

It happens for all kinds of different reasons. As I said, like English as a second language issue, it might be a really severe learning disability, sometimes students move around a lot, family moved, and they missed out on beginning instruction and so they get behind and get further and further behind. So a lot of college students work in the middle school that had students who had really severe reading problems.

**Conclusion**

The instructor felt that the service component of this class gave her students the real life experience and really helped them understand the concepts they have learned in the classroom and learn what it looks like to work in the real world as well as its difficulties. However, the instructor did not mention anything related to social justice issues that met the four criteria. Even when she talked about the reasons of slower readers, she did not mention any social structure problems that may be underlying these issues. The differences among students seemed to be a given that the
students needed to recognize and try to accommodate. The “why” of these differences was not emphasized, nor was social change.
Description and Classification of Course 6

Based on the syllabus, handouts, and interview with the instructor of Course 6, the course description and objectives, reading assignments, writing and other assignments or activities, and instructor’s perception of achievement were described and evaluated against the four criteria of social justice focus of course design. Table 46 is the summary of the evaluation, and following sections give detailed information that is the basis of the evaluation. Based on this summary, the classification of this class was in the category of strong social justice focus of course design, because it covered all of the four criteria to a very extensive degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Course Description and Objectives</th>
<th>Reading Assignments</th>
<th>Writing and Other Assignment</th>
<th>Instructor’s Perception of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social issues and injustice</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of causes of social issues</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to make social change</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication to act for social change</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46. Summary of Course Design by Criteria of Social Justice Focus for Course 6
Course Description and Objectives

In the syllabus

According to the syllabus, this course

Examines the historical roots, concepts, and principles of practice of service-learning in higher education. The focus of the course is on developing knowledge about service-learning and enhancing skills and competencies for designing service-learning opportunities in higher education as well as for active community involvement.

The syllabus cites the definition of 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. (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5)

The syllabus also emphasizes that the approach of this course is one of service-learning.

In addition to the primary objective of this course which is “to develop an understanding of service-learning,” the syllabus also gives ten specific course objectives, which are:

1. To become knowledgeable about and to increase an understanding of service-learning and community building
2. To engage in a community different from one’s own
3. To examine in-depth issues integral to community involvement and service-learning
4. To encourage active participation in diverse communities
5. To increase an understanding of community-identified assets
6. To integrate discussions on community, diversity, and social justice with service-learning
7. To develop knowledge and skills for designing effective service-learning activities and implementing service-learning programs
8. To provide opportunities and methods for reflection
9. To gain an understanding of an appreciation for multiple perspectives and how power and privilege shape these perspectives
10. To introduce issues related to administering service-learning programs in higher education

Among these ten course objectives, many of them have met the criteria of social justice focus of course design. Objectives 2, 4, and 6 met criterion #1, which emphasized social issues and social injustice; objectives 3, 6, and 9 met criterion #2, which talked about complex causes of social issues; objectives 6 met criterion #3, which talked about ways of making social changes; and objectives 4 and 8 met criterion #4, which encourage active participation in diverse community and emphasized personal commitment that can be achieved through reflection.

Because “service-learning is the core of this course, in theory and in practice,” the instructor wants her students not only “gain knowledge about service-learning through course readings and classroom-based learning,” but also “are engaged in service-learning through active involvement in a community-based project.” While the “the specific focus must involve students in a community different from their own for a minimum of three hours/week,” the instructor gave her students several possibilities for the project to choose from, which are:

1. Direct service at a local community agency/organization, or school (a list of sites from which to choose will be provided).
2. Indirect service with an organization/agency/volunteer group by providing a needed task (i.e., fundraising, newsletter, strategic planning) or assisting in the implementation of a special event (i.e., Columbus AIDS Walk, Race for the Cure)
3. Action research project which focuses on problem solving and change in a particular organization/agency by working directly with people in the organization.
4. Ethnographic interviews with members of a particular community including service providers, community members being served, volunteers assisting and others who are part of the culture of that community organization.
5. Community-based research project that provides a needed service to an organization, school, or agency (e.g., outcomes of welfare reform; school violence; impact of No child Left Behind Legislation) or provides analysis of university projects in the community (e.g., Campus Partners, Service-Learning Initiative, After School programs).

All these five options for service projects have met one or two criteria for judging social justice focus of course content. Option 1 and 2 met the criterion #1 because they address the social issues of service sites; options 1, 2, 4, and 5 met the criterion #2 because they address the complex causes of social issues; option 3 met criterion #3, because it asked students to focus on “problem solving and change.”

In addition to the options of community-based service requirement, the instructor also provided additional guidelines which she hoped that her students would take into consideration as they set up and begin their community service learning experience. The guidelines are as follows.

1. The majority of your service will be in direct service rather than indirect and that you are engaged in a community different from you own.
2. The majority of your time will be spent “doing” rather than watching/observing.
3. Use your service as an opportunity to stretch yourself. You won’t be left hanging on a limb as the class will provide a supportive environment and the structure to process.
4. Remember that good intentions do not always translate into good actions. Keep those for whom and with whom you are serving central in your experience.
5. Come to know and understand the community in which you are working. Take the time to read the local newspapers, learn the issues facing the neighborhood and/or organization and listen carefully to what is being said.
6. Making a commitment to an organization, community, or neighborhood is not to be taken lightly. The organizations and individuals with whom you agree to work will depend on you to fulfill the commitments you make to them.
Among these six guidelines, guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 6 emphasize personal involvement, engagement, and commitment which meet the criterion #4; guideline 5 emphasizes the learning of social issues facing the neighborhood, which meets criterion #1 and 2.

To sum up, according to the course description and objectives as well as community service options and guidelines in the syllabus, this course design has met all four criteria of social justice focus of course design.

**In the interview**

In the interview, I asked the instructor to clarify the meaning of social justice in her syllabus and why she included this as one of her course objectives, she told me that her definition of social justice would be as follows:

Social issues that affect individuals where there’s been a pattern of inequality or injustice that affects certain group of people more so than others. And interest in social justice links both kind of compassion with action. So there is a social change dimension build into social justice.

She elaborated the reason that she incorporated social justice as part of her course objectives as,

I don’t think you can teach service-learning class without addressing those issues. I mean I really believe that service-learning ought to be about more than just reinforcing the status quo, that it ought to be about looking at larger social issues, asking questions like why did these community service organization exist in the first place. And those are social justice issues in my mind.

To sum up, according to the instructor, social justice is a focus of service-learning. It has multiple dimensions, which include awareness of social injustice, complex cause of social issues, ways to make social change, and action to make social
changes. Therefore, it confirmed my judgment of the focus of this course design based
on the syllabus, that is, this course meets all four criteria of social justice focus of
course design.

**Conclusion**

From the syllabus, handout, and interview, this course design has met all four
criteria of social justice focus of course design.

**Reading Assignment**

**In the textbook**

In the syllabus, there are three required textbooks, one required reading
package, and one additional required reading chosen from four alternative books. The
required texts are *Where’s the learning in service-learning?* (Eyler & Giles, 1999),
*Building partnerships for service-learning* (Jacoby & Associates, 2003), and
*Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self* (Rhoads,
1997). I evaluate the reading assignments respectively.

**Where’s the learning in service-learning? (Eyler & Giles, 1999)**

This book is a summary of the findings from several comprehensive research
studies on students who participated in service-learning programs. The purpose of this
book is to provide information to help justify and sustain these programs. Based on
two national research projects, this book covered both the outcomes and processes of
service-learning. After an overview of the learning outcomes of service in Chapter 1,
Chapter 2 covered personal and interpersonal development, Chapter 3 and 4 covered
students’ understanding and applying knowledge as well as the engagement, curiosity,
and reflective practice. Chapter 5 talked about students’ development in critical thinking. Chapter 6 reported perspective transformation of students after they experience service-learning programs. Chapter 7 reported students’ development of citizenship. Chapter 8 is about program characteristics of effective service-learning. The last chapter claim to strengthen the role of service-learning in the college curriculum based on the results of the research projects.

Among these chapters, Chapter 5, 6 and 7 are related to the criteria of social justice focus of course design. In Chapter 5, community problems are called “ill-structured” problems that are difficult to understand and hence they seem to develop critical thinking abilities between pretest and posttest interviews.

Chapter 6 is about “the role of service-learning in helping some students critically examine what they know and ‘put on new glasses’ as they reframed their understanding of social issues and social change,” that is, to make “perspective transformation” (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 131). Although the authors were very aware of the political nature of and the debate about using “social change” as goal for service-learning, they believed that

Service-learning practitioners tend to come down on the side of transformational learning, supporting education that raises fundamental questions and empowers students to do something about them. Many believe that the essence of effective service-learning is in moving students beyond charity to active, committed citizenship. They hope that students will move beyond handing out cans of food to becoming actively engaged in long-term community problem solving. Students who work with community partners to make real changes happen in the community are political actors; this commitment to finding the roots of a community problem and making changes that address those root causes is likely to involve the student in questioning the status quo. It is this questioning of assumptions about how society is organized
and how these assumptions underlie social problems that is at the heart of transformational learning. (p. 132)

In Chapter 7 on Citizenship, the authors introduced three forms of civic participation, which are, political participation, participation in voluntary associations, and generation of social capital. They claimed that

Although we would not devalue individual helping as part of the development of social capital, we would argue that service-learning and higher education in general need to pay attention to the problem-solving capacities of college graduates in order to sustain lifelong constructive involvement in the community. (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 155)

To sum up, three out of nine chapters in this book heavily emphasized the social justice issues related to community service, the complexity of these social problems, problem solving and commitment to make social change. Therefore, this book met all four criteria of social justice focus of course design.

**Building partnerships for service-learning**

This book is mainly about how to build successful and sustainable partnership among higher education institutions, faculty, students, community service providers, and community members in order to achieve the purpose of service-learning.

Because of the emphasis on “how to” establish relationship between higher education and service sites, student affairs and academic affairs, and various campus infrastructures, this whole book is not closely related to the criteria for judging social justice focus of course design except one thing. That is, the benefits the service-learning partnerships are going to maximize. If service-learning relationships are not negotiated, nothing happens.
Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self

This book takes a postmodern position on the challenge of building communities of difference. The purpose of this book is to enhance people’s “understanding of the social processes associated with community service” and to “shed light on how higher learning might be restructured as we struggle to build democratic communities within the tensions and strains of a postmodern world” (Rhoads, 1997, p.2).

The book has eight chapters and, throughout the chapters, there are numerous scenarios and statements about the social issues and social injustice, complex causes of social issues, ways to make social change, and commitment for act for social change, which met all four criteria of social justice focus of course design. One outstanding example is where the author introduces a new concept of service, “critical community service,” which is his effort to “combine a theory of service with a feminist ethic of care and democratic concerns for social justice and equality” (Rhoads, 1997, p. 5). Here is how he discussed about critical community service.

Merely supplying Band-Aids, in and of itself, is not the solution to the plight of the poor. The challenge that faculty, staff, and students leaders face in structuring community service projects is to help students to consider how they might contribute to social change.

Community service that is seen as part of an action/reflection dynamic that contributes to social change is dangerous in that it fosters a desire to alter the social and economic structure of our society. It is political because it questions how power is distributed and the connection between power and economics. This is not the same conceptions of community service that Bill Clinton or George Bush has spoken of and that has emerged as populist sentiment.
The kind of community service suggested in this book—what I call “critical community service”—combines liberatory politics with the action/reflection necessary for the development of a critical consciousness. Critical community service becomes not only political action to alter social conditions, it is also a form of pedagogy capable of transforming students’ and teachers’ understanding of the social world. (p. 201)

Therefore, this book meets all the criteria for social justice focus of course design.

**Required readings packet**

A packet of readings is required of students in this class. There are sixteen articles in this packet. Many of these readings are about social issues and social justice approaches of service-learning, and most of them cover one or more of the criteria for judging social justice focus of course content. A complete listing of readings is included in Appendix. Here is one example from one article.

In *Investigating urban community needs: Service learning from a social justice perspective*, Maybach (1996) questioned the assumptions behind service-learning: “What is the ‘service ethic’ we strive for in service learning?” She argued that “individuals who serve with good intentions, however, without exploring the consequent effects of the service on the service recipient, are perpetuating an oppressive situation in society whether they are cognizant of the oppression or not” (Maybach, 1996, p. 226). The author claimed that

Service and giving must respond not only to the short-term needs of survival, as important as they are. Service and giving must also respond in a way that actually works to remove the barriers that keep these individuals in the margins of society. …Thus, not only must the symptoms of need be addressed in service, so too must the root cause of the need be focused upon in service situations. (p. 229)
The author noticed that in current practice, there is “overemphasis on the service and underemphasis on the remediation of the root causes of need” and she believed that this “would translate to a form of oppressions” (Maybach, 1996, p. 230). The author continued,

This oppression would also be identified in the way that the majority of service-learning programs working with direct service focus on the symptoms of need, which work to pacify the oppressed rather than work to empower them. In other words, the unspoken agenda behind a symptom-only focus may be to “help the needy, but not enough to threaten the status quo.” (p. 230)

To sum up, the required readings in this packet met the four criteria of social justice focus of course design.

**Additional required readings**

In addition to the required texts and articles, each student in this class was also required to select one book from a list of four books. These four books are *Rosa Lee: A mother and her family in urban America* (Dash, 1997), *Nickel and dimed: On (not) getting by in America* (Ehrenreich, 2001), *Ordinary resurrections: Children in the years of hope* (Kozol, 2001), and *My own country: A doctor’s story of a town and its people in the age of AIDS* (Verghese, 1995). According to the syllabus, these books “were selected with specific community service sites in mind.” The instructor’s intention was that her students would “select the book that focuses on issues that are relevant to their specific service site.”

Therefore, these books meet the criterion #1 for judging social justice focus of course design, because they focus on the social issues that are relevant to students’ service sites.
In the interview

In the interview, when she talked about the reading assignments for this class, the instructor told me the following:

The reading probably can be described in two ways. Some of the readings talk explicitly about service-learning, the research on service-learning, the principle of good practice on service-learning, the main concepts in service-learning, the research I have said. And the other reading really looks at the social issues around which the students’ community sites are structured. Many of the course packet as additional required readings, there is a list at the end of what all those are. But many of those readings are really narratives that describe kind of life situations of people who are experiencing the same social issues that are impacting the community service sites where the students are. Then the additional required book selection also selected for that purpose. And I tried to pick books that related directly to service site where students work. For example, My Own Country is a book that looks at HIV/AIDS, one of the community service site, is a AIDS service organization; Ordinary Resurrections is about kids at a after-school program located at a church, one of our site after-school program located at a church; Barbara Ehrenreich’s book looks at people who are working for minimum wage, and many of the people who access food pantries are those people kind of the working poor. So those books then are not explicitly about service-learning, but they are the people that students engaged in service learning will meet at their service site.

The instructor’s description of the additional required book confirmed my judgment of these readings, that is, these books are mainly about the social issues around the service sites the students went and the complexity of these issues.

Therefore, these reading met the criterion #1 and #2.

Conclusion

Based on the text and the interview, it is clear that the reading assignments for this class are explicitly and heavily involved with social issues, complex causes of social issues, ways to make social changes, and commitment to act for social change. Therefore, these readings met the four criteria of social justice focus of course design.
Writing Assignments and Other Assignments or Activities

In the syllabus

The major assignments and activities for this class include community service agreement, three essays, final synthesis paper, and reflection activities.

Community Service Agreement

The students were asked to write a Community Service Agreement that “outlines their goals, activities, and learning objectives for their community-based service project.” Students were required to at least include the following information:

1. Name, place, and mission/purpose of the community organization
2. The work to be done/activities in which you will be engaged
3. Learning outcomes for you—what do you want to learn more about, develop skills in, understand better, new issues exposed to?
4. How will you contribute to the community organization?

This agreement was written by students and discussed with their site supervisor or person(s) in the community with whom they would be working. The instructor asked students to monitor their progress after their objectives were established. This assignment may or may not relate to the criteria depending on each student’s thinking since there is no explicit requirement on learning objectives related to social issues.

Three Essays

According to the syllabus, “each essay assignment is designed to assist students in reflecting upon their learning in the course, particularly as it relates to their understanding of themselves, of diverse communities and of service.” Students were asked to “show evidence of thoughtful analysis, reflection, and integration of reading and experiential learning” in their essays. Essay topics/questions were given out in
advance of the due date and basically “the first essay focused on narrative/autobiography, the second on students’ additional book selection, and the third on application.” The specific requirements are as follows.

The topic for the first essay was “Situating the Self: Community, Difference & Identity.” In this essay, students were required to discuss “who they are in terms of the community in which they were a member. More specifically, think about and describe who they are in terms of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc.” In addition, students were also asked to discuss “how stereotypes influence their sense of ‘Other’ and their sense of self as different, and what understanding of service and community have evolved from their own backgrounds, experiences, and sense of self.”

The focus of the second essay was on the additional book students selected to read. In this essay, students were required to describe:

1. The central theme of the book (briefly).
2. The issues which the book helped to illuminate in the context of community service-learning work.
3. The relationship between who you are (situated self) and your reactions to the life stories of those described in the book.
4. How the book helped to illuminated the issues around which your community service site is structured.
5. How the text can be used in service-learning (i.e., implications for practice).

Particularly, the instructor reminded her students that “this assignment is not intended as a book report; but instead, as an examination of the critical and complex issues that emerge in the context of service-learning through narratives, life stories, and ethnographic research.”
The third essay asked students to design an innovative service-learning program/activity/course on a college campus, and include in their essay “the principles/concepts that would be central to their design.”

To sum up, the first and second essay assignments have explicitly met the criteria #1, and #2, because it involved students to look at social injustice issues, and the complex causes of those issues. The third essay assignment is based on readings which are heavily involved with social issues and social change; therefore, it is very possible that students’ writing will involve the same issues.

**Final synthesis paper**

According to the syllabus, “the final synthesis paper should be substantive with ample evidence of critical analysis, reflection, and substantive integration of course learning, including readings, class discussions, and community-based service.” In addition, students were required to address a set of questions in their papers, which mainly about three aspects.

The first aspect is about understanding of service and community. The instructor wanted her students to discuss whether “their understanding of service and community shifted as a result of their participation in this class,” what is their definition of service, their understanding of community as well as the relationship between service and community.

In the second aspect the instructor wanted her students to talk about is “university and community,” such as, “how service-learning is linked to higher
education and to the creation of community,” “what obligations do universities have to the communities in which they reside,” as well as “how these obligation are best met.”

The third aspect of students’ paper was about students’ personal experience and development through this class. The instructor wanted her students to talk about whether they had any new personal and professional commitments to service-learning, perception different from initial expectation, the new issues and questions for themselves, and new challenges they may have encountered and insights they have gained.

To sum up, this assignment required students to self reflect on the issues that involved with service and the community, their own commitments, and changes that may have occurred within themselves. Therefore, it met all four criteria of social justice focus of course design.

**Reflection activities**

The course handout Guidelines for Reflection expressed the importance of “reflection” for their instructor.

Reflection on your experiences in the community is an essential component of the service-learning process. ... It is reflection that insures the connection between thinking and doing, service and learning. Reflecting on your experiences in the community enables you to add depth to your learning, understand your feeling about your experiences, process your thoughts, reactions and questions about your experiences, and deepen your commitments to community involvement and social responsibility.

Because of the merit and necessity of reflection, the instructor highly recommended her students to “keep a reflective journal to record their observations, feelings, insights,
and learning while at their community service site,” which may “assist in the writing of their essays and final integrative paper.”

In addition, this class required each student to sign up to lead reflection at the beginning of each class for about 30 minutes. Students were also asked to provide a summary of their design “including goals of the reflection exercise, design implementation, readings to which the reflection is linked, instructions for facilitation, and expected learning outcomes” and distribute copies to each class member. The central purpose and focus for reflection activities would be “to assist others in making meaning in their service experiences and in connecting the readings required for the week with the community service work.”

In order to help students conduct effective critical reflection, the handout also gave some general questions that students could use in their design of reflection activities or in their journals. These are “What? So what? Now what?” and the meanings of these are as follows.

1. What -- What did I do today? What did I see? Who did I meet?
2. So what -- What did I learn? What does that mean to me? How do I think/feel about what I’ve done or seen? What questions do I have or were raised by my experience? How has this experience changed my feelings, beliefs, or sense of who I am?
3. Now What – what can I do? How does this change how I look at the world or what I thought I knew? How does this experience influence my commitments to community development or social justice?

To sum up, the emphasis on reflection to make connection between service and learning as well as thinking and doing all pointed to the commitment to community involvement and social justice. Therefore, the reflection activities for this class met the four criteria.
**In the interview and Conclusion**

In the interview the instructor did not elaborate a lot about the assignment. She emphasized the connection between what the students were doing at service sites and what the assignments asked them to do for class. The preceding analysis met all the criteria; hence, the writing and other assignments in this class have met all four criteria for judging the social justice focus of course design.

**Instructor’s perception of achievement**

**In the interview**

When I asked the instructor how was the service component specifically related to her course goals and to achieve those goals, the instructor told me that it helped her to achieve one of her goals, that is, for her students to think critically about “what service is, and what it means to be part of the community.” She told me that

They [her students] previously had little if any exposure or encounters with people whose life situations include things like poverty or homelessness or illiteracy, and when they actually get into community service site, where they are sitting side by side with kids who need help in school, they are not only developing relationship with the kids that helps them personalize the issue of illiteracy, but they began to ask questions about why in this state and age, and I am tutoring a sixth grade kid who can’t read or who doesn’t understand math? So it is because of those direct experience, they began to ask those larger questions.

