THE ROLE OF REQUIRED VOLUNTEERISM AND SERVICE-LEARNING ON

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY

By

Amanda Thacker Beeler

Elizabeth K. Crawford
Associate Professor
(Chair)

David W. Rausch
Professor
(Committee Member)

Steven R. Banks
Associate Professor
(Committee Member)

Amy L. Doolittle
Associate Professor
(Committee Member)

THE ROLE OF REQUIRED VOLUNTEERISM AND SERVICE-LEARNING ON

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY

By

Amanda Thacker Beeler

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the University of
Tennessee at Chattanooga in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree
of Doctorate of Education

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee

December 2018

ABSTRACT

Civic education has historically been one of the fundamental goals of U.S. higher education. However, the importance placed on teaching civic responsibility in this environment declined during the 20th century. Civic education experienced a resurgence in the 1980s, and service-learning pedagogy and other forms of community-based learning became increasingly popular. As a result, a number of high schools and institutions of higher education have implemented mandatory service programs aimed at encouraging students' long-term engagement in community and civic activities. However, there is a dearth of research on mandatory service programs and the efficacy of requiring students to participate in community service.

This study examined a mandatory service program implemented at a U.S. higher education institution using a longitudinal, mixed methods study of the service-learning and community service experiences of one cohort. Potential relationships were investigated between the number of service hours completed and/or service-learning courses taken and respondents' scores on a survey. Respondents completed the survey at three different data points during a 4-year enrollment period at the institution. Examined variables included gender, work location and hours, religious affiliation, voting habits, knowledge of the service requirement, prior service, and overall satisfaction with the institution's service program. Historical focus group data were also mined to explore potential connections between students' service experiences and views on civic responsibility.

This study responded to the need for more longitudinal studies on the outcomes of college student service activities and for more research on mandatory service programs. It also adds to the body of knowledge on service-learning pedagogy and volunteerism. The findings indicated that implementing a graduation service requirement and service-learning curriculum was not effective in altering students' perceptions of civic responsibility. However, the number of service hours completed and the number of service-learning courses taken in the first year were indicators of future service activities. Additionally, although a specific activity that increased students' perceptions of civic responsibility was not identified, the cohort's aggregate score improved over the course of the study. Data from subsequent cohorts should be analyzed, as these findings have policy and programmatic implications for the institution included in this study.

DEDICATION

To my grandmother, Jamia Scott Clark, who taught me to have faith – in myself, in others, and in a higher power. Thank you for encouraging even my craziest dreams.

To my mother, Kathy Clark Thacker, who always told me I could be anything I wanted to be and do anything I wanted to do and truly meant it. Thank you for always being my biggest fan.

To my daughter, Easton Kate Beeler, who reminds me daily that there will always be more to learn and that those lessons don't always come from a book. Thank you for proving that some things, like my love for you, *are* immeasurable, regardless of what the "experts" say. You are my life's greatest adventure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AACU, Association of American Colleges and Universities

HESLS, Higher Education Service-Learning Survey

OIRR, Office of Institutional Research and Retention

QEP, Quality Enhancement Plan

SPSS, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

ZPD, Zone of Proximal Development

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Producing civically and politically engaged graduates has been a fundamental goal of

U.S. higher education throughout its history (Bok, 2001; Misa, Anderson, & Yamamura, 2005;

Nuss, 2003; Prentice, 2011). However, the priority placed on civic learning declined during the

20th century as institutions of higher education evolved in response to changing student

demographics and their reasons for obtaining a college degree (Hartley, 2009; Nuss, 2003;

Thelin, 2011; Weerts, Cabrera, & Mejías, 2014). A renewed interest in civic education over the

last three decades has challenged colleges and universities to reexamine this historical goal of

higher education, which has led to the implementation of various programs designed to instill a

sense of social and civic responsibility in students (Bryant, Gayles, & Davis, 2012;

Chapedelaine, Ruiz, Warchal, & Wells, 2005; Mariappan, Monemi, & Fan, 2005; Mayhew &

Engberg, 2011; Millican & Bourner, 2011; Prentice, 2011).