When I asked the instructor how she helped her students develop understanding of those issues as well as how to solve those issues, she told me that,

Well, those are all things we discussed in class, those kinds of questions bubbled up. And there is kind of convergence of what they are reading, what they are doing and seeing in their community service site and in class discussion that help students think through those issues. As you know, there are no easy answers to those issues, but the fact that students are even thinking
about those issues and thinking about what their responsibilities are, I think it is an important first step.

To sum up, social justice was not only the instructor’s objectives but also one of the course achievements according to the instructor. This confirmed my judgment of this class.
Influence of Service-learning Courses on Social Responsibility and Intellectual Development

The first research question for this study is “what will be the social responsibility and intellectual development outcomes of participating in service-learning courses?” The two hypotheses given in Chapter 3 are as follows:

1. Hypothesis 1: Service-learning courses will result in a significant increase in social responsibility for students who participate.
2. Hypothesis 2: Service-learning courses will result in a significant increase in intellectual development for students who participate.

I will present the results for the two hypotheses respectively.

**Influence of Service-learning Courses on Social Responsibility Development**

This study used the Scale of Service Learning Involvement (SSLI) to measure development of social responsibility. Based on the Service Learning Model developed by Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990), SSLI has three subscales, which are Exploration, Realization, and Internalization. According to the model and previous studies, students who have stronger social responsibility will have lower scores on Exploration, and higher scores on Realization and Internalization. Therefore, a significant increase in social responsibility would mean significant decrease in Exploration and significant increase in Realization and Internalization scores after participating in a service-learning course. Paired t-test was performed for each subscale to see whether there was significant change from pretest to posttest. Results are reported for all the courses.
as one group (Table 47) as well as for each individual course (Table 48 through Table 54).

As shown in Table 47, with an alpha level of 0.05, there was statistically significant increase in Realization and Internalization for the whole group, with $t(71) = 2.152$, $p=0.035$ and $t(71) = 2.839$, $p=0.006$ respectively. However, students’ scores on Exploration did not decrease significantly. Hence, these results were partially consistent with the model and previous studies in that Realization and Internalization increased but Exploration did not decrease. For individual courses, only Course 1 and Course 6 had significant changes from pretest to posttest. As shown in Table 48, there was statistically significant decrease in Exploration for Course 1, $t(10) = -3.561$, $p=0.005$. As shown in Table 54, there was statistically significant increases in Realization and Internalization for Course 6, $t(8) = 3.026$, $p=0.016$ and $t(8) = 6.245$, $p=0.000$ respectively. In both of these courses, however, the number of student was small, with Course 1 at 11 and Course 6 at 9. These numbers are slightly lower than small group statistics usually uses (N=11 or more).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43.20</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49.24</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>51.03</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77.21</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>80.81</td>
<td>13.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01. ***p < 0.001.

Table 47. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for All Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>42.64</td>
<td>7.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>47.09</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76.45</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>16.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01. ***p < 0.001.

Table 48. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for Course 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>43.42</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>55.83</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.83</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for Course 2-Session 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>11.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51.55</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>83.11</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>86.33</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for Course 2-
Session 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69.67</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>72.58</td>
<td>12.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for Course 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.38</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>50.25</td>
<td>6.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>81.88</td>
<td>12.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for Course 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>41.82</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>47.82</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70.64</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>73.91</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for Course 5
Table 54. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for Course 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>55.11</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>3.026</td>
<td>0.016**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84.56</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>95.44</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>6.245</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001.

Influence of Service-Learning Courses on Intellectual Development

This study used Measure of Epistemological Reflection (Baxter Mogolda & Poterfield, 1985, Appendix B) to measure students’ intellectual development. MER is based on Perry Scheme (1970/1999) which divided intellectual development into five stages. Using MER students can get total protocol rating (TRP) both as categorical scores and continuous scores. The scores will range from 1 through 5, the larger the score, the more complex the intellectual development level. According to hypothesis 2 for this research question, I predicted significant increases on students MER scores from pretest to posttest. For continuous scores, I performed paired t-test. For categorical scores, I compared the percentage change for each stage from pretest to posttest. The results of t test for the whole group as well as each individual course are shown in Table 55, the percentage of each stage at pretest and posttest are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 as well as in Table 56.

As shown in Table 55, there were statistically significant increase for the whole group, t (71) = 5.016, p=0.000; for the Course 2-Session 1, t (11)=2.525, p=0.028; for the Course 2-Session 2, t (8)=2.528, p=0.035; and for Course 6, t (8) =
3.588, p=0.007. The total group became more complex and three individual classes had the same results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest M</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Posttest M</th>
<th>Posttest SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole Group</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>5.016</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.736</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2 - Session 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2.525</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.588</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001.

Table 55. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of MER for Whole Group and Each Course

As shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2, from pretest to posttest of the categorical scoring of the MER, there is a shift of MER percentages from less complex stages to more complex stages. To be specific, as shown in Table 56, on the one hand, percentages of students at stages lower than 3-3 have reduced from 9.7% to 5.6% for stage 2-2; from 9.7% to 6.9% for stage 2(3); from 8.3% to 4.2% for stage 2-3; and from 8.3% to 6.9% for stage 3(2). Overall, percentage of students under stage 3-3 reduced from 36.1% to 23.6%, which is a difference of 12.5%. On the other hand, except for 3-4 and 4-4, there is increase of percentage for stages at and above 3-3, from 45.8% to 47.2% for stage 3-3; from 8.3% to 18.2% for stage 3(4), from 1.4% to
2.8% for stage 4(3), and two new stages showed up in posttest, which are 4(5) (2.8%) and 4-5 (1.4%)

Figure 1. Percentage of Stages of MER at Pretest

Figure 2. Percentage of Stages of MER at Posttest
When MER categorical data is used, the stage movements also can be shown in a Cross-tabulation table as in Table 57 for the whole group. In these tables, the diagonal elements are those who stayed at the same stages from pretest to posttest, which have been highlighted. Those who are on the upper-right side of these diagonal elements are people who have made upward movements, and those who are on the lower-left side of those diagonal elements are people who have made downward movements along intellectual development. The percentages of students who made negative movement, no movement, and positive movements have been displayed in Table 58. For students in all the courses as a whole group, 3\% of the students made 1/3 stage negative movement; 60\% did not move. There were 37\% of the students moving upward. To be specific, 23\% of the students moved upward within 1/3 stage,
and 14% of the students moved at or above $\frac{1}{2}$ stage. These amount of change are consistent with previous research on classes designed to increase intellectual development.

Table 57. Cross tabulation of MER Pretest and Posttest Scores for Whole Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MERPRE</th>
<th>MERPOST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>4 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>0 4 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>0 0 2 0 3 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 24 8 0 0 0 0 0 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 4 1 0 0 0 0 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 1 1 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4 5 3 5 34 13 2 2 1 2 1 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 58. Amount of Stage Movement for Whole Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1/3 stage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Movement</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/6 stage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/3 stage</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/2 stage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2/3 stage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5/6 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The second research question for this study is “Does a social justice focus in the design of service-learning courses make differences in terms of outcomes on social responsibility and intellectual development?” and the two hypotheses for this question are as follows:

1. Hypothesis: Courses that focus on social justice will significantly increase students’ social responsibility compared to courses that do not focus on social justice.

2. Hypothesis: Courses that focus on social justice will significantly increase students’ intellectual development compared to courses that do not focus on social justice.

In order to see whether the students’ social responsibility and intellectual development change differently from one group to another group in terms of the focus of the course design, I examined whether they had significant differences in their pretest. However, no matter whether there were significant differences among groups in pretest, I used the pretest scores as covariate to make each group statistically equivalent when I analyzed the posttest scores in order to see the net effect of the focus of course design.

From the analysis of Course Description and Classification, I have concluded that the seven service-learning courses can be grouped into three different level of social justice focus of course design. The first level is called Non-Social Justice Focus.
(NSJ), that is, there is almost no social justice focus in the course design. This group consists of Course 3 and Course 5. The second level is called Moderate Social Justice Focus (MSJ), that is, there is some coverage of social justice in the course design but not thorough according to the criteria. This is Course 1. The third level is called Strong Social Justice Focus (SSJ), that is, there is strong emphasis on and thorough coverage of social justice in the course design. This group consists of Course 2-Session 1 & 2, Course 4, and Course 6.

In following sections, I will first present the effect of social justice focus of course design on student’ social responsibility development measured by SSLI subscales. Then I will present the effect of social justice focus of course design on students’ intellectual development measured by MER.

**Influence of Social Justice Focus of Course Design on Social Responsibility Development**

The one way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), using the three subscales of SSLI pretest scores as dependent variables and group (NSJ, MSJ, and SSJ) as independent variables, was statistically significant (Hotelling trace=0.26, F(6, 132)=2.88, p=0.011). Follow-up univariate ANOVA indicated that differences were significant at the 0.05 level for Exploration and Internalization subscale: Exploration, F (2, 69) =3.23, p=0.046; Internalization, F (2, 69) =4.88, p=0.010. Table 59 shows the cell means for each univariate effect. Follow-up comparisons of the means of subscales with significant univariate effects were conducted. Using Tukey pairwise
comparison with family error rate of 0.05: for Exploration subscale, the mean of MSJ group was statistically significant higher than SSJ group; for the Internalization subscale, the mean for the SSJ group was significantly higher than NSJ group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>NSJ M</th>
<th>NSJ SD</th>
<th>MSJ M</th>
<th>MSJ SD</th>
<th>SSJ M</th>
<th>SSJ SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration*</td>
<td>43.57</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>46.65</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>50.95</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization**</td>
<td>70.13</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>76.45</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>81.71</td>
<td>14.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: MANOVA Hotelling trace=0.26, F(6, 132)=2.88, p=0.011. Univariate ANOVA: Exploration, F (2, 69) =3.23, p=0.046; Realization, F (2, 69) =1.684, p=0.193; Internalization, F (2, 69) =4.88, p=0.010. *p<0.05. **p<0.01.

Table 59. SSLI Pretest Subscale Means by Focus of Course Design

The SSLI pretest scores were used as covariates when performing univariate ANCOVA (Analysis of Covariance) for the posttest of each subscale to test the group effect. After controlling for the pretest scores from each subscale, the group effects were significant for the posttest of Realization and Internalization subscale: for Realization, F (2, 68) =6.76, p=0.002; for Internalization, F (2, 68) = 7.40, P=0.001. Table 60 shows the cell means for each univariate effect. Follow-up comparisons were conducted using Tukey pairwise comparisons whenever the F-test was significant for the univariate ANCOVA. With family error rate of 0.05: for the Realization subscale, the mean for the SSJ group was significantly higher than both the MSJ and NSJ group; for the Internalization subscale, the mean for the SSJ group was significantly higher than both NSJ group and MSJ group.
Table 60. SSLI Posttest Subscale Means by Focus of Course Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>NSJ</th>
<th>MSJ</th>
<th>SSJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>44.61</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>42.64</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization**</td>
<td>47.91</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>47.09</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization***</td>
<td>73.22</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>16.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Univariate ANCOVA: Exploration, F (2, 68) =1.96, p=0.149; Realization, F (2, 68) =6.76, p=0.002; Internalization, F (2, 68) = 7.40, P=0.001.
**p<0.01. ***p<0.001.

In order to see whether students in each group had changed on social responsibility over the course, paired t-test was performed for each group with different degree of social justice focus of course design as shown in Table 61, 62 and 63. An analysis of these tables indicate the following: the non-social-justice group had no significant change on any of the subscales of SSLI; the moderate-social-justice group had significantly decreased on Exploration subscale, t (10) = -3.561, p = 0.005; the strong-social-justice group had significantly increased on Realization and Internalization subscales, t (37) = 2.471, p=0.018, and t (37) = 3.415, p=0.002 respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.57 9.12</td>
<td>44.61 8.09</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.65 8.04</td>
<td>47.91 6.62</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70.13 12.56</td>
<td>73.22 11.05</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(p<0.05\). **\(p<0.01\). ***\(p<0.001\).

Table 61. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for NSJ Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48.55 7.26</td>
<td>42.64 7.47</td>
<td>-3.561</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48.73 9.60</td>
<td>47.09 10.30</td>
<td>-0.837</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76.45 15.84</td>
<td>74.45 16.01</td>
<td>-0.486</td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(p<0.05\). **\(p<0.01\). ***\(p<0.001\).

Table 62. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for MSJ Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41.66 7.32</td>
<td>41.11 8.45</td>
<td>-0.439</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50.95 9.21</td>
<td>54.05 5.97</td>
<td>2.471</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81.71 14.39</td>
<td>87.24 10.92</td>
<td>3.415</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(p<0.05\). **\(p<0.01\). ***\(p<0.001\).

Table 63. Comparison of Pre-Post Measures of Subscales of SSLI for SSJ Group
Influence of Social Justice Focus of Course Design on Intellectual Development

The one way univariate ANOVA using the MER pretest as dependent variables and group (NSJ, MSJ, and SSJ) as independent variable was not statistically significant at 0.05 level. However, pretest scores were still used as covariates when posttest was analyzed for group effect. The one way univariate ANCOVA (Analysis of Covariance) using the MER pretest scores as covariates, MER posttest scores as dependent variables and group (NSJ, MSJ, and SSJ) as independent variables, was also not statistically significant at 0.05 level. The result was close, however, with F (2, 68) = 2.41, p=0.097. Table 64 shows the cell means for the group effect of both pretest and posttest of MER. Although not needed, follow-up comparisons of means were performed to see what made the significant level of univariate F test close to 0.05. Using Tukey pairwise comparison with family error rate of 0.05, no comparison was significant. However, the difference between NSJ and SSJ was close, with t (1, 60) = 2.189, p=0.083.

In order to see whether students in different groups changed in their intellectual level after the service-learning courses, paired t-test was performed for each group. As shown in Table 64, only the SSJ group had significantly improved in their intellectual development measured by MER at 0.05 level, t (37) = 4.530, p=0.000; the significant level of NSJ was close to 0.05, t (22) = 1.971, p=0.061.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>NSJ M SD</td>
<td>MSJ M SD</td>
<td>SSJ M SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>2.87 0.38</td>
<td>2.65 0.47</td>
<td>2.97 0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>2.93 0.39</td>
<td>2.81 0.49</td>
<td>3.14 0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1.971</td>
<td>1.736</td>
<td>4.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Univariate ANOVA of Pretest, F (2, 69) = 2.09, p=0.132; Univariate ANCOVA of Posttest, F (2, 68) = 2.41, p=0.097. 
***p<0.001.

Table 64. MER Pretest and Posttest Means for Focus of Course Design

When MER categorical data are used, the stage movement can be shown in a Cross-tabulation table as in Table 65, 66 and 67 for the three groups with different degree of social justice focus. In these tables, the diagonal elements are those who stayed at the same stages from pretest to posttest, which have been highlighted in each table. Those who are on the upper-right side of these diagonal elements are students who have made upward movements, and those who are on the lower-left side of those diagonal elements are students who have made downward movements along intellectual development.

The percentages of students who made negative movement, no movement, and positive movements in each group have been displayed in Table 68. For Non-Social-Justice group (N=23), there was one student who made 1/3 stage negative movement, 59% did not move, 17% moved 1/3 stage up, and 4% moved ½ stage up. For Moderate-Social-Justice group (N=11), there was one student who made 1/3 stage negative movement, 46% did not move, 9% moved 1/6 stage up, 18% moved 1/3 stage
up, 9% moved $\frac{1}{2}$ stage up, and 9% moved 1 stage up. For Strong-Social-Justice group, no one moved downward, 55% did not move, 3% moved $\frac{1}{6}$ stage up, 26% moved $\frac{1}{3}$ stage up, 8% moved $\frac{1}{2}$ stage up, and 8% moved $\frac{2}{3}$ stages up.

Comparison of the three groups showed that the NSJ group has the least positive movement from pretest to posttest, with only 21% of the students had positive movement in NSJ group, 45% of the students had positive movements in both MSJ and SSJ groups. However, students in the MSJ and SSJ group did not move at the same rate and SSJ group had more dramatic movement. While most of the students (36%) in MSJ group moved upward within $\frac{1}{3}$ stage and only 9% moved above $\frac{1}{3}$ stage, there were 24% of students in SSJ group moved upward within $\frac{1}{3}$ stage, and 21% moved above $\frac{1}{3}$ stage. In addition, 9% of students in MSJ had negative movement, while there was no one in the SSJ had negative movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MERPRE</th>
<th>MERPOST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 65. Cross-tabulations of MER Pretest and Posttest for Non Social Justice Group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MERPRE</th>
<th>MERPOST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 66. Cross-tabulations of MER Pretest and Posttest for Moderate Social Justice Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MERPRE</th>
<th>MERPOST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 67. Cross-tabulations of MER Pretest and Posttest for Strong Social Justice Group
### Table 68. Amount of Stage Movement by Focus of Course Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Social-Justice</th>
<th>Moderate-Social-Justice</th>
<th>Strong-Social-Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1/3 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Movement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/6 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/3 stage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1/2 stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2/3 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5/6 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 stage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Influence of Volunteer Involvement on Social Responsibility Development

The third research question is: “Do students with different levels of previous involvement in volunteer work have different outcomes on the development of social responsibility?” The hypothesis for this question is as following,

Hypothesis: Students who have participated more in volunteer work will have higher level of social responsibility development measured by SSLI.

In answering this question, I have replicated as well as expanded the work done by Olney and Grande (1995). I first presented the analysis of SSLI pretest scores to see whether students with different level of Volunteer Involvement before the class had different level of Social Responsibility measured by SSLI. Then I presented the analysis of SSLI posttest scores using pretest scores as covariates to see whether
students with different levels of Volunteer Involvement changed differently in their social responsibility after the service-learning courses.

The one way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), using the three subscales of SSLI pretest as dependent variables and level of Volunteer Involvement (Never, Occasional, Consistent, and Cause-Oriented) as independent variables, was statistically significant (Hotelling trace=0.93, F (9, 194) =6.66, p=0.000). Follow-up univariate ANOVA indicated that differences were significant at the 0.05 level for each subscale: Exploration, F (3, 68) =2.90, p=0.041; Realization, F (3, 68) =11.11, p=0.000; Internalization, F (3, 68) =10.76, p=0.000. Table 69 shows the cell means for each univariate effect. Follow-up comparisons of the means of subscales with significant univariate effects were conducted. Using Tukey pairwise comparison with family error rate of 0.05: for Exploration subscale, there was no significant pairwise difference among the group means; for Realization subscale, the mean for Never group was significantly lower than the other three groups and the mean for Occasional group was significantly lower than the Consistent group; for the Internalization subscale, the mean for the Never group was significantly lower than the other three groups, and the mean for the Occasional group was significantly lower than the Consistent and Cause-Oriented group.
The SSLI pretest scores were used as covariates when performing univariate Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) for the posttest of each subscale to test the group effect. After controlling for the pretest scores from each subscale, the group effects were not significant for the posttest of any subscale of SSLI at 0.05 level. However, for Internalization, it was close to 0.05, which was $F(3, 68) = 2.64$, $p=0.057$. Table 70 shows the cell means for each univariate effect for posttest. Follow-up comparisons were conducted using Tukey pairwise comparison only for Internalization to see what made it almost significant at 0.05. With family error rate of 0.05, no comparison was significant, but the difference between Occasional and Consistent group was close, with $t(65) = 2.613$, $p=0.053$. 

Table 69. SSLI Pretest Subscale Means by Levels of Volunteer Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Never M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Occasional M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Consistent M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cause-Oriented M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration*</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>40.35</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization***</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>48.30</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>54.24</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization***</td>
<td>51.33</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>74.65</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>100.67</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: MANOVA Hotelling trace=0.93, $F(9, 194)=6.66$, $p=0.000$. Univariate ANOVA: Exploration, $F(3, 68) = 2.90$, $p=0.041$; Realization, $F(3, 68) = 11.11$, $p=0.000$; Internalization, $F(3, 68) = 10.76$, $p=0.000$.

*p<0.05. ***p<0.001.
Table 70. SSLI Posttest Subscale Means for Volunteer Involvement

The decreasing trend of Exploration and increasing trends of Realization and Internalization across the four conditions for both pretest and posttest are shown in Figure 3, 4, and 5.

Figure 3. Means of Exploration Pretest and Posttest by Levels of Volunteer Involvement
Figure 4. Means of Realization Pretest and Posttest by Levels of Volunteer Involvement

Figure 5. Means of Internalization Pretest and Posttest by Levels of Volunteer Involvement
Because of the small sample size of Never and Cause-oriented groups, further analyses focused only on Occasional and Consistent groups. At pretest, these two groups followed the decreasing trend on Exploration subscale and the increasing trend on Realization and Internalization subscales. However, the changes from pretest to posttest on each subscale are different for Occasional and Consistent groups. Analyses of posttest scores of Occasional and Consistent groups were performed using pretest scores as covariates to see whether these two groups changed differently from pretest to posttest. Results of ANCOVA showed that the rates of changes for these two groups were not significantly different on Exploration and Realization subscales, with F (1, 63) = 0.534, p = 0.467 and F (1, 63) = 0.296, p = 0.588 respectively. But the rates of change for these two groups were significantly different on Internalization subscale, with F (1, 63) = 6.331 and p = 0.014. Paired t-test showed, that for Exploration subscale, both Occasional group and Consistent group decreased, but none of these changes was significant at 0.05 level. For the Realization subscale, while the Occasional group increased significantly, t (48) = 2.181, p = 0.034, the change of Consistent group was not significant. For the Internalization subscale, while the Consistent group increased significantly, t (16) = 2.158, p=0.046, the change of Occasional group was not significant.

In order to differentiate the influence of volunteer involvement and social justice focus of course design in students’ development of social responsibility, further analyses were done. Table 71 is the cross tabulation across the degrees of Social
Justice Focus in Course Design and two levels of volunteer involvement. From this table, it shows that while students in NSJ and MSJ were more likely to be in the Occasional group than expected, students in SSJ were more likely to be in the Consistent group than expected. The chi-squared test showed almost significant results with chi-squared (2, N=66) = 5.81, p = 0.055.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Volunteer Involvement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSJ</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSJ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSJ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 71. Cross-tabulation of Social Justice Focus in Course Design and Two Levels of Volunteer Involvement

In order to see whether Volunteer Involvement and Social Justice Focus are two different sources associated with students’ development of social responsibility, two kinds of analyses are needed. First, students in the courses with same level of social justice focus need to be compared between Occasional group and Consistent group to see whether Volunteer Involvement has any effect. Second, students with same Volunteer Involvement level need to be compared between NSJ, MSJ and SSJ to see whether levels of social justice focus have an effect. Because number of students in NSJ-Consistent and MSJ-Consistent are too small (N=3 and N=1 respectively), analyses were done only for students in courses with different levels of social justice.
focus for the Occasional group, and students with different Volunteer Involvement in courses with strong social justice focus (SSJ).

In order to see whether levels of social justice focus made a difference for students with same Volunteer Involvement level, Table 72 and 73 show the SSLI pretest and posttest subscales means for Occasional group in courses with different levels of social justice focus. For each subscale, pretest scores were used as covariates, and posttest scores were analyzed using ANCOVA to see whether students who were in the Occasional group changed differently because they were in courses with different levels of social justice focus. The results showed significant effect of social justice focus in course design on two subscales of SSLI: for Exploration, $F(2, 45) = 1.302$, $p = 0.282$; for Realization, $F(2, 45) = 5.74$, $p = 0.006$; for Internalization, $F(2, 45) = 6.679$, $p = 0.003$. The paired t-tests provided more insight. For Exploration, while NSJ and SSJ did not have significant changes, MSJ had decreased significantly, with $t(9) = -3.347$, $p = 0.009$. For Realization, while NSJ and MSJ did not have significant changes at 0.05 level, SSJ had increased significantly at 0.05 level, with $t(20) = 2.761$, $p = 0.012$. For Internalization, only SSJ had changed significantly at 0.05 level, with $t(20) = 3.069$, $p = 0.006$. These results suggest that even for students with the same level of Volunteer Involvement, degrees of social justice focus in course design did make differences in students’ development of social responsibility.
Table 72. SSLI Pretest Subscale Means for Occasional Group in Different Levels of Social Justice Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSJ</td>
<td>MSJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>44.56</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>46.72</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>70.33</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 73. SSLI Posttest Subscale Means for Occasional Group in Different Levels of Social Justice Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSJ</td>
<td>MSJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>44.17</td>
<td>9.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>72.11</td>
<td>11.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to see whether students in the courses with same levels of social justice focus changed differently because they had different levels of Volunteer Involvement, Table 74 and 75 show the means for students in Occasional group and Consistent group enrolled in the courses with strong social justice focus (SSJ). For each subscale, pretest scores were used as covariates, and posttest scores were analyzed using ANCOVA to see whether students who were in the courses with strong social justice focus changed differently because they had different levels of Volunteer Involvement. The results showed that: students with different Volunteer Involvement did not change significantly different at 0.05 level for any of the subscale: for
Exploration, $F(1, 31) = 1.765$, $p = 0.194$; for Realization, $F(1, 31) = 0.026$, $p = 0.874$; and for Internalization, $F(1, 31) = 1.090$, $p = 0.305$. However, the paired t-test provided more information. For Exploration subscale, neither Occasional group nor Consistent group changed significantly at 0.05 but they changed in different directions: for Occasional group, their Exploration mean score increased with $t(20) = 0.128$, $p = 0.899$, and for Consistent group, their Exploration mean score decreased with $t(12) = -0.876$, $p = 0.398$. For Realization subscale, Occasional group increased significantly at 0.05 level while Consistent group did not, with $t(20) = 2.761$, $p = 0.012$ and $t(12) = 0.707$, $p = 0.493$ respectively. This result is consistent with the results from the whole group but with evidence for Occasional group’s change in Realization. For Internalization, the Occasional group changed significantly at 0.05 level, with $t(20) = 3.069$, $p = 0.006$ and Consistent group did not change significantly at 0.05 level, with $t(12) = 1.499$, $p = 0.160$. This result is different from the results from the whole group where Consistent group changed significantly but Occasional group did not. The discrepancy between this analysis and the analysis of the whole group is because Occasional group also included students from NSJ and MSJ courses in the study of the whole group. The NSJ and MSJ courses did not influence students’ Realization and Internalization as significantly as SSJ did. Therefore, Occasional students in the whole group did not change as significantly as students in SSJ on either Realization or Internalization subscale. However, even in the courses with the same degree of social justice focus (SSJ), Occasional and Consistent students changed differently for each of the three subscales. Occasional group has changed significantly in both Realization
and Internalization subscale, while Consistent group only changed almost significantly in Internalization subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>SSJ</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>43.43</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>41.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>78.14</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>86.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 74. SSLI Pretest Subscale Means of SSJ for Occasional and Consistent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>SSJ</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>43.62</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>38.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>54.33</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>55.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>84.19</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>91.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 75. SSLI Posttest Subscale Means of SSJ for Occasional and Consistent Groups

**Influence of Enrollment Reason on Social Responsibility Development**

The fourth research question is “Do students with different reasons for taking service learning courses have different outcomes on the development of social responsibility?” and the hypothesis for this question is as follows.

**Hypothesis:** There will be differences in development of social responsibility among subgroups of students who are taking service-learning courses for different required and voluntary reasons.
Similar to the analysis of SSLI for levels of Volunteer Involvement, I first presented the analysis of SSLI pretest to see whether students with different types of Enrollment Reasons before the class had different levels of Social Responsibility measured by SSLI. Then I presented the analysis of SSLI posttest using pretest scores as covariates to see whether students with different types of Enrollment Reasons changed differently in their social responsibility after the service-learning courses.

The one way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), using the three subscales of SSLI pretest scores as dependent variables and types of Enrollment Reasons (Required for Major, Elective for Major, Free Elective for Content, Free Elective for Service, Mount Leadership Society) as independent variables, was statistically significant (Hotelling trace=0.44, F (12, 191)=2.36, p=0.008). Follow-up univariate ANOVA indicated that differences were significant at the 0.05 level for two of the three subscales: Exploration, F (4, 67) =3.07, p=0.022; Realization, F (4, 67) =3.30, p=0.016. Table 76 shows the cell means for each univariate effect. Follow-up comparisons of the means of subscale with significant univariate effect were conducted. Using Tukey pariwised comparison with family error rate of 0.05, the only comparison that was significant was from Realization subscale, with students who are enrolled as elective courses for major had lower mean than students from Mount Leadership society, t (23) = 3.297, p = 0.0132. In the two other comparisons from Exploration, the significant levels were close to 0.05: students from free for content and free for service had lower scores than students from Mount Leadership Society, p
= 0.075 and $p = 0.069$ respectively. However, the sample size for Mount Leadership Society was small; the results need to be interpreted with cautions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Required for Major M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Elective for Major M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Free Elective for Content M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Free Elective for Content M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mount Leadership Society</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration*</td>
<td>44.56</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>39.15</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>48.86</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization*</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>45.12</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>51.90</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>57.86</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>73.56</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>73.35</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>81.70</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>81.54</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>85.14</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: MANOVA Hotelling trace=0.44, $F (12, 191)=2.36$, $p=0.008$. Univariate ANOVA: Exploration, $F (4, 67) =3.07$, $p=0.022$; Realization, $F (4, 67) =3.30$, $p=0.016$; Internalization, $F (4, 67) =1.75$, $p=0.150$. *$p<0.05$.

Table 76. SSLI Pretest Subscale Means for Enrollment Reason

The SSLI pretest scores were used as covariates when performing univariate Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) for the posttest of each subscale to test the group effect of Enrollment Reason. After controlling for the pretest scores from each subscale, the group effects were not significant for the posttest of any subscale of SSLI at 0.05 level. However, for Internalization, it was close to 0.05, which was $F (4, 66) =2.19$, $p=0.080$. Table 77 shows the cell means for each univariate effect for posttest. Follow-up comparisons were conducted using Tukey pairwise comparison only for Internalization to see what made it almost significant at 0.05. With family error rate of 0.05, no comparison was significant. The only comparison that was close to significance is that, with students who are enrolled as required courses for major had lower mean than students who were enrolled as free elective courses for content, $t (35) = 2.768$, $p = 0.0548$. 266
Table 77. SSLI Posttest Subscale Means for Enrollment Reason

Although it is not clear from above analysis regarding the relative relationship among the different types of enrollment reasons, patterns appear to emerge from Figure 6, 7, and 8, where the means of Exploration, Realization, and Internalization across the five types of enrollment reasons for both pretest and posttest are shown. From these figures, it is seen that: the students who took the service-learning courses as the Required Courses for Major and Elective Course for a Major requirement tended to score similar to each other and both are Required courses. Students who took the courses as Free Elective for Content and Free Elective for Service tended to score similar to each other and both of these reasons are Free Electives. Students from Mount Leadership Society tended to score differently from the above two groups and had a small sample size.

For the Exploration subscale, students from the MLS scored the highest at the pretest, students in the Required group scored the second highest, and students in the Free group scored the lowest at the pretest. After taking the courses, all groups
decreased on their Exploration subscale, with MLS students dropped the most to the level of Required group, and Free group still scored the lowest.

Figure 6. Means of Exploration Pretest and Posttest by Enrollment Reason
Figure 7. Means of Realization Pretest and Posttest by Enrollment Reasons
For the Realization subscale, students from the MLS again scored the highest at the pretest, students in the Free group scored the second highest, and students in the Required group scored the lowest. After taking the courses, every group increased except MLS students who dropped a little bit but still kept the highest score across groups. The Free group still scored the second highest, and the Free for Service subgroup seemed to increase more than Free Elective for Content group. The Required group still scored the lowest at the posttest, and the Elective for Major group seemed to increase more than the Required for Major group.
For the Internalization subscale, students from MLS scored the highest at the pretest, and Free group scored the second highest, and the Required group scored the lowest. After taking the course, every group scored higher at posttest than at the pretest, but the MLS students increased the least. As a group, Free group still scored the second highest, and Required group still scored the lowest. However, within the Free group, the Free for Content subgroup increased significantly from pretest to posttest, with $t(9) = 2.722$, $p=0.024$; within the Required group, the Elective for Major subgroup increased significantly from pretest to posttest, with $t(16) = 2.438$, $p=0.027$.

Because the similarity between two subgroups in Required group, and the similarity between the two subgroups in the Free group, the Required group and Free group were compared. MSL was excluded because of its special background and low sample size. Univariate ANOVA of pretest was performed to see whether there was significant difference between the two groups on the three subscales. The results indicated that differences were significant at the 0.05 level for two of the three subscales: Exploration and Internalization, with $F(1, 63) = 8.727$, $p=0.004$, and $F(1, 63) = 4.685$, $p=0.034$ respectively. And the significant level for Realization subscale was close to 0.05, with $F(1, 63) = 3.793$, $p=0.056$. Using the pretest scores as covariates, ANCOVA of the posttest was performed for each subscale. The results indicated that after controlling the pretest, differences were significant at the 0.05 level for Internalization subscale, with $F(1, 62) = 4.620$, $p=0.036$. And the significant level of Exploration subscale was close to 0.05, with $F(1, 62) = 3.094$, $p=0.083$. These findings were supported by paired t-tests of the three subscales for both groups. Both
groups did not change significantly on Exploration, with \( t (44) = -0.317, p=0.753 \) for Required group and \( t (22) = -0.439, p = 0.665 \) for the Free group; on the Realization, with \( t (44)=1.795, p=0.080 \) for Required group, and \( t (22) = 1.789, p=0.087 \) for the Free group. For Internalization, the change of Required group was not significant at 0.05 level but close to it, with \( t (22) = 1.924, p = 0.061 \). The change of Free group was significant at 0.05 level, with \( t (22) = 2.381, p = 0.026 \). Table 78 and 79 show the cell means for each univariate effect of pretest and posttest for the two newly formed groups: Required group and Free group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>New Groups of Enrollment Reason</th>
<th>Required Group</th>
<th>Free Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.76</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.76</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization*</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.48</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ANOVA of Pretest: Exploration, \( F (1, 63) = 8.727, p=0.004 \); Realization, \( F (1, 63) = 3.793, p=0.056 \); Internalization, \( F (1, 63) = 4.685, p=0.034 \). 
* \( p< 0.05 \). ** \( p<0.01 \).

Table 78. SSLI Pretest Subscale Means by New Groups of Enrollment Reason
Table 79. SSLI Posttest Subscale Means by New Groups of Enrollment Reason

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>New Groups of Enrollment Reason</th>
<th>Required Group</th>
<th>Free Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.98</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization*</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.57</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ANCOVA of Posttest: Exploration, F (1, 62) = 3.094, p= 0.083; Realization, F (1, 62) = 1.304, p= 0.258; Internalization: F (1, 62) = 4.620, p=0.036.
* p<0.05.

To sum up, comparing the Required and the Free group, it seemed that the Free group had developed further on their social responsibility at beginning of the courses because of lower Exploration score and higher Realization and Internalization scores than the Required group. In addition, students in Free group moved more rapidly toward higher level of social responsibility (Internalization subscale) than students in Required group through the service-learning experience. The students from MLS were not comparable with these two groups due to small sample size and the fact that these students were intensively involved in community service prior to taking the service-learning courses and had been exposed to many of the social issues and underlying causes of these social issues before this study.

In order to differentiate the influence of enrollment reason and social justice focus for students’ development of social responsibility, further analyses were done. Table 80 is the cross tabulation across the levels of Social Justice Focus in Course Design and new groups of Enrollment Reasons. From this table, it shows that while
students in NSJ and MSJ were more likely to be in the Required group than expected, students in SSJ were more likely to be in the Free group than expected. The chi-squared test showed significant results with chi-squared (2, N=65) = 22.00, p = 0.000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Course Design</th>
<th>New Groups of Enrollment Reason</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required group</td>
<td>Free group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSJ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSJ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 80. Cross-tabulation of Social Justice Focus in Course Design and New Groups of Enrollment Reasons

In order to see whether Enrollment Reason and Social Justice Focus are two different sources associated with students’ development of social responsibility, two kinds of analyses are needed. First, students in the courses with same level of social justice focus need to be compared between Required group and Free group to see whether Enrollment Reason has any effect. Second, students with same Enrollment reason need to be compared between NSJ, MSJ and SSJ to see whether levels of social justice focus have any effects. Because number of students in NSJ-Free and MSJ-Free are too small (N=2 and N=1 respectively), analyses were done only for students in courses with different levels of social justice focus for the Required group, and students with different Enrollment Reason in courses with strong social justice focus.
In order to see whether degrees of social justice focus made a difference for students with same enrollment reason, Table 81 and 82 show the SSLI pretest and posttest subscales means for Required group in different levels of social justice focus. For each subscale, pretest scores were used as covariates, and posttest scores were analyzed using ANCOVA to see whether students who were in the Required group changed differently because they were in courses with different levels of social justice focus. The results showed that for Exploration, F (2, 38) = 2.609, p = 0.087, and for Internalization, F (2, 38) = 1.834, p = 0.174 there were no significant differences. For Realization, the difference was significant with F (2, 38) = 6.50, p = 0.004. The paired t-tests provided more insight. For Exploration, while NSJ and SSJ did not have significant changes, MSJ had decreased significantly, with t (9) = -3.347, p = 0.009. For Realization, while NSJ and MSJ did not have significant changes at 0.05 level, SSJ had increased significantly, with t (10) = 2.532, p = 0.030. For Internalization, none of the comparisons was significant with SSJ close to 0.05 significance level, t (10) = 2.006, p = 0.073. These results suggest that even for students with the same enrollment reason (Required group), degrees of social justice focus in course design did make differences in students’ development of social responsibility. It seems that students in Required group has changed most dramatic in Realization subscale after taking the SSJ course.
In order to see whether students in the courses with same degree of social justice focus changed differently because they had different enrollment reasons, Table 83 and 84 show the means for students in Required group and Free group enrolled in the courses with strong social justice focus. For each subscale, pretest scores were used as covariates, and posttest scores were analyzed using ANCOVA to see whether students who were in the courses with strong social justice focus changed differently because they had different enrollment reasons. The results showed that for Realization and Internalization, there were no significant differences, with $F (1, 28) = 0.770, p = 0.388$ and $F (1, 28) = 1.852, p = 0.184$ respectively. For Exploration, significant level...
was close to 0.05, with $F(1, 28) = 3.799$, $p = 0.061$. The paired t-test showed that, for Exploration subscale, while both Required and Free group did not change significantly at 0.05, they changed in different directions. For Realization subscale, Required group increased significantly at 0.05 level while Free group did not, with $t(10) = 2.532$, $p = 0.030$ and $t(19) = 1.713$, $p = 0.103$ respectively. For Internalization, the change of the Required group was close to but not significant at 0.05 level, with $t(10) = 2.006$, $p = 0.073$. Free group did change significantly at 0.05 level, with $t(19) = 3.485$, $p = 0.002$.

These results were different from the results from the analysis of the whole group. For SSJ, the Required students changed more dramatic in Realization than the whole group, and Free students changed more dramatic on Internalization than the whole group. Therefore, students in courses with the same degree of social justice focus (SSJ) had changed differently for each of the three subscales. Required group has changed significantly in Realization subscale, and Free group has changed significantly in Internalization subscale.

This pattern is similar to the relationship between Occasional and Consistent group. An examination of the cross tabulation of Volunteer Involvement and Enrollment Reason showed high correlation between Required and Occasional as well as Free and Consistent (see Table 85). This may be part of the reason for the pattern. Chi-squared test shows that chi-squared ($1, N=59) = 4.896$, $p = 0.027$. However, 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5, results need to be interpreted with caution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>SSJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>42.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>77.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 83. SSLI Pretest Subscale Means of SSJ by New Groups of Enrollment Reason

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>SSJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>44.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>53.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>83.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 84. SSLI Posttest Subscale Means of SSJ by New Groups of Enrollment Reason

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Groups of Enrollment reason</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Involvement</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 85. Cross-tabulation of Volunteer Involvement and New Groups of Enrollment Reason
Relationship between Social Responsibility and Intellectual Development

The fifth research question is as follows: “What is the relationship between phases of social responsibility and Perry levels of intellectual development?” and the hypothesis for this question is as follows:

Hypothesis: There will be a positive relationship between phases of social responsibility and Perry levels of intellectual development.

According to the Service Learning Model developed by Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) there is positive relationship between intellectual development and social responsibility. That is, people at higher levels of intellectual development will be at higher levels of social responsibility development. In this study, intellectual development was measured by MER which gives a single score of people’s intellectual level, with larger value representing higher level of intellectual development. While social responsibility was measured by SSLI, which had three subscales, Exploration, Realization, and Internalization, with Exploration representing a lowest level of Social Responsibility, Realization represents a medium level, and the Internalization represents a highest level. According to Olney and Grande (1995), who developed SSLI, there was significant negative correlation between Exploration and Internalization and significant positive correlation between Realization and Internalization. Therefore, if the hypothesis was supported, there would be negative correlation between MER scores and Exploration scores, moderate positive correlation
between MER scores and Realization scores, and strong positive correlation between MER scores and Internalization scores.

In order to replicate the study of Olney and Grande (1995), Cronbach alphas were calculated and Pearson’s correlation test was used to analyze SSLI pretest and posttest to see whether the scales are reliable and the correlation among the three subscales are the same as in Olney and Grande’s study. Then Pearson’s correlation test was used for both pretest scores and posttest scores to see whether the relationship between Social Responsibility and Intellectual Development is as predicted.

As shown in Table 86, the Cronbach alphas were displayed for subscales of SSLI to see whether the scales are reliable. All of the alphas are higher than or about 0.75, suggesting good reliability of these subscales. The alphas for Internalization are higher than 0.85, suggesting very good reliability. In Table 87, the correlations among subscales of SSLI from pretest and posttest are only partly consistent with the pattern found in Olney and Grande’s (1995) study. There was significantly positive correlation between Realization and Internalization both for pretest and posttest. However, there were no significant negative correlations between Exploration and Internalization. Hence, Exploration scores did not go down as Internalization increased. The conceptual model of social responsibility assumes that Exploration will go down as Internalization increases. These data in my study are not consistent with the model on this point.
Table 86. Scale Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Realization</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest (N=72)</td>
<td>Posttest (N=72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>.7485</td>
<td>.7546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>.7627</td>
<td>.7401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>.8523</td>
<td>.8640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<0.001.

Table 87. Correlations among Subscales of SSLI for Pretest and Posttest

In Table 88 the relationship between MER and subscales of SSLI is shown. In pretest, the MER had significantly negative correlation with Exploration at 0.001 level. Although not significant, the MER correlated with Internalization positively on the pretest. On posttest, the same pattern appeared, but the correlation between MER and Exploration was not statistically significant, and the correlation between MER and Internalization was statistically significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it appears that Exploration scores went up after taking service-learning courses and so did Internalization scores. These results differ from the model on Exploration.
Table 88. Correlations between MER and Subscales of SSLI for Pretest and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Realization</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MER Pretest</strong></td>
<td>-.455(***</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MER Posttest</strong></td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.276(*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05. ***p<0.001.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to explore the impact of service-learning courses on students’ development social responsibility and intellectual complexity. Specific research questions include: (a) What will be the social responsibility and intellectual development outcomes of participating in service-learning course? (b) Does a social justice focus in the designs of service-learning courses make difference in terms of outcomes on social responsibility and intellectual development? (c) Do students with different levels of previous involvement in volunteer work have different outcomes on the development of social responsibility? (d) Do students with different reasons for taking service learning courses have different outcomes on the development of social responsibility? (e) What is the relationship between social responsibility and Perry levels of intellectual development?

In this chapter, the findings from this study will be compared to current literatures and implications of the study will be explained. Finally, both significance and limitations of this study will be covered.
Course Description and Classification

In this study, all the courses studied are well developed service-learning courses. They are offered by colleges that espoused service-learning as effective pedagogy. They have established good partnership with community agencies or local schools as service setting for the service-learning courses. They also have clear emphasis on reflection activities, either through classroom activities or through reflection journals or essays. The instructors are experienced in teaching service-learning courses, and all of them have taught service-learning course more than once. However, they also have differences in their course designs. Specifically, there was a difference in the degree to which social justice was a focus in course design.

After analyzing the design of each course, the seven service-learning courses were grouped into three different levels of social justice focus of course design. The first level is called Non Social Justice Focus (NSJ), that is, there is almost no social justice focus. This group consists of Course 3 (Lifespan Motor Development) and Course 5 (Reading Foundation). The second level is called Moderate Social Justice Focus (MSJ), that is, there is some coverage of social justice in the course design but through according to my criteria. This is a single course, Course 1 (English Workshop). The third level is called Strong Social Justice Focus (SSJ), that is, there is strong emphasis on and through coverage of social justice in the course design. This group consists of Course 2-Session 1 & 2 (Leadership in Community Service), Course 4 (Consumer Housing in Community), and Course 6 (Administration of Service Learning).
In following sections, the seven courses were first treated as a whole group to see the effects of service-learning courses on students’ development of social responsibility and intellectual development. The seven courses then were studied and compared within and between the three levels of social justice focus in course design. Students’ characteristics, Volunteer Involvement and Enrollment Reason were also studied to see the impact of these factors as well as their interactions with social justice focus in course design. Finally, relationship between development of social responsibility and intellectual development were investigated and reported.

Influence of Service-Learning Courses on Social Responsibility Development

The hypotheses that service-learning courses will result in a significant increase in the development of social responsibility for students who participate in service-learning courses were supported. There were significant increases in Realization and Internalization subscales of SSLI for the seven courses combined. For each individual course, due to small sample size, changes need to be large in order to obtain significant results. However, two courses seem to have had effects on students. For Course 1 (English Workshop), students decreased significantly on Exploration subscale; for Course 6 (Administration of Service Learning), students increased significantly on the Realization and Internalization subscales.

For Olney and Grande (1995), Realization and Internalization were highly correlated. These two phases are comparable in terms of the characteristic of volunteer activities, but they are different in that people at Internalization phrase have internalized complex understanding and are committed to action for social justice.
Hence, from the review of literatures, higher scores on Realization and Internalization subscales are desired outcomes for many service-learning educators. The results from this study showed students in these courses increased their realization that it was important to work with community agencies and/or to serve a population about which they cared. In addition, for some students awareness of social injustice and commitment to social change for social justice were enhanced. These results are partly consistent with Johnson and Bozeman’s (1998) in that Realization and Internalization were enhanced. It also replicates some of Payne’s (2000) findings that Internalization scores increased after taking service-learning courses. Unlike Payne, Exploration did not significantly decrease, however. This study gave more evidence that service-learning courses appear to influence students toward individual service and mutual learning and finally, for some, toward commitment to social justice.

In this study, Exploration, Realization, and Internalization all increased at the same time for some students. This pattern is different from the prediction of the model (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990). This may suggest revised interpretation of the model. Some students, perhaps students scoring higher on the Perry scheme, enhance simultaneously on Exploration, Realization, and Internalization at the same time due to service-learning experience.

**Influence of Service-Learning Courses on Intellectual Development**

As regards to the influence of taking service-learning courses on students’ intellectual development, this study provides evidence that students become more complex in their thinking and reasoning after the service-learning courses. Because the
results from the instrument (MER) used to measure students’ intellectual development level can be expressed in both continuous and categorical data, results will be discussed in both data formats. The parametric analysis showed that when taken as a whole group, the intellectual development level of students in the seven courses significantly increased from pretest to posttest. For individual courses, students in three out of seven courses have significantly improved their intellectual level, which are Course 2- Session 1 & 2, and Course 6. All three of these courses have been classified as having a strong social justice focus in their course design.

The categorical data also showed a clear pattern of a shift from lower level of intellectual development to higher level of intellectual development. Among 72 students, 37% of them have made positive stage changes after taking the service-learning courses. Using a different measurement (MER), this study supports the findings from previous studies (Batchelder & Root, 1994; Eyler & Gilers, 1999; Eyler, Root, & Gile, 1998; Osborne, Hammerich, & Hensley, 1998) that service-learning courses will improve students’ intellectual development. Amount of development varied from 1/6 to 1 stage and the amount of developmental changes is consistent with the results of other courses deliberately designed to foster intellectual development (e.g., Adams & Zhou, 1990, 1994; Widick, Knefelkamp, & Parker, 1975; Widick & Simpson, 1978).

However, when these courses are studied according to their levels of social justice focus in course design, the impact of service-learning courses on students’ intellectual development are somewhat different. This is explored in another section.
Influence of Social Justice Focus in Course Design on Social Responsibility Development

There have been numerous value discussions on what kind of citizenship and social responsibility should be fostered through education and service-learning courses. Many theorists have suggested that commitment to social justice (e.g., Berman, 1997; Kahne & Westheimer, 1996) and social justice education should be combined with service-learning to give students a “deeper understanding of the social, economic and political dynamics that contribute to increasing levels of social inequality” (Reardon, 1994, p52; also see O’Grady, 2000). However, others disagree with these values and advocate only personal responsibility and development as the focus of service-learning outcomes (e.g., Boyte, 1991; Cohen, 1994; Conrad & Hedin, 1991; Smith, 1994).

Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) have put the different kinds of social responsibility into their Service Learning Model; however, social-justice oriented responsibility is the most valued form of outcome in the model. Hence, service learning courses designed with a social justice emphasis should foster students to move along this spectrum of social responsibility faster than those without. However, no studies have been conducted to test this hypothesis. The results from this study start to fill this gap.

Based on the criteria for judging a social justice focus in course design, these seven courses were classified into three groups, Non-Social Justice (NSJ), Moderate Social Justice (MSJ), and Strong Social Justice (SSJ). The pretest scores of SSLI were first compared among the three groups to see whether there were any differences prior to the courses. Significant differences were found for Exploration and Internalization
subscales. Post-hoc analysis showed that for Exploration subscale, the mean for MSJ group was significantly higher than SSJ group; for the Internalization subscale, the mean for the SSJ group was significantly higher than NSJ group. In order to see the net effect of service-learning courses with different degrees of social justice focus in their course designs, pretest scores were used as covariates to make each group statistically equivalent when I analyzed the posttest scores. The results showed that after controlling for the pretest scores from each subscale, the group effects were significant for the posttest of Realization and Internalization subscales. Follow-up comparisons showed that, for the Realization subscale, the mean for the SSJ group was significantly higher than both the MSJ and NSJ group; for the Internalization subscale, the mean for the SSJ group again was significantly higher than both NSJ group and MSJ group. Hence, strong social justice focus contribute to the development of social responsibility beyond service experience per se.

Comparison between the pretest and posttest SSLI scores were also performed for each group. The results showed that, the non-social-justice group had no significant change on any of the subscale of SSLI; the moderate-social-justice group had significantly decreased on Exploration subscale; and the strong-social-justice group had significantly increased on Realization and Internalization subscale and no change on Exploration.

These results support the hypothesis that service-learning courses with strong social justice focus can help move students toward a social responsibility depicted by Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) at the levels of Realization and Internalization faster.
than service-learning courses with moderate or without social justice focus. In addition, courses with moderate social justice may help students move away from Exploration faster than courses without social justice focus. These results showed that although the overall effect of all the service-learning courses in this study were positive on students’ development of social responsibility, it was mainly because courses with strong social justice focus moved students upward in Realization and Internalization. Course designs did make differences, and this may be why Kollcross (1997) did not find any significant outcomes for the courses she studied.

However, students’ previous volunteer involvements and reasons for taking service-learning courses also play a role in their development of social responsibility; their interactions are discussed in another section.

**Influence of Social Justice Focus in Course Design on Intellectual Development**

Social justice education has been proved to be able to enhanced students’ intellectual development (Adams & Zhou, 1990, 1994); however, no studies have compared courses with and without social justice focus in their influence on student’s intellectual development. This study provides some evidence that students from courses with strong-social-justice focus design become more complex in their thinking and reasoning than courses that have moderate social justice focus or those that do not have social justice focus. The parametric analysis of the pretest scores of MER did not show significant difference among the three groups. When pretest scores were used as covariates to make each group statistically equivalent, the analysis of posttest did not show significant differences among the three groups at 0.05 level. However, the
significant level was close to 0.05. Therefore, as an exploratory study, follow-up comparisons were performed, and the difference between NSJ and SSJ was almost significant at 0.05 level; with SSJ group had higher MER posttest scores. This shows that students in the SSJ courses had higher rates of improvement in their intellectual development than students in the NSJ courses.

The comparisons of pretest and posttest scores of MER for each group showed results showed that only the MER scores of the SSJ group had significantly increased from pretest to posttest at 0.05 level, but the significant level of NSJ was also close to 0.05.

The categorical data of MER gave more information on the effect of different degrees of social justice focus in course design. Comparison of the three groups showed that the NSJ group has the least positive movement from pretest to posttest. While only 21% of the students had positive movement in NSJ group, 45% of the students had positive movements in both MSJ and SSJ groups. However, students in the MSJ and SSJ group did not move at the same rate and the SSJ group had more dramatic movement. While most of the students (36%) in MSJ group moved upward within 1/3 stage and only 9% moved upward above 1/3 stage, there were 24% of students in SSJ group moved upward within 1/3 stage, and 21% moved upward above 1/3 stage. In addition, 9% of students in MSJ had negative movement, while no one in the SSJ had negative movement.

These results are consistent with Adams and Zhou’s (1990, 1993) finding about the influence of social justice education on students’ intellectual development.
Based on the comparison between SSJ courses and NSJ as well as MSJ courses, SSJ appeared to have the most positive impact on students’ intellectual development.

Influence of Volunteer Involvement on Social Responsibility Development

In order to validate their newly developed instrument based on Service Learning Model (Delve, Mintz, Stewart, 1990), Olney and Grande (1995) have conducted contrast studies using level of volunteer involvement. In this study, I replicated Olney and Grande’s study using level of volunteer involvement, and extended it to see whether students with different initial level of volunteer involvement will have different rates of development of social responsibility.

While Olney and Grande (1995) have used SSLI to see whether students with different levels of volunteer involvement have different levels of social responsibility development, no studies have tried to explore whether the initial level of volunteer involvement will influence students’ social responsibility development through taking service-learning course. This study has some findings on this question. In general, the changes from pretest to posttest on each subscale are different for Occasional and Consistent groups.

For the Exploration subscale, while Occasional group and Consistent group decreased, none of these changes was significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the results are different from Olney and Grande’s (1995) expectations. The expectation was that students with more volunteer involvement would have lower scores on Exploration and higher scores on Realization and Internalization.
For the Realization subscale, while all the groups increased, only the Occasional group increased significantly at 0.05 level. The Occasional group have had volunteer from time to time, but had not developed a commitment to a community agency or population. It seemed that the service-learning courses have moved them from Exploration phase to Realization phase.

For the Internalization subscale, both the Occasional and Consistent group scores increased in the pre/post-test comparisons; however, only the Consistent group increased significantly at 0.05 level, and this is aligned with the expectations of Service Learning Model. The service-learning courses in this study influenced Consistent students to move from Realization phase to Internalization phase.

These results on the influence of service-learning courses on students with different initial levels of volunteer involvement may be used partially to substantiate the developmental nature of Service Learning Model (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990). The Occasional group developed into the Realization phase rather than Internalization phase; and Consistent group developed the most in Internalization. Therefore, the service-learning courses in this study have served students very well in their development along the spectrum of social responsibility. The exception is the Exploration phase discussed previously.

Because there were more Occasional students in NSJ and MSJ than expected and more Consistent students in SSJ courses than expected, analyses were done to see whether the effects of the levels of social justice focus in course design and the levels of previous volunteer involvement can be differentiated.
One analysis was performed on the Occasional students in NSJ, MSJ and SSJ to see whether the effect of social justice focus in course design still exist. Results showed the same pattern as for the whole group: for Exploration, only MSJ had significant decrease over the course; for Realization and Internalization, only SSJ had significant increase over the course. Therefore, different levels of social justice focus in course design did have effects on students’ development of social responsibility.

Another analysis was performed on Occasional and Consistent students in the SSJ courses. Results showed that while the Occasional students changed significantly on both Realization and Internalization subscale, the Consistent students only changed almost significantly on Internalization subscale. This is different from the results of the whole group, where Occasional group only changed in Realization subscale. The overall pattern of development of students with different initial level of volunteer involvement was largely sustained. That is, Occasional students developed their Realization and perhaps Internalization, and Consistent students developed their Internalization after taking service-learning courses.

**Influence of Enrollment Reason on Social Responsibility Development**

It is possible that students who are taking the service-learning course because it is required for the major or as a choice on a required list of courses for the major enter classes with different levels of social responsibility than those who are taking the courses as free electives and it is possible that service-learning courses have different influence on the two group of students.
The findings of the Required for Major group and that of the Elective for Major group were similar to each other; the findings of the Free Elective for Content group and that of the Free Elective for Service group were similar. One Required group and one Free group was then formed. The Required group was compared to the Free group. Pretest scores were analyzed first to see whether students in these two groups were different at the beginning of the course. The differences were significant for Exploration and Internalization subscale, and almost significant for Realization subscale at 0.05 level. Students in Free group had lower Exploration, higher Realization and Internalization scores than students in Required group, which suggests that the Free group who selected these classes were already ahead of the Required group in social responsibility. The posttest scores were analyzed after controlling the pretest scores. Differences were found significant for Internalization, and almost significant for Exploration at 0.05 level. For Exploration subscale, while the mean of the Free group decreased, the Required group increased. For Realization, both groups increased but not significantly. For Internalization subscale, both groups increased significantly but students in the Free group moved up more quickly than students in Required group. Motivation seems to have influence along with course design.

These results not only sustain Eyler, Giles, and Braxton’s (1997) findings about the differences between students who freely choose to do service and those who do not on measured outcomes, but also provide evidence that students who choose to take a service-learning course rather than being required to take such a course gained more in social responsibility development. However, because students in NSJ and
MSJ courses were more likely to be in the Required group than expected, students in SSJ courses were more likely to be in the Free group than expected, analyses were done to differentiate the effect of levels of social justice focus in course design and types of enrollment reason.

One analysis was performed on the Required students in NSJ, MSJ and SSJ to see whether the effect of social justice focus in course design still exist. Results showed the same pattern as for the whole group: for Exploration, only MSJ had significant decrease over the course; for Realization, only SSJ had significant increase over the course; and for Internalization, only SSJ had almost significant increase over the course. Therefore, different levels of social justice focus in course design did have different effects on students’ development of social responsibility even when they took courses for the same reason (Required).

Another analysis was performed on Required group and Free group students in the SSJ courses. Results showed similar patterns as in the study of the whole group, with the Free group had favorable results in Exploration and Internalization subscales. The only difference was that the Required group had significant increase on Realization, but the Free group did not. This happened may due to the fact that Required group students were more likely to be Occasional students. As I have shown, SSJ courses had strong effects on Occasional students on their development on Realization. However, the differences in enrollment reason still made differences in students’ development of social responsibility and Free group developed more favorably.
Relationship between Social Responsibility and Intellectual Development

In developing Service Learning Model, Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) speculated that there is a positive relationship between intellectual development and development of social responsibility. That is, people at a higher level of intellectual development will be at a higher level of social responsibility development, or levels of intellectual development are necessary but not sufficient for levels of social responsibility. Onley and Grande (1990) developed Scale of Service Learning Involvement (SSLI) to measure social responsibility development depicted by Delve et al., and used Erwin’s (1983) Scale of Intellectual Development (SID) to support the validity of SSLI.

However, as Moore (1989) has noticed that the major difficulty with SID and some other “objective-style” measure of the Perry scheme is “their lack of grounding in the ongoing theoretical refinements of the model” (p. 505). For example, it has been agreed upon that Perry’s Position 6 through 9 are not intellectual development but “existential and psychosocial (Rodgers, 1980; Brougghton, 1975; King, 1982)” (Rodgers, 1989, p. 142), but SID considers Commitment as intellectual development and has one subscale on this aspect. In addition, another subscale, Empathy is also not “directly based to Perry scheme but was interpreted from the items that clustered together to form this fourth factor” (Erwin, 1983, p. 7). Finally, as a recognition instrument, SID tends to inflate stage ratings (Rest, 1973). Therefore, Measure of Epistemological Reflection (MER) (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1985) was used in
this study because MER is a production instrument and tends not to reflect inflated scores.

Before using MER to validate SSLI, the reliability and convergent validity of SSLI were tested. Cronbach aphas showed that the internal reliability of each subscale of SSLI is good, which is consistent with Olney and Grande (1995). However, the results of intercorrelations among subscales of SSLI are different from Olney and Grande but similar with Johnson and Bozeman (1998). In all three studies, there were significantly positive correlations between Realization (REA) and Internalization (INT) subscales, and there is no significant correlations between Exploration (EXP) and REA subscales. However, as to the correlations between EXP and INT, three studies had different results. In Olney and Grande’s study, there were significantly negative relationship between EXP and INT. In Johnson and Bozeman’s study, there were non-significantly positive correlation between EXP and INT at the pretest and significantly positive correlation between these two subscales at the posttest. In this study, there were non-significantly positive correlation between EXP and INT at both pretest and posttest.

Therefore, it seems that there is no significant relationship between EXP and INT. Even though Service Learning Model does imply sequentiality even if not exclusiveness. However, all three kinds of outcomes could occur simultaneously from the same experience for very complex students who never volunteered previously. Therefore, students who start at different phases of social responsibility can have different movement along the three subscales. This may be why Johnson and Bozeman
(1998) found that students increased in both EXP and INT rather than decreased in EXP and increased in INT as they expected. In short, the model may need revision.

In addition, Johnson and Bozeman (1998) also claimed that the REA and INT should be combined into one subscale because they have correlations and they are indistinguishable through cluster analysis. However, as Olney and Grande (1995) noted that REA and INT have similar characteristics of volunteer activities but are different in that students at INT phase have understanding of the complexities of social injustice. Therefore, INT have incorporated REA and an add-on component of social awareness, and the high correlation does not necessary make them into one subscale. In fact, this study provide more evidence that REA and INT are distinct subscales.

The correlation analysis of MER and SSLI pretest and posttest in this study have supported the speculation that social responsibility and intellectual development have a positive relationship. Because the MER scores have negative correlations with EXP (significant at pretest), no relationship with REA, and positive correlations with INT (significant at posttest). This suggests that students scored low at MER tended to be at EXP phase, and students scored high at MER tended to be at INT phase. However both students scored low and high at MER can be at REA phase. Therefore, there is distinction between REA and INT phases measured by SSLI.

**Strengths and Limitations**

In this study, the pretest-posttest response rate was high (97%): only two out of 72 students who participated in pretest but did not in posttest. This allowed the researcher to compare students from pretest and posttest. However, the limitation of
this study lies in the small sample size (72 in final sample for the seven courses). Although this researcher made every effort to recruit participants, the final response rate was 41%, which is acceptable but not optimum. In addition, the original plan was to recruit some higher rank graduate students to obtain a full range of intellectual development from less complex level to more complex level. However, the highest rank of students in this study was first-year master students, therefore, not many students in this study achieved very high level of intellectual development. For some analysis, the sample sizes for some categories were not large enough to give conclusive results. Future studies need to increase the sample size or collect data over longer period of time to accumulate data for appropriate analyses.

In addition, this study has included service-learning courses with different levels of social justice focus in design. Comparisons among these levels provide insights into the different effects of various designs in service-learning courses. However, if non-service-learning courses were also included in the study, comparison can be made between non-service-learning and service-leaning courses to see the net effect of service-learning courses in students’ development of social responsibility and intellectual development. Future studies can incorporate courses that do not have service-learning pedagogy as comparison groups.

The document analyses of the course syllabus, textbook, handouts as well as interview with instructors in this study provided rich descriptions of the courses as well as solid basis for classification of these courses. However, due to time constraints, participant observation of the classroom and service sites were not conducted, which
may have helped confirm or disconfirm what have been found through document analyses and interviews.

**Implications**

This study has provided evidence of the positive influence of service-learning courses especially the ones with strong social justice focus in course design on students’ development of social responsibility and intellectual development. These results gave more support to service-learning practitioners and theorists who value and support the combination of service-learning and social justice education. Service-learning courses often have students encounter complex social issues associated with service sites; these experiences present challenges that can initiate students’ development of social responsibility and cognitive complexity. However, service-learning courses do not foster these developments automatically; intentional designs are needed appropriately to challenge and support students. Social justice education usually introduces students to different views of the social problems and encourages students to take actions to address these problems (for example, Adams & Zhou, 1990, 1993; O’Grady, 2000). This coverage familiarizes students with concepts for higher phases of social responsibility and it is important for students to develop sense of social responsibility. In this study, courses in SSJ cover the concepts of social justice education extensively. Students who had SSJ experiences developed the most in the sense of social responsibility and cognitive complexity.

In addition, as shown in this study, levels of social responsibility have positive relationships with levels of intellectual ability, and development of social
responsibility may presuppose intellectual development. There were exceptions, however. Some students in dualism scored high in Realization and Internalization. Either the two phenomena are not related or the dualists who scored high in Internalization may be making a Foreclosed commitment. This means the choice made is motivated from the outside and is not yet an internal commitment. This is the case because internal locus of control is not developed (Pearson & Rodgers, 1999). Therefore, students’ development of social responsibility can be genuine or foreclosed depending on their levels of intellectual development. This is a challenge to service-learning practitioners. If the goal is to foster genuine development of social responsibility, it is not enough to just cover the content of social justice education or increase students’ scores on SSLI. Using developmental instruction to enhance students’ intellectual development would need to be a constant concern in program and course designs.

It is also worth noting that service-learning practitioners need to be aware of the impact of service-learning on students with different initial levels of volunteer involvement and reasons for taking service-learning courses in their development of social responsibility. As found from this study, the service-learning courses helped students move through the phases of social responsibility as depicted by the Service Learning Model (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990). Therefore, appropriate designs for students at different phases may be necessary. In addition, students who took service-learning as required did not develop as fast as students who took the courses as free
electives. This suggests that motivation is an important variable. How does one overcome “required” motivation?

Finally, this study provided further evidence for the validity of Service Learning Model (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990) and the usefulness of Scale of Service Learning Involvement (Olney & Grande, 1995) and Measure of Epistemological Reflection (Baxter Mogalda & Poterfield, 1985) in measuring students’ development of social responsibility and intellectual development. It is important in practice that valid and reliable instruments are used to assess students before their participation in service-learning programs or courses as well as afterward; hence, instructor or program coordinators can plan or adjust the activities accordingly.
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APPENDIX A

SCALE OF SERVICE LEARNING INVOLVEMENT
Scale of Service Learning Involvement

The following statements ask about your feelings about doing volunteer work, including anything from fund-raising for an organization like the American Heart Association to directly working at a local agency to writing editorials for causes that you care about. In the statements that refer to your peer group, please think of any group of people with whom you associate with the most such as a fraternity, sorority, church group, or dorm group. In the statements that ask about “recent” feelings, please indicate the extent to which you have noticed such feelings within the last six months.

Please indicate your attitudes by marking the following on your answer sheet.

(A)=Strongly reflects my feelings about volunteer work
(B)=Somewhat reflects my feelings about volunteer work
(C)=Does not much reflect my feelings about volunteer work
(D)=Does not at all reflect my feelings about volunteer work

If you are really not even leaning slightly one way or the other, then select

(E)=At this time, I just don’t know my feelings.

1. I would be involved in volunteer work whether or not I had friends working with me.

2. My main reason for participating in a volunteer work would be to have fun.

3. Volunteer work changes the way I spend money.

4. I choose my volunteer work based on what my peer group decides to do.

5. I get irritated with teachers or professors who do not discuss the social consequences of the material they are teaching.

6. There are so many places and people that need my help, I’m not sure that I have the energy to do all I should do.

7. I would participate in a march or demonstration on social issues that are important to me.

8. I prefer to do volunteer work that requires a short-term commitment.
9. I am starting to realize that volunteer work simply puts “band-aids” over social problems, rather than solving them.

10. I don’t feel comfortable talking about volunteering with family or friends because they may not understand my commitment.

11. When I graduate, I will be careful to work only for a company that is socially and morally responsible.

12. I would volunteer to help with a group mainly because volunteers get something fun, like a t-shirt.

13. I think the people served offered volunteers as much as volunteers offer them.

14. A main reason I participate in my volunteer activities is because of good relationship with the agency supervisors.

15. I need to work toward changing social systems that create disadvantaged people.

16. I would volunteer to help an agency on a one-time basis rather than have an ongoing commitment.

17. I am starting to realize how much volunteers can learn through their volunteer work.

18. I often have to supplement information in classes with my own research of the moral implications of the content.

19. Helping to raise money for a charity organizations for me is as important as working more directly and consistently with it.

20. I have been amazed at what I can learn from people I consider to be “underprivileged.”

21. I doubt that volunteer work will ever have much effect on my career goals.

22. As a volunteer, I think I will learn as much or more from the clients as I learn from professors and supervisors.

23. I am more likely to help with a fundraising if I am personally involved with the organization.
24. My decision to keep volunteering with an organization depends on whether my peer group is continuing the activity.

25. I feel very loyal toward one particular organization and I do most or all of my volunteer work there.

26. One of the important reasons I do volunteer work is to have fun with my friends.

27. I am aware of how unfair life can be to some people.

28. I often explain to my friends why I think volunteer work is important.

29. I would rather do volunteer work with my friends than without them.

30. I often read news articles about social problems that concern me.

31. Most (or all) of my volunteer work involves raising money for charitable or nonprofit organizations.

32. Volunteer work changes how I treat other people.

33. I think volunteering will have me vote for social justice candidates and issues.

34. There are so many places that need volunteer help that I sometimes feel confused about where I should help.

35. I have done a number of class papers about a particular social issue that concerns me.

36. I prefer to work with local agencies, so my efforts benefit people from my community.

37. I hate the terms “disadvantaged,” “needy,” or “underprivileged” people.

38. I realize that the causes of most social issues are very complex.

39. I believe it takes more than time, money, and community efforts to solve social problems.

40. If my peer group does not take on a service project, I probably would not volunteer.

41. I do as much volunteer work as I can because I feel close to the other volunteers in the agency.
42. Although it is important to raise money to help needy people, I am not personally interested in working directly with them.

43. I want my donations to get to the root of social problems.

44. I would not change my volunteer activities even if my parents or friends disapproved.

45. My major responsibility toward homeless people is not to harm them or harass them in any way.

46. I think that volunteer work at local agencies will not solve most social problems.

47. I am careful not to be involved with social issues for selfish reasons.

48. My main responsibility toward disadvantaged people is to volunteer my time and effort regularly.

49. I have participated in campaigns for candidates who are socially responsible.

50. I prefer not to make long-term commitments to any one agency or social cause.

51. I think about how I can make a difference for social justice.

52. I choose my volunteer work based upon the social issue(s) it addresses.

53. I would do fund-raising for any agency that is doing something positive.

54. I think volunteers can learn from the people who they serve.

55. I would volunteer even if I had to do it alone.

56. I would be more likely to participate in volunteer work if I could meet people my age.

57. I sometimes feel overwhelmed by how frustrating volunteer work can be.

58. I think that some social service agencies create more social problems.

59. I often think about my own stereotypes.

60. I would be more likely to participate in volunteer work if it didn’t require more than a few hours of my time.
61. I would participate in volunteer work because I understand how important the work is to those needing it.

62. I believe that I will be involved in social justice issues for the rest of my life.

63. I usually feel overwhelmed at the complexity of social problems (homelessness, hunger, etc.).

64. I would volunteer for activities if they was more fun involved.

65. I feel I am more committed to a social issue than to a social agency.

66. If I missed a volunteer activity, I would feel bad primarily because I had let my peer group down.

67. I am motivated to do volunteer work because I know personally the people who benefit from the work.

68. I would do as much volunteer work as I can because I am committed to fighting social injustice.

69. I think that people who are more fortunate (e.g., me) must help less fortunate people with their needs and problems.

70. While volunteer work can be frustrating at times, I seldom feel overwhelmed by that frustration anymore.

71. Please mark the following choice that best describes your level of volunteer activity.
   A. I have never participated in a fund-raising or volunteer activity in my life.
   B. I volunteer for fund-raising or other activities from time to time.
   C. I volunteer to help organizations consistently and regularly.
   D. I am committed to a social cause (environment, homelessness, etc.) and take actions for that cause.

72. Please choose the statement that best describes your reason for taking this Service Learning course.
   A. I have participated in this Service Learning course because it is required for my major.
   B. I have participated in this Service Learning course because it is on a list of courses required by GEC or my major.
   C. I have participated in this Service Learning course as an elective course because I am interested in the course content.
D. I have participated in this Service Learning course as an elective course because I am interested in doing the service.
E. I have participated in this Service Learning course because it is required for scholars in the Mount Leadership Society.
APPENDIX B

MEASURE OF EPISTEMOLOGICAL REFLECTION
INSTRUCTIONS: The questionnaire that follows has to do with your perspective on learning in college. Each of the questions on the following pages asks for your opinion or choice on a given subject, and the REASONS why you have that particular perspective or opinion. We are interested in understanding your perspective as fully as possible. Please give as much detail as you can to describe how you feel about each question. Feel free to use the backs of pages if you need more space. All information will be confidential. Thank you!
THINK ABOUT THE LAST TIME YOU HAD TO MAKE A MAJOR DECISION ABOUT YOUR EDUCATION IN WHICH YOU HAD A NUMBER OF ALTERNATIVES (e.g., WHICH COLLEGE TO ATTEND, COLLEGE MAJOR, CAREER CHOICE, ETC.). WHAT WAS THE NATURE OF THE DECISION?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE AVAILABLE TO YOU?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT THESE ALTERNATIVES?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

HOW DID YOU GO ABOUT CHOOSING FROM THE ALTERNATIVES?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHAT THINGS WERE THE MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS IN YOUR CHOICE? PLEASE GIVE DETAILS.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________
DO YOU LEARN BEST IN CLASSES WHICH FOCUS ON FACTUAL INFORMATION OR CLASSES WHICH FOCUS ON IDEAS AND CONCEPTS?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHY DO YOU LEARN BEST IN THE TYPE OF CLASS YOU CHOSE ABOVE?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE ADVANTAGES OF THE CHOICE YOUR MADE ABOVE?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE DISADVANTAGES OF THE CHOICE YOUR MADE ABOVE?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

IF YOU COULD GIVE ADVICE TO ANYONE ON HOW BEST TO SUCCEED IN COLLEGE COURSEWORK, WHAT KIND OF ADVICE WOULD YOU GIVE THEM? TALK ABOUT WHAT YOU BELIEVE IS THE KEY TO DOING WELL IN COLLEGE COURSE.
DURING THE COURSE OF YOUR STUDIES, YOU HAVE PROBABLY HAD INSTRUCTORS WITH DIFFERENT TEACHING METHODS. AS YOU THINK BACK TO INSTRUCTORS YOU HAVE HAD, DESCRIBE THE METHOD OF INSTRUCTION WHICH HAD THE MOST BENEFICIAL EFFECT ON YOU.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHAT MADE THAT TEACHING METHOD BENEFICIAL? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC AND USE EXAMPLES.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WERE THERE ASPECTS OF THAT TEACHING METHOD WHICH WERE NOT BENEFICIAL? IF SO, PLEASE TALK ABOUT SOME OF THE ASPECTS AND WHY THEY WERE NOT BENEFICIAL.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS YOU LEARNED FROM THE INSTRUCTOR’S METHOD OF TEACHING?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP WITH AN INSTRUCTOR THAT WOULD HELP YOU TO LEARN BEST AND EXPLAIN WHY.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________
DO YOU PREFER CLASSES IN WHICH THE STUDENTS DO A LOT OF TALKING, OR WHERE STUDENTS DON’T TALK VERY MUCH?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHY DO YOU PREFER THE DEGREE OF STUDENTS INVOLVEMENT/PARTICIPATION THAT YOU CHOSE ABOVE?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE ADVANTAGES OF YOUR PREFERENCE ABOVE?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE DISADVANTAGES OF YOUR PREFERENCE?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHAT TYPE OF INTERACTIONS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE AMONG MEMBERS OF A CLASS IN ORDER TO ENHANCE YOUR OWN LEARNING?
SOME PEOPLE THINK THAT HARD WORK AND EFFORT WILL RESULT IN HIGH GRADES IN SCHOOL. OTHERS THINK THAT HARD WORK AND EFFORT ARE NOT A BASIS FOR HIGH GRADES. WHICH OF THESE STATEMENTS IS MOST LIKE YOUR OWN OPINION?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________

IDEALLY, WHAT DO YOU THINK SHOULD BE USED AS A BASIS FOR EVALUATING YOUR WORK IN COLLEGE COURSES?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHO SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE EVALUATION YOUR DESCRIBED ABOVE?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU THINK THE RESPONSE YOU SUGGESTED ABOVE IS THE BEST WAY TO EVALUATE STUDENTS' WORK IN COLLEGE COURSES.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________
SOMETIMES DIFFERENT INSTRUCTORS GIVE DIFFERENT EXPLANATIONS FOR HISTORICAL EVENTS OR SCIENTIFIC PHENOMENA. WHEN TWO INSTRUCTORS EXPLAIN THE SAME THING DIFFERENTLY, CAN ONE BE MORE CORRECT THAN THE OTHER?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

WHEN TWO EXPLANATIONS ARE GIVEN FOR THE SAME SITUATION, HOW WOULD YOU GO ABOUT DECIDING WHICH EXPLANATION TO BELIEVE? PLEASE GIVE DETAILS AND EXAMPLES.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

CAN ONE EVER BE SURE OF WHICH EXPLANATION TO BELIEVE? IF SO, HOW?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

IF ONE CAN’T BE SURE OF WHICH EXPLANATION TO BELIEVE, WHY NOT?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS WITH INSTRUCTORS OF SERVICE-LEARNING COURSES
Interview Questions with Instructors of Service-Learning Courses

Introduction

The main purpose of my interview is to know about the course design of your service-learning course.

Questions

1. Please think to yourself for a moment before you answer my question. My first question is: What are your goals for this service-learning course? [Follow-up question: Please tell me more about … Or What does … mean to you?]

2. Please tell me one by one, why each of your course goals is important to you?

3. You may write some notes to yourself before you answer this question. Please tell me: What did you do to accomplish each of your course goals? Please take your goals one by one and cover specifics, such as, readings, activities, assignment, etc.

4. In some way, you already told me something relevant to the following question, but now I want to focus on this question, that is: How did the service component relate to each of your course goals?
APPENDIX D

INVITATION LETTER TO INSTRUCTOR OF SERVICE-LEARNING COURSES
Invitation Letter to Instructor of Service Learning Courses

The Ohio State University Protocol No.02E0134

Dear Name of Instructor,

I am a doctoral student in Higher Education working with Dr. Robert F. Rodgers, Associate Professor of Education at The Ohio State University. The purpose of my dissertation research is to examine the outcomes of service-learning courses offered at The Ohio State University. Hopefully, the results will inform practitioners as well as theorists about the results of various kinds of design and the pedagogical elements that may facilitate different outcomes. If you desire, outcomes on your specific course will be provided to you.

I am writing to request your participation in my dissertation research study. Your participation in this study would take place during the quarter when you offer your service-learning course and would consist of:

- Providing the course syllabus, handouts, or other related documents for analysis;
- Participating in an interview (about one hour in length) at the end of the quarter concerning the design and implementation of the class.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and will only take a limited amount of time. You may withdraw from the study at any time. All information will be collected anonymously and will be held confidentially. I hope you will be willing to assist in the research and assist The Ohio State University in documenting the development of service-learning courses.

Please complete the enclosed Research Consent Form and Participation Information Form. You may also contact me at wang.547@osu.edu or 614-6889598 to indicate your willingness to participate in this research study or ask for further information.

Sincerely,

Yan Wang Robert Rodgers
Doctoral student Associate Professor
School of Educational Policy School of Educational Policy
and Leadership and Leadership
College of Education College of Education
The Ohio State University The Ohio State University
APPENDIX E

RESEARCH CONSENT FORM FOR INSTRUCTOR OF SERVICE-LEARNING COURSE
Consent for Participation in Social and Behavioral Research

The Ohio State University

I consent to participating in research entitled The Designs and Outcomes of Service Learning Courses.

Robert F. Rodgers (Principle Investigator), Associate Professor of Education, or authorized representative Ms. Yan Wang (Co-Investigator), Ph.D. Candidate, has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

I agree to provide the syllabus and other documents to the researcher, and have my interview audio taped. I understand that I will get the results for the document analysis, and a transcription will be provided to me to make any changes or corrections that I find necessary. I understand that identifying information during the interviews may be deleted.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: ____________
(Research Participant)

Signed: ___________________________
(Principle Investigator or Authorized Representative)
Participation Information Form

If you are willing to be involved with this study, please complete this form and return to:

Yan Wang
517 Montgomery Ct,
Columbus, OH 43210.

By completing this form, you agree to participate in the research study on service learning courses designs and outcome as outlined in the enclosed letter. The researcher will be in contact with you with further information once the form has been received. Please feel free to contact the researcher at 614-6889598 and via email at wang.547@osu.edu.

Name:_________________________ Department: ____________________________
Telephone: _________________ E-mail address: __________________________
Office address: ________________________________
Title of your service-learning course: ________________________________
Quarter your service-learning course offered: ____________________________
APPENDIX F

INVITATION LETTER TO STUDENTS IN SERVICE-LEARNING COURSES
Invitation Letter to Students in Service-learning Courses

The Ohio State University

Dear students,

I am a doctoral student in Higher Education working with Dr. Robert F. Rodgers, Associate Professor of Education at The Ohio State University. The purpose of my dissertation research is to examine the outcomes of service-learning courses offered at The Ohio State University. Hopefully, the results will help us design better classes. If you desire, outcomes on your specific course will be provided to you. I hope you will be willing to assist in the research and assist The Ohio State University provide better service-learning courses. Since the number of participants is very important to any conclusion I can draw from this study, I would like to invite all of you to participate in my study.

If you agree to participate, this study would take place during the quarter when you are taking this service-learning course and would consist of:

• Fill out two questionnaires during the first week of the quarter;
• Fill out two questionnaires during the tenth week of the quarter.

One questionnaire called Measure of Epistemological Reflection (MER) consists of essay questions, please answer each question as thoroughly as you can and write down your answers for each question even you may feel that you have to repeat yourself to some extent. It will take about 30 to 45 minutes to answer this questionnaire. The other questionnaire called Scale of Service Learning Involvement consists of multiple choice questions, please use pencil to mark the responses to the questions. It will take about 15 minutes to answer this questionnaire.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and will only take a limited amount of time (45-60 minutes for two questionnaires). You may withdraw from the study at any time. However, it is important to the study to have both pre-course and post-course questionnaires from each participant. A gift certificate from a restaurant on High Street will be provided to you as a thank-you after both pre-course questionnaires and post-course questionnaires are received by this researcher. All information will be held confidentially.

Please complete the enclosed Research Consent Form and Participation Information Form and return them to me. You may also contact me at wang.547@osu.edu or 614-6889598 to ask for further information.

Sincerely,

Yan Wang
Ph.D. Candidate
School of Educational Policy and Leadership

Robert Rodgers
Associate Professor
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
Consent for Participation in Social and Behavioral Research

The Ohio State University                     Protocol No. 02E0134

I consent to participating in research entitled The Designs and Outcomes of Service Learning Courses.

Robert F. Rodgers (Principle Investigator), Associate Professor of Education, or authorized representative Ms. Yan Wang (Co-Investigator), Ph.D. Candidate, has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

I agreed to take the two questionnaires during the first week of the quarter and again during the last week of the quarter. I understand that identifying information on the questionnaires will be deleted.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: __________
(Research Participant)

Signed: ___________________________
(Principle Investigator or Authorized Representative)
Participation Information Form

If you are willing to be involved with this study, please complete this form and return to:

Yan Wang
517 Montgomery Ct.
Columbus, OH 43210

By completing this form, you agree to participate in a research study on service learning courses designs and outcomes as outlined in the enclosed letter. The researcher will be in contact with you about further participation once the form has been received. Please feel free to contact the researcher at 614-6889598 and via email at wang.547@osu.edu.

Name:__________________________ Telephone: ____________________

E-mail address:____________________________________________________

Title and number of the service-learning course:_______________________

Quarter and year the service-learning course offered: _________________
APPENDIX H

SYLLABUS OF COURSE 1 – LITERACY AND COMMUNITY: CREATING LEARNING PARTNERSHIP
Course 1: Literacy and Community: Creating Learning Partnerships

Creating Learning Partnerships:
This course is designed to give you practice in the kinds of critical thinking, learning, reading, writing, listening and discussing skills that are essential to academic inquiry. Since no one lives in a vacuum, how we learn and what we learn depends largely on the communities with which we interact and the varying literacies those communities value. Our knowledge base—and the kinds of knowledge we value—can therefore be said to be **contextual**, that is dependent on and relative to our unique learning experiences. This quarter, we will be investigating the nature of literacy, knowledge, and community in a number of ways, including forming literacy partnerships with elementary school students who are preparing to take the Ohio Fourth Grade Proficiency Test. **One important goal of the course is for you to make connections between your work at the University and what you experience and learn as a Literacy Partner at Trevitt Elementary’s after school program.**

This is how the partnership program will work. You will work one hour each week outside of class (Wednesday’s class time) onsite at Trevitt Elementary with one or more first grade students on activities we or their teachers have planned as a way of helping them prepare for Ohio’s Proficiency Test. Your activities with the students will help them improve their literacy skills, and they will help you to think more consciously about your own reading and writing habits and how you acquired them, the kinds of knowledge that are important in a given situation, and how multiple literacies allow you to interact among many different kinds of groups with relative freedom.

During our class meetings, you’ll be sharing reading and writing activities with each other. We’ll all be learning from and teaching each other about the ways we see connections between literacy, knowledge, and community. Working together, then, by the end of the quarter we’ll be able to identify patterns we see and discuss how they influence the ways people learn. We’ll begin by considering definitions of a number of terms and ideas connected to literacy, learning and community; then, as our own ideas expand, we’ll revise and refine those terms as the quarter progresses.

The Bottom Line: You may be wondering why there is a “service” component to this course. The partnerships we form this quarter create a “win-win” situation. Not only will you have the satisfaction of knowing that you have been a role model for your partner(s) and your classmates, you will have created real experiences from which you can learn about society, its expectations, and assumptions, and about the highly varied contexts in which people live. There is also richness to the knowledge you’ll gain about acquiring reading and writing skills for college, because you’ll be writing about ideas and issues that have meaning to you, topics that aren’t simply “satisfying a prompt.” In effect, you’ll be “learning to do by doing,” and by writing and reading and talking and listening about the experiences you and your classmates share this quarter, you’ll have begun to accomplish the main goal of any writing course: communicating effectively.

Required Texts and Materials:

- **Mitchie, Gregory.** *holler if you hear me: the education of a teacher and his students.* NY: Teacher’s College Press, Columbia University, 1999.


- **A college-level grammar handbook (I’ve ordered Lunsford’s Easy Writer, 2nd ed.)**
Two 3.5-inch disks formatted for the Mac. (You can purchase disks already formatted in the bookstore. Even if you use another kind of computer outside of class, you will need to purchase 2 Mac disks for use in this class.)

Access to a college-level dictionary (American Heritage’s preferred).

Course Policies:

Attendance and Participation: Attending class is your choice; it is a commitment you make to the work when you enroll in any class. This course demands your consistent participation both in class and at Trevitt. If you are unable to attend class, you are required to call my office in advance and leave a message. If you must miss a session with your literacy partner at Trevitt, you must make arrangements with a classmate to make sure your literacy partner will have someone to work with. Remember that younger students will tend to model your consistency and will rise (or fall) according to the expectations you establish together. You will also need to contact members of your peer group, since they depend on you to complete activities we do in class.

You are responsible for turning in any and all assignments when they are due.

You are allowed to miss three classes, including one session at Trevitt before your grade will be affected. If you miss 6 or more classes, it is likely that you will have missed a substantial amount of work and may not be able to pass the class. In other words, your full participation and attendance is required. If you choose to miss class or a Wednesday with your literacy partner, you cannot expect to receive the full benefit of that day’s session. Moreover, you cannot expect your classmates or me to spend time trying to recreate what you have missed. The opportunity to share what the class was that day will have passed.

Writing:

Three Major Projects: There will be two major writing assignments for this course. The first is a “literacy autobiography,” where you will explore the people, places, and things that have influenced your becoming a “literate” person in society. Second, you will research and write about a topic in public education. This project will require you to gather a substantial amount of objective information on your topic and incorporate it into a conventional academic argument. Finally, you will work with the members of your peer group on third, collaborative and creative project that will focus around your experiences as literacy partners. These assignments tend to evolve as we work on them together, so it is important you allow sufficient time in your schedule to work on them as significant documents.

Journals: Your journals are places where you will practice developing your ideas, a number of which may find their way into your final project. You will write two or three journals (between one and two pages, typed, each) each week. One journal each week will be a consideration of your reading assignments for the week, a second will provide a personal reflection about your experiences with your literacy partner each week. Your journals should be reflections, where you analyze and evaluate the text/session, rather than a simple summary of what you read or what activities you did with your partner(s). These will be collected at the beginning of the class period on the day they are due.

Writing workshop days: Since we will meet in a computer lab twice a week, we will be using a great deal of that time to produce formal and informal writing on topics pertinent to the class. Denney 307 is equipped with iMacs. You will need to be prepared to work in this medium in class. To this end, you will need to purchase two 3.5” computer disks formatted for Mac; you will also need to be able to access your email from the lab. This is especially important if you plan to switch between Mac and PC
format. (See below.) **You are responsible for having your assignments in a format you can use in class.**

Dealing with grammar: You may be surprised to discover that we don’t talk formally about grammar very often in class. This doesn’t mean it’s not important. Agreed upon conventions about grammar serve to minimize miscues in communication, and writers choose to observe or defy these conventions in order to get their meaning across to readers in particular ways. Generally speaking, most classes you’ll take at Ohio State will expect you to conform fairly closely to the conventions of “School English,” but as you write for different classes and different disciplines, you’ll see that each context differs—if only slightly. As you draft documents, I’ll point out places where your writing differs from academic convention in ways that may affect the meaning you’re trying to convey. That way, you can consult a grammar handbook, learn the convention, and then make an informed choice about whether you can make your writing more effective. Working with grammar in this way puts it in a more realistic place as part of the entire writing process.

**Late Work:** Work that is turned in late will be read but will receive a grade of “0” or “E”. If you turn in an assignment late, you cannot expect it to be returned with assignments that were turned in on time.

**Format for turning in papers:** Most word-processing programs create an acceptable document with adequate margins. Your papers should be double-spaced to improve readability and allow room for comments. This includes drafts of papers that your writing groups will be working with. Drafts of your essays should be typed. If you have further questions about format, consult a grammar handbook. Handbooks provide useful information about spacing around extended quotes, citing sources, etc. If you are e-mailing an assignment to me or to your classmates, please send your attachment in “rich text format” (*.rtf) so that multiple word processing programs can open the file.

**Plagiarism:** Using someone else’s ideas or words as your own, or using them without giving the appropriate person credit is considered a serious offense at OSU and every other college or university and may result in expulsion or dismissal from the institution. It’s best (and easy) not to take the risk. Consult your student handbook, OSU’s website, or an OSU First-Year Composition folder for details.

**Reading:**
We will be reading two very different texts during the quarter. *holler if you hear me* is a collection of stories about teaching and learning taken from the author’s experience as a teacher and learner in an urban school. The other book, *Help America Read: A Handbook for Volunteers*, is a resource book that discusses how students learn about reading and writing, and it offers suggestions we can use to help Trevitt students achieve their goals. *Your written responses to each reading assignment will be due the day we are scheduled to discuss it, but I also want you to come to class with a written question or comment about something that seemed significant to you in the assignment.* We will use these as springboards into discussing the reading. Since we’re all teachers and learners, we all have something significant to contribute to the discussion. It’s important to be open to other people’s input, to listen to them carefully, and to help them clarify their ideas.

**Mutual respect:**
A successful learning environment is one in which teachers and students share respect for each other and the experiences each person brings to the classroom. I expect this to be true for our class as well. Know that I am genuinely interested in your ideas, and one of my goals this quarter is to help you present those ideas in an effective manner. I want our class to be a place where you can safely take risks with the ways you think about and express your ideas, and comments I make on your work will be directed to that end.

Please show respect for your classmates by engaging in the work of the course during class and saving social conversations, work for other classes, and reading the newspaper for another time. You also show respect for your classmates by having assignments ready when they are due. *If you have a cell*
phone or pager, either turn them off or set them to vibrate during class. If you must leave class for any reason, it’s okay simply to get up and leave quietly. That way, class can continue with minimum distraction. I will reserve the right to ask someone to leave the class if I believe s/he is being disruptive; moreover, because this is your class, you also have the right to ask someone who is being disruptive in class to stop.

**Grades:**
Your grade for this class will be determined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Autobiography</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Project</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Project</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterms on Reading</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam (Presentation)</td>
<td>05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/Participation/Activities</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Getting help with your work
One characteristic of a collaborative classroom is that you can rely on classmates and on me to get help when you’re stuck. If you have questions, ask. Stay in touch with members of your writing group and help each other work through problems that arise in the group. You can schedule individual or group conferences with me during my office hours listed above. If it’s impossible to meet during these times (not just inconvenient), we can usually find a time that works for both of us.

Writing Programs
If you feel there is a problem or an issue between us that we cannot satisfactorily resolve together, there is an English Department resource with whom you can speak confidentially. The Writing Programs Ombudsman (or woman) provides and impartial resource for students and teachers when there are questions about policy, perceived personality conflicts between students and teachers, or dilemmas about grading or plagiarism.

Using Computers:
We meet each week in DE 307, one of the English Department’s designated computing labs. DE 307 is an iMac lab with a Local Area Network (LAN) and Internet access. While it is probable that we may not take advantage of all of the technologies available in the lab during the quarter, I believe the ones we do use will afford you additional strategies for writing and for thinking about writing. Because activities in the lab center on using the computers, you will need to have your work saved to at least TWO diskettes formatted for a Macintosh platform. We will also do computer-based peer responding in and out of class. Time deadlines will become critical to observe for these exercises.

**Some Macs can speak WinPC but WinPCs don’t like to speak Mac:**

It will be your responsibility to be prepared to work in a format that is compatible with the word processing software in the lab. To avoid classroom glitches, time hassles, and other headaches if you use other computing resources on campus or at home, you can:

- Use only MS Word for your documents. Claris Works and Microsoft Works do not translate. Don’t assume all forms of MS Word will translate. Be wary of crossing platforms: PC software doesn’t talk Mac and Mac doesn’t talk PC.
- Save a copy of your work as a “text only” file or as “*.rtf” and be prepared to reformat your document in the lab.
E-mail your document to yourself by cutting and pasting from your word processing program into the text body of the e-mail. You can access your campus email through http://www.campusi.com.

If you are e-mailing an assignment to me or to your classmates, please send your attachment in “rich text format” (*.rtf) so that the file can be opened by multiple word processing programs.

Copy and paste your text into a Mac Word document and save it to the LAN. Remember to e-mail a copy of the changed document back to yourself before you leave the lab.

I’d strongly recommend you experiment with these strategies ahead of any due dates if you plan to use a PC for most of your work. Documents saved to a disk on a dedicated word processor will not work in any of the Denney Hall Labs.

FYI: The computer labs in Denney Hall 308, 312, and 316 are public labs between 5:30 and 10 PM Sunday through Thursday. DE 308 has MacG4s, and the other labs are equipped with Dell PCs.

The Office for Disability Services—http://www.ods.ohio-state.edu
The Office for Disability Services (ODS), located in 150 Pomerene Hall (292-3307), offers a variety of services for students with documented disabilities. ODS proctors examinations for students who need exam accommodations. This office provides a variety of other services and auxiliary aids that include access to class notes, taped textbooks, interpreters and/or closed captioning for deaf students, and a variety of special equipment housed in an Adapted Technology Center. To access services, students must provide ODS with documentation of the disability. ODS staff also diagnose learning disabilities. Students are frequently referred to this office by faculty or advisors when it has been observed that a student has difficulty with some aspect of learning or exhibiting what has been learned. Students may also refer themselves.

Three rules you can remember to make this course a successful experience:

Showing up is good.

Turning in late work is bad.

Communication is key.

Let’s work together to make this a great class! I’m looking forward to working with you.
Course 2: Leadership in Community Service

Course Purpose
This course examines leadership in the context of service and community involvement. In this course, students will gain an understanding of service and leadership for "the common good," analyze the setting in which service takes place, actively participate in a community service setting for a minimum of three hours a week, gain hands on knowledge, skills, and experience about a specific community organization, and develop their own leadership style and skills in a community setting. The purpose of this course is to prepare students for a lifetime of engaged, responsible, and active community involvement and leadership.

Course Description and Objectives
The core of the learning experience in this course is community involvement. The course examines leadership in the context of service and community involvement. The question of leadership for what purpose will be critically examined through the lens of service and community. Students will be encouraged to thoughtfully and critically analyze their own leadership responsibilities, community involvements, and service commitments.

The primary objectives of the course are:
• to gain an understanding of leadership, community involvement, and the "common good"
• to understand and utilize concepts informing leadership practice such as self knowledge, vision, common purpose, commitment, followership, collaboration, empowerment, inclusiveness, controversy with civility, social change, etc.
• to develop leadership skills and competency through application of leadership concepts in a community setting
• to understand a community issue from multiple perspectives
• to integrate service/community involvement experiences with readings on leadership, community, and service
• to understand and distinguish between community-identified assets and needs from externally defined needs; and to address needs as defined by community agencies through direct service
• to understand and describe connections and inequities related to power, privilege, community resources, and social justice
• to develop a personal philosophy of service and community leadership through critical analysis of social issues, reflection, and community involvement

Course Format
The format for this course includes in-class lectures, discussion groups, reflection activities, and a field experience at a local Columbus community service organization. All of these components are integral to the course. Each student will select from a list of 5 service sites at which a minimum of 3 hours/week of involvement at the site is required. Discussion groups comprised of all the students at each community service site will constitute a central component of class. Each group will be facilitated by a site leader/teaching assistant who will also act as a liaison between you and your community service site as necessary. Additional guidelines for the community service component of the class are included in the course packet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Service Sites</th>
<th>Site Leader/TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After School Academic Success(ASAP)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Center-North</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medary Elementary School</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Services, Inc.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project OpenHand – Columbus</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Required Texts


Selected readings and supplementary forms/handouts are available in the EDU P&L 271 Course Packet, which may be purchased at COP-EZ, Tuttle Park.

Course Requirements
• Community Service Site Placement
As noted above, each student is required to spend a minimum of three hours/week at a designated community service site. Scheduled hours are to be determined with the community agency supervisor and your TA. Your commitment to your site is crucial to your own learning as well as to the community service site. Extend the same courtesy to your site as you would if you were employed by showing up on time and at scheduled times.

• Class Participation
Class attendance is expected as is active participation in both class discussions and community service. Each student is expected to achieve a high level of involvement in class discussions by preparing for each class, completing all assignments, and integrating both in-class and community-based learning.

• Discussion Group Involvement
Each week, half of the class session will be spent in small discussion groups organized around your particular community service site. Attendance and active engagement in these groups are required and an integral part of class time. Discussion will be facilitated by your site leader/TA and will provide you with an opportunity to discuss your involvement at your site as well as to ask questions.

• Presentations (2)
What? Presentation- (May 8)- This group project addresses the particular issue about which your site is focused (i.e. AIDS, literacy, youth development, poverty, hunger, etc.). What is the issue? Investigate why the agency you are working with exists. What is the need for this organization? Why does this need exist? Consider these questions from multiple perspectives: your own, an agency staff member’s, a person who uses the agency’s services, a tax payer, a class member not involved at your site, and others. What would need to happen for this organization to no longer be needed by the community? Be sure to differentiate between needs-based/deficiencies and assets-based/capacities orientations. This presentation is to be accompanied by a group paper on this issue (see guidelines under “written work”). This presentation is not to exceed 20 minutes per group.

Final Presentation (May 29) – This presentation focuses on what the group has learned from working at this service site. This learning is to be creatively displayed through lecture and visual aides. Individual learning and insight is also to be represented. This presentation is not to exceed 20 minutes per group.

• 2 Quizzes
Two short quizzes (typically 10 items) will be given during the quarter on unannounced dates. The quizzes will cover assigned readings to date and will be constructed of several multiple choice, matching, and short answer questions. These quizzes will not be difficult if you keep up with reading assignments. The quizzes will be scheduled for the first 10 minutes of class. If you are absent or late to class, the quiz must be scheduled during instructor office hours.
• Written Assignments
  1) Service-Learning Agreement  
    [Due April 17]
    A service-learning plan worksheet is to be completed by you and discussed with your site supervisor  
    (the form is included in the reading packet). It articulates and describes your service and learning goals  
    for your involvement at your community service site and the activities you will be engaged in during  
    your time there. This agreement should include the days and times you will be working at your site.  
    Please give one copy of this agreement/form to your supervisor, one copy to  
    your TA, and two copies to Jen Gilbride-Brown. One copy will be returned to you after  
    evaluation (4 copies).

    In the course packet you will also find a Community Involvement Activity Record. Please utilize this  
    form to keep track of service hours and corresponding activity throughout the quarter. At the end of the  
    quarter, this record will be due on June 10th, except for graduating seniors. Deadline will be negotiated
  
  2) Reflective Reaction/Question Sheets  
    [Due Weeks 2 through 10 at beginning of class to your TA - 9 total]
    You are encouraged to keep a personal journal during the course as a way for you to reflect on and  
    make meaning of your service experience at your community site, in class discussion, and through the  
    readings. You will be asked to highlight reactions from your reflections through construction of  
    Reflective Reaction/Qwestions. The content of the cards should include meaningful reactions and  
    insights you have drawn from the previous week’s reading, service, and class involvement along with  
    questions that have emerged. The reflections are to be turned in to your TA each week at the beginning  
    of class. Additional guidelines for the Reflective Reaction/Qwestions are provided in the course packet.

  3) Essays (3)  
    [Due April 24, June 5]
    Reflective essays described below should be approximately 3-5 pages in length, typed and double-  
    spaced. The essays should reflect an integration of your service-involvement, class discussions, and  
    reading. All papers must utilize at least 6 citations from a variety of the assigned readings.

    Who Am I?—Please write an essay in which you discuss who you are in terms of the communities in  
    which you are a member. More specifically, think about and describe who you are in terms of race,  
    ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, ability/disability, religious background, national origin, etc.?  
    What groups/communities are or have been different for you? For whom are you different? Describe a  
    time when you interacted with others different from yourself – how did you feel and what did you think  
    about? How do/did stereotypes influence your sense of others as different and of your sense of self as  
    different. Describe what you take for granted or do not notice and how privilege or oppression might  
    impact how you experience the world? Do you consider yourself to be a leader? How do you describe  
    yourself as a leader? Is there an issue(s) that you care about? [due April 24]

    Relational Leadership Reflection – Please write an essay in which you use the “Relational Leadership  
    Model” to reflect on the process of working as a group in preparation for your What? Presentation.  
    Using each component of the model, reflect on whether or not these elements were present in your own  
    group contribution and leadership/followership. Were they present in others’ contributions?  
    Constructively critique your own and your group’s performance in preparing for the presentation and  
    during the actual class time. [Due May 15]

    Now What?— In this final reflective paper, thinking about who you are and how you relate to others,  
    describe what difference your experience makes in who you are as a leader and how you intend to make  
    a difference. How will you practice your leadership and for what purpose? What do you stand for?  
    Describe your commitments and responsibilities - as they have been informed by your learning in this
class - to your self, to others, to a specific organization(s) you are a member, and to the various communities of which you are a member, or not.
[ due June 5- except for graduating seniors. Deadline will need to be negotiated ]

4) Letter to your community service site
[due June 10- except for graduating seniors. Deadline to be determined.]
Your community service site supervisor will benefit from hearing what you have learned from this experience after volunteering on a consistent basis for approximately 9 weeks, including what you have brought to – and taken away – from your community service site. To that end write a letter to your community service site supervisor describing what you have learned as a result of your involvement there. In addition to identifying how you have benefited from your participation, describe what you think the benefits to the community and to the service organization have been. Additional guidelines for this letter are available in the reading packet.

Evaluation

Class/Service Attendance and Participation 10 points
Service Attendance and Participation 10 points
Group Briefings & Final Presentation 10 points
What? Group Presentation 15 points
2 Quizzes – 5 points each 10 points
Reflective Reaction/Question Cards 10 points
Service-Learning Agreement 5 points
Reflective Essays (3) 45 points (15,15,15)
Letter to Community Service Site 10 points

125 points

* Attendance and active participation are expected both in class and at your service site. Two points will be subtracted for each class or volunteer time missed. If you are unable to attend class, contact Jennifer Gilbride-Brown as soon as possible.
* Site leaders/TAs are responsible for awarding participation, presentation, and reflection card points. Jennifer Gilbride-Brown will evaluate all other written materials.
* Late work will not be accepted without penalty unless appropriate arrangements have been made with Jen Gilbride-Brown and documentation is submitted. One point per day will be subtracted for each day an assignment is overdue. No more than two points will be deducted.

Grading Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94-100 (117.5-125)</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-93 (112.5-116.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87-89 (108.75-111.25)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>84-86 (105-107.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-83 (100-103.75)</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77-79 (96.25-98.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>74-76 (92.5-95)</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70-73 (87.5-91.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>64-69 (80-86.25)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>63 and below (78.75-below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Outline and Schedule

Week 1
Wednesday, April 3
Introduction to course - overview and expectations
Community service site introductions and selections
Week 2  
April 10

**Entering Communities: Principles of Good Practice in Community Service**

[begin discussion groups]

Reading assignment:
- Finding Your Voice: Preface, Chapters 1&2
- In Watters & Ford:
  - American Horse (pp. 5-14)
  - Privileged Ones (pp. 14-24)
  - Corla Hawkins (pp. 176-182)
  - What is Poverty? (pp. 266-269)
  - Helping and Hating the Homeless (pp. 270-283)
  - The Way It’s Supposed to Be (pp. 363-372)

**Reflection card due at beginning of class**

Week 3  
April 17

**Leadership in a Changing World: Building Capacity**

Reading assignment:
- Finding Your Voice: Chapters 3
  - Building Communities from the Inside Out (packet)
  - Watters & Ford:
    - The Mending Wall (pp. 123-124)
    - Service Learning: Education with a Purpose (pp. 193-199)

**Service-Learning Agreement due**

**Reflection card due at beginning of class**

Week 4  
April 24

**Building Communities of Difference: Encouraging Inclusiveness**

Reading assignment:
- Finding Your Voice: Chapter 6
  - White Privilege and Male Privilege (packet)
  - Watters & Ford:
    - Breaking Silences (pp. 219-232)

(These assignments will be very helpful in constructing your Who Am I? paper)

**Written assignment: Who Am I? paper due**

**Reflection card due at beginning of class**

Week 5  
May 1

**Lives of Commitment: Leadership and Service**

Reading assignment:
- Jeffrey Adler’s Commencement Address (packet)
- Finding Your Voice: Chapters 5&7
- Watters & Ford:
  - A New First Lady (pp. 92-99)
  - Family Legacy (pp. 24-30)

**Reflection card due at beginning of class**

Week 6  
May 8

**Leadership for What? Purpose**

**What? Presentations**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Responsible Leadership in Community Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Reading assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watters &amp; Ford:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer of Success (pp. 103-108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women, Home, and Community: Struggle in an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Environment (pp. 412-419)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection card due at beginning of class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Leadership for Social Change: Building Bridges from Commitment to Coalitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 22</td>
<td>Reading assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding Your Voice: Chapter 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watters &amp; Ford:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inaugural Address (pp. 89-92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter from Birmingham Jail (pp. 285-299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optional Reading: Leadership for Social Change (packet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection card due at beginning of class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Building &amp; Renewing Commitments to Leadership in Community Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 29</td>
<td>Final Class Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding Your Voice: Chapter 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Jeffrey Adler Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection card due at beginning of class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Summary: &quot;Who Can Keep Us Caged?&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 5</td>
<td>Course Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding Your Voice: Chapter 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watters &amp; Ford:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poem for the Creative Writing Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(pp. 142-143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written assignment: Now What? paper due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection card due at beginning of class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Letter to Community Service Agency and Community Involvement Activity Report due by 4pm on Monday, June 10th to Jen Gilbride-Brown’s box in 301 Ramseyer Hall.
Absolutely no work will be accepted for credit past Monday, June 10th at 4pm. Please be sure to communicate AHEAD OF TIME any difficulties you are having with the class or assignments.

Seniors graduating at the end of spring quarter have different final deadlines. Please be sure to check with Jen Gilbride-Brown about those dates and making different arrangements.
APPENDIX J

SYLLABUS OF COURSE 3 – LIFESPAN MOTO DEVELOPMENT
Course 3: Lifespan Motor Development

Course Description

A study of the continuous process of motor development and motor behavior across the lifespan. Skills will be developed in observation and analysis of locomotor, non-locomotor, and manipulative skill sequences. The phylogenetic and ontogenetic factors mediating human growth and development will be discussed and applied. Relationships among growth, maturation, motor performance, and the persons’ context will be discussed. Developmental considerations will be discussed with respect to planning and directing movement experiences for individuals across the lifespan. Individual and gender differences will be identified and applied to movement settings. The course incorporates a 3-credit lecture and a 2-credit service-learning experience. The service-learning experience consists of weekly instruction in a community-based early childhood motor skill program or a senior recreation center. Academic concepts learned in class will be applied and utilized in the service-learning setting.

Objectives

1) Identify and apply models of motor development to lifespan movement.
2) Explain the principles of motor development and apply them to the learning and teaching of motor skills across the lifespan.
3) Identify the interaction between the social and cognitive domains and the potential influence on motor development.
4) Identify the movement characteristics and basic skills of individuals from birth through late adulthood.
5) Understand how constraints (task/performance/environment) influence motor performance.
6) Demonstrate how to use appropriate instruments of motor skills to specific age groups.
7) Discuss the influence of aging on motor skill performance and the implications to movement programming for the elderly.
8) Discuss the impact of physical growth and biological maturity on the motor performance of children, youth, and adults.
9) Develop beginning level competency in assessing the motor performance of young children.
10) Develop skills in synthesizing research material in a written, scientific form.
11) Synthesize class content and make applications to the field settings in which the student is enrolled.
12) Conduct a senior or child study applying concepts learned in the course.

Course Format and Assessment

Course format: a variety of group activities, in-class and outside small assignments, and other learning experiences will be used throughout the duration of this course to achieve the stated objectives.

1. Preparation class: finish assignment reading as well as be ready to discuss field experience; check the website for relative information regarding lecture the following week. OSU website updated every Sunday.
2. Participation of cooperative group working as well as discussion in the class: these sessions are geared to provide information aligned with specific units to be covered in this course. Assigned readings for each class session will be elaborated upon during the scheduled sessions.
3. Field Experience: Regular attendance and participation in the child study program or senior center is required. Furthermore, course enrollees must maintain a biweekly journal that you will bring in class to discuss the relative topic; you will turn in your journal to me.

4. Learning Activities: Learning activities will be used to enhance the learning process with tasks/assignments/ individual/group presentations most relevant to content as it is covered across the duration of the quarter.

5. Quizzes and Exam: Quizzes will be applied in order to aid students in learning the material. Most quizzes will be multiple choice and/or short answer. The contents to study for the quizzes are previously assigned readings, activities, and lectures that the instructor covered.

6. Attendance for the class: Course enrollees are expected to attend all classes. Since attendance is a necessary expectation for this course, 4 points are awarded for each class session attended. The attendance roster will serve as the record of student attendance. Absences will be documented and may negatively impact your final course grade (see Course Expectations).

7. Participation is a daily expectation. Every student is expected to complete the reading(s) prior to assigned dates, be prepared to discuss reading contents in class, and participate in the course activities and applied learning experiences in a substantive way. Participation will be assessed through the scores you receive on discussion and in-class assignments (see Course Expectations).

8. Toy Assignment: Students will visit a toy store. They will examine gender-role stereotyping and ethnic stereotyping with respect to the packaging and marketing of toys to children of a specific gender and ethnicity. Students will consider the impact of stereotyping on promotion of movement and motor development.


Assessment contingencies are based on how well students meet the expectations of the course with regards to attendance, participation, projects, presentation, and quizzes. Assignments. Learning tasks are designed to allow students to determine the effort, time, commitment, and quality of work they choose to put into the course. Points will be earned as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Contingencies</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Due Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Quizzes (drop off one worst score)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Every Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vide exam - FMS Assessment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>April 1 – June 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance in class</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>April 1 – June 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation (included individual/group presentation)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Writing</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>April 8 – May 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Option: Two lesson plans for your teaching situation with three journals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toy Assignment</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation and short paper</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra credit (optional)</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>April 1- June 6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Philosophy of Teaching in this Course*

*The grade of A should simply certify that we have learned a great deal in absolute terms, not that we have learned a great deal more than other students (Richard W. Malott). I apply this principle to my course.*
I also respect that my class may/may not be one of the most important in your career. Thus, you can set up your own grade level target and try to achieve it. I will respect it as well as try to help you to achieve what you want for your career.

In this course, I also provide a retake of a quiz verbally (up to 7 days after originally taken) and I will give back up to half the lost points. Moreover, you can receive up to an additional 10 points of extra credit.

COURSE EXPECTATIONS

Class will generally includes:
Quiz 10, lecture, diversity of cooperative group working (e.g., group/individual presentation/written activities); discuss field experience.

Participation:
Active participation:
1. Be present in the classroom;
2. Write and turn in the assignment to the instructor as an individual or group;
3. Listen respectively when the other individual is speaking;
4. If you speak out in the class three times on three different topics (maximum), you are encouraged not to speak out again for the class period; if you have questions and/or wish to discuss more, you can come to see the instructor after class or during office hour. So, all students are able to participate during the short amount of time we have.

To not receive the participation grade:
1. Talk when another student or the instructor is speaking or lecturing to the class;
2. Leave before half the class is over.

Quality of work:
Being able to clearly articulate with people (e.g., students, athletes, parents, administrators, the community, media) is critical to your role as a professional. The expectation is that all written work will be typed or computer generated, double-spaced, spell checked, and proofread for grammatical and typing accuracy. You are expected to develop quality work that reflects you as an effective professional. This suggests delving into additional literature to enhance your knowledge, expertise, and quality of the program you will deliver to persons with who you provide service.

Support for your work:
Having a viewpoint is critical! It is just as important, however, that you are able to provide an appropriate rationale, show support for what you believe, and are able to document your perspectives by citing relevant literature.

Attendance Criteria:
This course requires peer interaction and involvement within a variety of learning experiences, which makes attendance a necessary requirement. This suggests that your attendance pattern will directly impact the grade you earn. With this in mind, only absences due to severe illness or a death in the family will be accepted as valid. Please contact the course instructor PRIOR to your absence so arrangements can be made to cover your assigned tasks in your peer group. You must provide medical documentation upon your return to class, which does not include a health center form that indicates you went there at some time during the day. In the event of a valid absence, and upon your request, missed work can be made-up.

Tardiness:
Students will sign the attendance roster as they enter the classroom. Class begins promptly at 10:30 am. If you arrive late to class, enter QUIETLY, and QUICKLY find a seat. You may sign the attendance
roster at the end of class. Please know that tardiness to class will not be tolerated. Learning experiences and quizzes will begin at the designated class starting time. Students entering class late will have only the amount of time left to complete the assignment or quiz. Two tardies constitute one absence, which will be deducted from your attendance points (2 points).

**Missed work:**
Evaluation of in-class learning experiences is often immediate and on sight. If you have an excused absence and have spoken with the instructor prior to class you may make up the in-class activity within two class sessions. This requires you to contact the instructor to discuss the missed work. If you do not have an excused absence, or arrive after the experience is over, you cannot make it up. This same policy will hold true for missed application exercises, quizzes, and the exam.

**Academic Misconduct:**
Cheating of any kind or plagiarism of others work/thoughts will not be tolerated. Citing of another person’s words or thoughts must be done using correct referencing in the text and then included in a bibliography. All instances of academic misconduct will be submitted to the Office of Academic Misconduct, following procedural guidelines.

**Attire and Unprofessional Behavior:**
Hats and sunglasses should be worn outdoors and removed when you enter the classroom and the elementary school. Seeing your face is helpful in determining whether you understand concepts and applications. Therefore, I can teach proactively. No bad words are allowed in the classroom and during the practicum, as practiced by professionals. If you are prostrate any situation relative to this class and/or lab, send an e-mail message or stop by my office. It also helps to ensure that students complete their own work. Infraction of this expectation will result in a 2-point deduction from your point total. Moreover, no jeans, hats, or sunglasses are allowed in the filed experience; you should dress professionally by wearing appropriate athletic attire.

**EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

Course grades will be determined by the percentage of total points earned by each student. See Tables 1, 2, and 3.

**Grade Criteria**
The following percentage breakdown will be used to arrive at a final letter grade:

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94% &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A -</td>
<td>90 - 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>87 - 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B -</td>
<td>83 - 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>77 - 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C -</td>
<td>73 - 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>67 - 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D -</td>
<td>63 - 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>≤ 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Textbook**
## Tentative Course Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>In class activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. April 1/Tu</td>
<td>Review syllabus; go over field experience assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students who signed up for the Senior Center need to go to the Gillie Recreation Center by 12:18pm (for one hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. April 3/Th</td>
<td>Orientation to field experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. April 8/Tu</td>
<td>Definition of Motor Development (MD), Importance of MD, Models of MD, Principles of MD</td>
<td>Ch. 1 - pp. 1 - 28</td>
<td>Lecture, learning activities, and Journal # 1 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. April 10/Th</td>
<td>Application of cognitive development to motor programming</td>
<td>Ch. 2 - pp. 29 – 46</td>
<td>Quiz # 1, Lecture, and learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. April 15/Tu</td>
<td>Lecture 5: Social Development, and Application of social development to motor programming</td>
<td>Ch. 3 - pp. 47 - 69</td>
<td>Lecture, learning activities (assign partner presentation), and Journal # 2 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. April 17/Th</td>
<td>Infant Reflexes</td>
<td>Ch. 10 - pp. 235 - 255, Ch. 6 - pp. 112 - 136</td>
<td>Quiz #2, Lecture, learning activities (partner presentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. April 22/Tu</td>
<td>Watch Video of Infant Reflexes, Rudimentary Movements of Infancy, Early Brain Research</td>
<td>Ch. 11 - pp. 256 – 272, Toy assignment due</td>
<td>Lecture, learning activities, and Journal # 3 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. April 24/Th</td>
<td>Gross Motor Skills: Locomotor skills, Object control skills (Gymnasium activities)</td>
<td>Ch. 13 - pp. 297 - 327, Ch. 14 - pp. 328 - 364</td>
<td>Quiz #3, Lecture, learning activities, and Gymnasium activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. April 29/Tu</td>
<td>Task analysis and instruction of FMS (Gymnasium activities)</td>
<td>Ch. 17 - pp. 428 - 453</td>
<td>Lecture, learning activities, and Journal # 4 due, and Gymnasium activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. May 1/Th</td>
<td>Review of Videotape of FMS Implications of FMS stages to movement programming</td>
<td>Ch. 18 - pp. 456 - 474</td>
<td>Quiz #4, Lecture, learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. May 6/Tu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal # 5 due, FMS Assessment Videotape Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. May 8/Th</td>
<td>Assessment of Test of Gross Motor Development</td>
<td>From Web, reading notes</td>
<td>Lectures, group activities, quiz # 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. May 13/Tu</td>
<td>Introduction to Stage Theory, and Neurological soft signs</td>
<td>Further direction to be provided</td>
<td>Lecture, learning activities, and Journal # 6 due, and further directions given on May 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. May 15/Th</td>
<td>Dynamic System Theory</td>
<td>Further direction to be provided</td>
<td>Quiz #6, Lecture, and learning activities, group assign for visiting toy store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. May 20/Tu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visit toy sore and fill out the information and present next class time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical Growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. May 22/Th</td>
<td>Prenatal development &amp; exercise during pregnancy, Influence of Teratogens, &amp; Relevance to Parenting &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>Ch. 5 - pp. 84 - 111</td>
<td>Group presentations and lecture, and learning activities, partner working, Journal # 7 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. May 27/Tu</td>
<td>Growth During Infancy &amp; Childhood; Intra-sex Differences in Growth, Inter-sex Differences in Growth</td>
<td>Ch. 7 - pp. 137 - 171</td>
<td>Quiz # 7, Lecture, and learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. May 29/Th</td>
<td>Measuring Physical Growth, Skeletal Age &amp; Growth Charts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture and learning activities, Journal # 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. June 3/Tu</td>
<td>Physical Growth in Adult &amp; Aging Populations, Motor Performance in Adult &amp; Aging Populations</td>
<td>Ch. 16 - pp. 394 - 425</td>
<td>Quiz # 8, lecture, and learning activities; open book quiz with partner #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. June 5/Th</td>
<td>Presentation for 3 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation and short paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. June 9-12</td>
<td>Office hours: 9:00am to 11:00am (or around that time) or by appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbally retake the last quiz (optional for whoever wants to retake it. I will give back only up to half of the original points lost).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service-Learning Experience

As a mandatory part of the course (2 credits), students will engage in a community-based physical activity program. Students may select from (depending upon space):

1) Early Childhood Motor Skill Program at Hubbard Elementary

In this program students will instruct motor skills to pre-kindergarten children. The focus of the program is on fundamental motor skill development. Students will directly teach small groups of students under the supervision of a Teaching Assistant & Professor. Sessions are Wednesday and Friday.

2) Senior Recreation Center

In this program students will work with seniors who attend the senior recreation center. Instruction may range across personal training in the weight room, assisting with strength and conditioning classes, walking programs, or other related activities. Students set weekly hours with the center.

Guidelines for Involvement with the Service Learning Experience

The participation in the service learning experience involves commitment from both Ohio State University students and the school or recreation center working with us. For this experience to be positive for both groups in the collaborative relationship, it is important that the following guidelines are maintained:

1) Students must dress professionally and appropriately for their physical activity setting. Tennis shoes must be worn and clothing should allow movement and demonstration. Students should not wear clothing that is ripped (e.g. torn jeans) or t-shirts with inappropriate logos (e.g. advertising alcohol, tobacco, using vulgar words, etc.).

2) Students must attend the program at their designated time each week, no absences will be tolerated or allowed to be made up. For every absence from the program, the student’s entire course grade will be dropped one entire grade (e.g. from an A to a B). If a student is unable to make the program due to illness or family emergency, the instructor must be contacted ahead of time and documentation must be provided. Late arrival or early leaving from the program will result in a drop of one-part of a letter grade from the entire course grade for each occasion (e.g. from an A to an A-).

3) Journals must be turned in at class on the due date. No late journals will be accepted even by email because the teaching assistants will perform the grading. Only late journals will be allowed after class up to 30 minutes in my office/envelope in front of my office.

4) Students should act respectfully and responsibly in the setting. Any complaints of inappropriate behavior will be dealt with severely and may result in the student receiving an E for the course.

5) Students will respond to all emails from the Teaching Assistant in charge of the setting.

6) Students will alert the instructor and/or their Teaching Assistant of any potential concerns in the community setting.
Students must achieve 9 hours of service learning time over the quarter and attend sessions every week for 9-10 weeks.

**Early Childhood Motor Skill Program Calendar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Pre-kindergarten – 10:00 a.m. - 11:05 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Pre-kindergarten – 10:00 a.m. - 11:05 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Senior Recreation Center Calendar (individual schedules)**

Students will assist at the center for 1 hour per week for a total of 10 weeks. Students will attend the center at their designated time each week and bring a sign-in sheet. Students will ask a member of the staff from the senior recreation center to sign their name and attach to your senior case study assignment at the end of the course.

For the senior center you can go M - F 8 am – 5 pm/Saturday 10 – 2 pm/ Wednesday 6 – 10 pm. You will figure out more details with Sally Hamrick (the Assistant Center Director) when she presents your orientation at 10:45 pm on January 9.
APPENDIX K

SYLLABUS OF COURSE 4 – CONSUMER HOUSING IN COMMUNITY
Course 4: Consumer Housing in Community

Course Description

Production and allocation of housing and current consumer problems. Includes service-learning experience related to data collection and analysis and neighborhood development.

Objectives

When finished with this course, the successful student will be able to (1) Understand importance of housing in US society; (2) Identify institutions and special interests involved in the production, maintenance, regulation and distribution of housing; (3) Compare and evaluate alternative solutions to housing problems; (4) Collect, interpret, and report housing data.

Course Reading Materials


University District Code Enforcement: An Assessment and Recommendations for Improvement. (A copy will be given to each student.)

Course Grade

Daily assignments
Definitions and questions @ 10 80 points
Timeline @ 5 40
Midterm exam 100
Reflection paper 100
Reflection paper 100
Final Report 100
Total 520 points

The course grade will be determined according to the following scale:
A > 480 points  B- > 415 points  D+ > 348ints
A- > 468 points  C+-> 400 points  D > 312 points
B+> 452 points  C > 375 points  E > Less than 312 points
B > 425 points  C- > 365 points

Student Responsibilities

Class Attendance: Attendance is a non-negotiable requirement. The course is built around weekly discussions, and participation is essential. Students are expected to remain for the entire class period and to participate in class discussion. Any announcements, handouts, or course material are the responsibility of the student.
Assignments: Each reading assignment should be completed prior to the date assigned. **Students are expected to be prepared to discuss the reading assignment in class.**

**Written assignments should be typed.** Written assignments should be turned in at the beginning of the class period. **Assignments are to be submitted in class on the due date. Late assignments will not be accepted.**

**Course Requirements and Procedures**

**Course Location:** The course will meet at the Human Ecology House, 1621 No. Fourth Street, corner of Fourth and 12th Avenue. Parking is available on the street or in the Zettler parking lot with a parking permit, OR Take East Residential bus from west side of Union; it runs about every 15 minutes.

**Appeals:** Students wishing to appeal the grading of an assignment must make the appeal in writing within 5 calendar days after an assignment is returned.

**Changes in Course Content or Schedule.** Changes in course content or schedule will be announced in class, and it is the responsibility of the student to hear and record this information.

**Academic Misconduct.** Any instance of cheating will be handled in accordance with established University procedures. Plagiarism or unethical activity, including having a friend write a paper for you, purchasing a paper, signing a friend=s name on an attendance roster or quiz, copying or paraphrasing material from a source without giving a proper citation, will not be tolerated. Any instances of academic misconduct will be reported to the Committee on Academic Misconduct (University Rule 3335-5-487). If you are not sure what constitutes plagiarism or unethical student behavior, ask me.

**COURSE SCHEDULE**

The schedule and/or assignments may be adjusted during the quarter. Announcement of changes will be made in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of course B content, activities, service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR 3</td>
<td>HISTORY OF A NEIGHBORHOOD</td>
<td>Read Medoff &amp; Sklar, Ch. 1, pp. 7-35. Submit written definitions of the following terms and describe how the term is used in the reading:  &lt;br&gt;- White flight  &lt;br&gt;- Federal Housing Administration  &lt;br&gt;- Urban renewal  &lt;br&gt;- HUD  &lt;br&gt;- Unemployment rate  &lt;br&gt;- Redlining  &lt;br&gt;- Blockbusting  &lt;br&gt;Submit (electronically) five events and dates for the Dudley Street timeline.  DUE APR 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR 8</td>
<td>HISTORY OF A NEIGHBORHOOD, PT. 2</td>
<td>Read Solove report and University District Code Enforcement Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR 10</td>
<td>Orientation Meeting with Weinland Park Neighborhood Residents</td>
<td>Introduction to Course and Text Movie about Dudley Street Weinland Park Slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR 15</td>
<td>INVESTING IN A NEIGHBORHOOD: NEIGHBORHOOD RESPONSE</td>
<td>Read Ch. 2, pp. 37-65. Submit written definitions of the following terms and describe how the term is used in the reading: - coalition Submit two questions for class discussion. Submit (electronically) 5 events and dates for the Dudley Street timeline. DUE APR 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR 17</td>
<td>Meeting with WP Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR 22</td>
<td>ORGANIZING A NEIGHBORHOOD</td>
<td>Read Ch. 3, pp. 67-87. Write two-three paragraphs describing the concept: - community organizing (e.g., how is community organizing accomplished, what are the benefits) Submit (electronically) 5 events and dates for the Dudley Street timeline. DUE APR 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR 24</td>
<td>Meeting with WP Group</td>
<td>First Reflection Paper Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR 29</td>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 1</td>
<td>Meeting with WP Group</td>
<td>Read Ch. 4, pp. 89-113 Submit written definitions of the following terms and describe how the term is used in the reading: - bottom-up planning - community assets - community agencies - moratorium - comprehensive plan Submit (electronically) 5 events and dates for the Dudley Street timeline. DUE May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 6</td>
<td>CONTROLLING THE PLAN PLANNING</td>
<td>Read Ch. 5, pp. 115 -144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit written definitions of the following terms and describe how the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>term is used in the reading:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- eminent domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit two questions for class discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit (electronically) 5 events and dates for the Dudley Street timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DUE May 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 8</td>
<td>Meeting with WP Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 13</td>
<td>FINANCING THE PLAN</td>
<td>Read Ch. 6, pp. 145-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit written definitions of the following terms and describe how the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>term is used in the reading:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- land trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- homeowners classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Investment Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit (electronically) 5 events and dates for the Dudley Street timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DUE MAY 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 15</td>
<td>Meeting with WP Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 20</td>
<td>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Read Ch. 7, pp. 169-201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|         |                                      | Write a description of Community development:  
<p>|         |                                      | A with people in mind and discuss economic trends that undermine         |
|         |                                      | community development                                                   |
|         |                                      | Submit (electronically) 5 events and dates for the Dudley Street timeline.| |
|         |                                      | DUE MAY 13                                                              |
| MAY 22  | Meeting with WP Group                |                                                                        |
| MAY 27  | LESSONS IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT      | Read Ch. 9, pp. 245-288                                                  |
|         |                                      | Discuss the following quote:                                            |
|         |                                      | A Community development must begin by recognizing and reinforcing resources |
|         |                                      | within the community.                                                   |
|         |                                      | (P. 254).                                                               |
|         |                                      | Submit (electronically) 5 events and dates for the Dudley Street timeline.| |
|         |                                      | DUE MAY 27                                                              |
| MAY 29  | Meeting with WP Group                | Work on Final Report                                                    |
| JUN 3   | Class time for Final Report Preparation |                                                                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUN 5</th>
<th>Meeting with WP Group</th>
<th>Presentation of Final Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUN 10</td>
<td>Final Exam B 3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>FINAL REFLECTION DUE BY JUNE 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service-Learning Project**

Service-learning is a way of teaching and learning that emphasizes active learning, reciprocity with community groups, and reflection on connections between service and learning. Active learning means that students learn and develop through active participation in organized service activities in the community. Students devote structured time in reflection or analysis of the connection between the service activity and concepts taught in the course.

The service-learning project for this course is to work with a group of residents from the Weinland Park neighborhood in a neighborhood development process. The residents who were invited to join the group were identified as leaders and as residents committed to the future of Weinland Park neighborhood. The course group residents and OSU students will work through a study of community development implemented in a Boston neighborhood. The group will look for similarities and contrasts between the two neighborhoods and for ideas and strategies that might be useful in Weinland Park. The group will seek to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats or challenges for the neighborhood and think about ways to build on strengths, take advantage of opportunities, reduce weaknesses, and deal with threats. The ultimate goal of the course is to develop community development goals and strategies for achieving goals. Students and residents will produce a report documenting their discussions, decisions, and plans.
APPENDIX L

SYLLABUS OF COURSE 5 – READING FOUNDATIONS AND SERVICE LEARNING
Course 5: Reading Foundations & Service Learning

Course description

According to the syllabus, this class is a foundation course in reading and provide Early and Middle Childhood preservice teachers with an understanding of the reading process and contemporary theories and issues of literacy learning. This course presents a cognitive-constructivist view of the reading process and a social-constructivist view of teaching and learning. Through this lens, students are regarded as active participants in the learning process, and teaching and learning are socially situated activities occurring in a community of practice or culture. Major themes woven throughout the course include a child-centered philosophy of the teaching of reading and the importance of carefully planning instruction for minority students and other diverse learners with varying literacy backgrounds. An emphasis are placed upon the ways in which effective teachers empower students to become literate within the context of research-based, authentic reading and writing practices.

Objectives

Upon the completion of this course, students should be able to:

- Display an in-depth knowledge of the reading process.
- Articulate knowledge of a social-constructivist view of teaching and learning and apply this knowledge to a range of teaching-learning situations in reading.
- Display knowledge of a range of instructional and assessment approaches for fostering and promoting children’s reading development.
- Make informed judgments about the use and effectiveness of technology to assist children’s reading development.
- Demonstrate an awareness of the needs of children for whom reading presents many challenges.

Required Texts:


*Additional handouts and articles as assigned.

*You will need to purchase a folder for your journal.

Optional Text:


Statement of Student Rights:

Any student with a documented disability who may require special assistance should self-identify to the instructor as early as possible in order to receive effective and timely accommodations.

Requirements:
Please use 12 pt. font and double space all assignments. Use APA format (5th edition) for all papers. Failure to abide by these guidelines will result in a 5% reduction in the grade.

1. **Community Service in Reading (25 points)**

   You will be asked to perform at least 25 hours (approximately 3 to 4 hours per week) of community service in University District school. Arrangements have been made for you to work at one of many possible school sites. If you are already engaged in a community-based volunteer effort in reading or if you work with children in reading on a regular basis, you may be able to use that experience to fulfill this course requirement. We would like you to have the opportunity to work with children in on-to-one, small-group, and whole-class settings and engage children in a range of activities that foster literacy development. Debbie Morbitt, the Service Learning Coordinator, will outline this portion of the course in more detail. Your service in schools is a core learning experience in the course and is designed to help you make connections between theory and practice, as well as provide you with practical experience with children as readers and writers.

2. **Dialogue journal (20 points)**

   You will be asked to reflect upon your school site experiences and keep a dialogue journal. Each week, please record the date, location, and times of your school visits, a brief statement about the activities in which you participated, and your reflections of those experiences (approximately 2 pages typed). The purpose of this journal is to prompt you to make connections between the literacy theories discussed in your OSU class and the teaching/learning practices seen in your community service placement. Particular attention should be given to the challenges you encounter and the insights you gain into a social-constructivist view of teaching and learning, to link instructional approaches and assessment, to focus on the needs of struggling readers, and the use of technology to support individual students’ reading development. You will have the opportunity to share and discuss your journal entries and service learning experiences with others in your OSU class. You should have minimum 7 entries total.

3. **Observing and recording a child’s oral reading (20 points)**

   You will be expected to take a running record of a child’s reading at your school site, assess his/her comprehension, and record the results. Upon completion, write a report describing your interpretations of the students’ scores based upon your emerging understanding of the reading process. References should be made to information gleaned from class readings.

4. **Professional reading (10 points)**

   Once during the quarter, you will be expected to select an article on some aspect of reading from a refereed journal to read, summarize, and present to the class. After reading the article, prepare a one-page handout for the members of the class (examples of appropriate journals include Reading Research Quarterly, Journal of Reading Behavior, The Elementary School Journal, and the Reading Teacher. After reading the article, prepare a one page handout for the members of the class. ON the handout, please include:
   - A complete reference citation for the article
   - A summary of the main points/ideas (can use bullets, make a list, outline, etc…)
   - Your thoughts, reactions, questions, etc…as they pertain to the article and what has been learned in class as well as what you have experienced during service learning.
   Please notify the professor of your presentation date at least one week prior to the presentation. You will be given approximately 5 minutes of class time to share your article.

5. **Final Exam (20 points)**

   You will be tested on your knowledge of course content. Main topics covered in the Graves, Juel, & graves text will be the focus of the assessment, and will be discussed during the quarter in class. The test will consist of multiple choice, matching, and short answer questions.
**Attendance (5 points):** Because of the nature of the course, regular attendance is required. Absences will affect the final grade. Credit will be given for class participation.

Final grades will be determined on the following scale:

- 95-100% = A
- 84-86% = B
- 74-76% = C
- below 60 = E
- 90-04% = A-
- 80-83% = B-
- 70-73% = C-
- 87-89% = B+
- 77-79% = C+
- 60-69% = D

At the end of the quarter, the instructor will assign a letter grade based upon her judgment of how the student met stated course objectives. It should be noted that grades of A and A- are only used where the work is of excellent standard. Grades are determined according to the instructor’s assessment from comparison with other students in the course and expectations based on the instructor’s experience and quality of work related to course objectives.

Please make sure to edit/proofread your work carefully. Points will be deducted for spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors.

*Syllabus is subject to change by the instructor as needed.

**WEEKLY CLASS TOPICS**

March 31:
- Introduction to the class; discussion of syllabus, readings, etc.
- Overview of the course
- Introduction to service learning—Service Learning Coordinator

April 7:
- GJG: Chapter 1 & 2: Reading and Learning to Read and Reading Instruction
- Clay: Chapter 2: Reading and Writing: Processing the Information in Print
- Cognitive-constructivist view of reading
- Schema theory and reading
- Reader response theory
- Components of the literacy curriculum
- Basal, literature, and whole language approaches

April 14:
- GJG: Chapter 3: Emergent Literacy
- Clay: Chapter 1: Observing Change in Early Literacy Behaviors
- Impact of reading aloud to children
- Factors affecting reading development
- Phonemic awareness
- Promoting emergent literacy

April 21:
- GJG: Chapter 4 & 5: Word Recognition and Vocabulary Development
- Reading instruction approaches
- Word study
- Identifying, selecting, and teaching individual vocabulary words

*Dialogue journal due for the first time*
April 28:
- Clay: Chapters 4-7: The Observation Survey-Parts One and Two

May 5:
No class (IRA Conference) Use this time to administer the running record. Bring a copy of your data and the book used for the running record to class next week.

May 12:
- GJG: Chapter 11: Classroom Assessment
- Assessment strategies
- Types/purpose of assessment

May 19:
- GJG: Chapter 6: Scaffolding Students’ Comprehension of Text: Teaching Guided Approaches
- Clay: Chapter 3: Assisting Young Children Making Slow Progress
- Components of a scaffolded reading experience-assisting readers
- Methods for teaching various types of texts

*Bring to class two picture books of your choice. They should be appropriate read-alouds for the students in your service-learning site.
*Dialogue Journal due for the second time*

May 26: No Class – Memorial Day-University Closed

*Running record and interpretation paper due from graduating seniors by Tuesday, May 27th. Submit directly to instructor or place in mailbox*

June 2:
- GJG Chapter 8: Teaching for Understanding in Content Areas
- Framework and approaches
- GJG: Chapter 9: Writing and Reading
- Reciprocal processes of reading and writing
- Teaching/using the writing process
- Writing to learn
- Writing workshop
- GJG Chapter 10: Literacy Instruction for English Language Learners
- Linguistic and cultural differences – raising teacher awareness
- Suggestions for teaching second language learners

*Running record and interpretation paper due from non-graduating students*

June 9:
Final Exam
*Dialogue journal due for the third time*

**Other Information:**
CLASS WEB SITE: As a student in the course, you will have access to the Literacy Foundations website that accompanies this course.

Mobile Phones and Pagers
These items are to be turned off for the duration of class. I reserve the right to take appropriate action (grade deduction, etc.) if needless beeping and buzzing disturb the class. In an adult learning environment, these interruptions are not only distracting, but also rude.
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SYLLABUS OF COURSE 6 – SEMINAR ON SERVICE-LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION
Course 6: Seminar on Service-Learning in Higher Education

Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.

[Margaret Mead]

Introduction

This course examines the historical roots, concepts, and principles of practice of service-learning in higher education. The focus of the course is on developing knowledge about service-learning and enhancing skills and competencies for designing service-learning opportunities in higher education as well as for active community involvement. Service-learning is defined 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.” (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5). The approach of this course is one of service-learning.

Course objectives

Understanding involves intimacy and equality between self and object, while knowing implies separation from the object and mastery over it.

[from Belenky et al., Women’s Ways of Knowing, p. 101]

The primary objective of this course is to develop an understanding of service-learning. Specific course objectives are:

- To become knowledgeable about and to increase an understanding of service-learning and community building
- To engage in a community different from one’s own
- To examine in-depth issues integral to community involvement and service-learning
- To encourage active participation in diverse communities
- To increase an understanding of community-identified assets
- To integrate discussions on community, diversity, and social justice with service-learning
- To develop knowledge and skills for designing effective service-learning activities and implementing service-learning programs
- To provide opportunities and methods for reflection
- To gain an understanding of an appreciation for multiple perspectives and how power and privilege shape these perspectives
- To introduce issues related to administering service-learning programs in higher education

Required texts


Required readings
A packet of required readings is available at Cop-E in the Tuttle Parking Garage. A complete listing of readings is included at the end of this syllabus as well as in the packet.

**Additional Required Readings**

In addition to the required texts and articles, each student will select one book for the list below. These books are also available at SBX Bookstore (and amazon.com). A sign-up process will be facilitated to assure even distribution and to complement the book discussion assignment described later in the syllabus. Books were selected with specific community service sites in mind. My intention is that you will select the book that focuses on issues that are relevant to your specific service site.

Choose one of the following:


**Course requirement**

_The things in civilization we most prize are not of ourselves. They exist by grace of the doing and sufferings of the continuous human community in which we are a link. Ours is the responsibility of conserving, transmitting, rectifying and expanding the heritage of values we have received that those who come after us may receive it more solid and secure, more widely accessible and more generously shared than we have received it. [John Dewey]_

**Class participation**

Class attendance is expected, as is active participation in both class discussion and community-based activities. As a graduate seminar course you will be expected to achieve a high level of involvement in class discussions and in your community service by preparing for class, completing all assignments, and integrating all dimensions of learning.

In addition to consistent active participation in class discussion, you will each be expected to sign up to lead reflection at the beginning of class. Guidelines for reflection will be provided. Discussion and sharing about your community service involvement will also be considered and evaluated as class participation.

**Community-based service**

_Everyone can be great, because everyone can serve._

[Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.]

Service-learning is the core of this course, in theory and in practice. As you gain knowledge about service-learning through course readings and classroom-based learning, you will also be engaged in service-learning through active involvement in a community-based project. This may take from in
several ways, but the specific focus must involve you in a community different from your own for a minimum of three hours/week.

**Specific possibilities for this project are:**

- Direct service at a local community agency/organization, or school (a list of sites from which to choose will be provided).
- Indirect service with an organization/agency/volunteer group by providing a needed task (i.e., fundraising, newsletter, strategic planning) or assisting in the implementation of a special event (i.e., Columbus AIDS Walk, Race for the Cure)
- Action research project which focuses on problem solving and change in a particular organization/agency by working directly with people in the organization.
- Ethnographic interviews with members of a particular community including service providers, community members being served, volunteers assisting and others who are part of the culture of that community organization.
- Community-based research project that provides a needed service to an organization, school, or agency (e.g., outcomes of welfare reform; school violence; impact of No child Left Behind Legislation) or provides analysis of university projects in the community (e.g., Campus Partners, Service-Learning Initiative, After School programs).

Additional guidelines for community-based service requirement will be provided.

**Written assignments**

- Community Service Agreement

This agreement outlines your goals, activities, and learning objectives for your community-based service project. At a minimum this agreement should include the following information:

- Name, place, and mission/purpose of the community organization
- The work to be don/activities in which you will be engaged
- Learning outcomes for you—what do you want to learn more about, develop skills in, understand better, new issues exposed to?
- How will you contribute to the community organization?

This agreement is written by you and discussed with your site supervisor or person(s) in the community with whom you will be working.

Once your objectives are established, progress should be monitored throughout. While not required, it is highly recommended that you keep a reflective journal to record your observations, feelings, insights, and learning while at your community service site. Keeping a journal will assist in the writing of your essays and final integrative paper.

- Three Essays

Each essay assignment is designed to assist you in reflecting upon your learning in the course, particularly as it relates to your understanding of yourself, of diverse communities and of service. Essays should show evidence of thoughtful analysis, reflection, and integration of reading and experiential learning. Essay topics/questions will be given out in advance of the due date. [The first essay will focus on narrative/autobiography, the second on your additional book selection, and the third on application].
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• Reflection Design Write-UP

Each student will sign up to lead reflection at the beginning of class. A summary of your design including goals of the reflection exercise, design implementation, readings to which the reflection is linked, instructions for facilitation, and expected learning outcomes will be written and copies for each class member distributed.

• Final synthesis paper

The final synthesis paper should be substantive with ample evidence of critical analysis, reflection, and substantive integration of course learning, including readings, class discussions, and community-based service. [NB: This means that you should cite from the readings in your paper.] As you write this paper, please return to your community service agreement to evaluate your work in the community in relation to intended outcomes and learning objectives.

With substantive and thoughtful references made to the readings and to your community service, your paper should address the following questions:

How has your understanding of service and community shifted as a result of your participation in this class? What is your definition of service? What does community mean to your? How do your definitions of service and community relate to one another? How is service-learning linked to higher education and to the creation of community? What obligations do universities have to the communities in which they reside? How are these obligations best met? What new personal and professional commitments have you made to service-learning? How was your community service experience different from what you expected? What new issues and questions have you grappled with? What new challenges have your encountered and insights have you gained as a result?

This paper should be approximately 12-15 pages in length. Creativity in presentation is welcome. However, the primary emphasis is on integration and synthesis of all aspects of the course and your learning.

Evaluation

Evaluation will be based on performance in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Essays</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Service</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Synthesis Paper</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Participation (includes active class participation, leading reflection, and discussion of community-based service)

3 Essays (5%, 10%, 10%)

Community-based Service (includes completion of agreement, follow-through, commitment to site, site supervisor evaluation)

Final Synthesis Paper

100%
### COURSE OUTLINE AND SCHEDULE

*West with the Night, p. 154.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, April 1</strong></td>
<td>NO CLASS—ACPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, April 8</strong></td>
<td>Introductions and Introductions to the Seminar</td>
<td>What is service-learning? Community service involvement Sign up for reflection/book selection/community work/project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

******April 11th – Janet Eyler speaking at 9am in 150 Younkin Success Center ****

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Due: Essay # 1 – Situating the self Community service agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, April 22</strong></td>
<td>Theoretical Framework: Entering Communities and Community Building</td>
<td>Readings: Reading Packet – Erdich -- ”American Horse” (articles 3-7) Coles – “Privileged Ones” Kozol – “Corla Hawkins” Parker – “What is Poverty?” Pogash—“The way it’s Supposed to be” Rhoads -- Chapter 3: Thinking about Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Week 6  The common good? Reciprocity in service-learning  
Group discussion on additional book selection

Readings: Additional book selection

Rhoads - Chapter 5: Mutuality  
Chapter 6: Community Building

Reading Packet - Porter & Monard – “Ayni in the Global Village”
(article 15)

Due: Essay # 2 (Book Selection focus)

Week 7  Outcomes associated with service-learning  
Tuesday, May 13

Readings:
Eyler & Giles - Chapters 1-4
Rhoads - Chapter 7: Action/Reflection

Week 8  Outcomes (continued)  
Tuesday, May 20 (panel of students)

Readings:
Eyler & Giles - Chapters 5-9

Reading Packet - Jones – “The underside of service-learning”  
(articles 12, 14) Wade – “From a distance”

Week 9  Effective partnerships and service-learning  
Tuesday, May 27

Readings:
Jocaby - Chapter 1, 2, 4, 5
Eyler & Giles - Chapters 8, 9

Due: Essay # 3
[Friday May 30th – Synthesis paper for those graduating]

Week 10  Partnerships in service-learning (continued)  
(panel presentation: university and community)

Readings:
Jocaby - Chapters 6, 8, 9, 13
Rhoads - Chapter 8

Exam Week  The future role of service-learning in higher education?  
Tuesday, June 10 Final reflection (and potluck lunch) – presentation on service-learning experiences
Exiting community
Summary and course evaluations

Readings:
Rhoads - Conclusion
Jacoby - Chapter 15

Due: Synthesis paper (May 30 for those graduating)

List of Required Reading in Reading Packet