This dissertation examined two approaches that were implemented at a U.S. higher

education institution in an effort to promote civic responsibility and moral development: service-

learning pedagogy and a graduation service requirement. This chapter provides the background

of the study, discusses the evolution of moral and civic education at institutions of higher

education, and explores how the priorities of college students have changed over time. The

problem examined in the study is stated along with a discussion of the research objectives and a

description of the study's significance. A brief overview of the methodological design is

presented, including the study's delimitations and definitions of several of the terms used throughout the manuscript.

Background

Higher education in the United States has been assigned many goals throughout its history, but three central themes have remained consistent: intellectual, vocational, and moral education (Nuss, 2003; Prentice, 2011). Moral education was initially rooted in the religious missions of colleges and universities whose primary intent was to educate future clergy and produce citizens with strong religiously based principles (Felten & Clayton, 2011; Kezar, 2004; Malone, 1968; Thelin, 2011). As the nature of U.S. higher education evolved, the primary goal of moral education shifted to civic learning, which focused on developing educated citizens with the skills and interests necessary to actively participate in a democratic society (Bryant et al., 2012; Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Hartley, 2009). The institutional focus on citizenship and moral education as core values began to decline in the early 20th century as U.S. colleges and universities started to spend more time on the vocational preparation of students in an effort to meet the demands of an increasingly diverse student population (Bok, 2001; Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Bryant et al., 2012; Jacoby, 2009). As more students sought academic programs to prepare them to enter specific careers, moral and civic education became less of a priority for U.S. institutions of higher education (Hartley, 2009; Nuss, 2003; Thelin, 2011; Weerts et al., 2014).

A national focus on civic engagement and social responsibility emerged from the tumultuous civil rights movement and the activist era of the 1960s. During this time, U.S. federal service programs, such as Peace Corps and Volunteers in Service to America, were created to encourage Americans to engage in service to their communities and the broader global society

(Hartley, 2009; Nesbit & Brudney, 2010; Perry, Thomson, Tschirhart, Mesch, & Lee, 1999). Despite growing public service initiatives, interest and involvement in community engagement activities began sharply declining during the 1980s, especially among college-aged students (Jacoby, 2009; Pryor, Hurtado, Saenz, Santos, & Korn, 2007). Furthermore, studies show that college students have increasingly become more individualistic, narcissistic, and materialistic, placing a higher value on money and fame than showing empathy and concern for others (Konrath, O'Brien, & Hsing, 2011; Mallan, 2009; Myers, 2001; Stewart & Bernhardt, 2010; Twenge, 2006; Twenge & Foster, 2010).

Twenge, Campbell, and Freeman (2012) analyzed the responses of 9.2 million individuals from the Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennial generations using data from the Monitoring the Future survey (Johnston, Bachman, O'Malley, & Schulenberg, 2009) and the American Freshman project (Pryor et al., 2007). Respondents were either seniors in high school or first-year college students at the time of the survey, which allowed Twenge et al. (2012) to examine generational differences and changing trends. Since 1989, being well off financially has been ranked as the most important life goal for students (Twenge et al., 2012). In comparison, respondents collectively ranked financial success as their eighth highest priority in the 1971 survey (Twenge et al., 2012). The rising costs of higher education and housing over the past several decades have been suggested as possible reasons for this shift (Kamenetz, 2006; St. John & Parsons, 2004). However, Twenge et al. (2012) dismissed this explanation citing the survey question, which "uses the phrase 'very well off' rather than 'comfortable' or merely 'well off'" (p. 1058).

According to survey questions measuring empathy and compassion, Millennial and Generation X responses indicated a decline in overall concern for others (Twenge et al., 2012). Twenge et al. (2012) stated:

> Compared to Boomers, Millennials were less likely to have donated to charities, less likely to want a job worthwhile to society or that would help others, and less likely to agree they would eat differently if it meant more food for the starving. (p. 1054)

There was only one category where Millennials scored higher than Boomers and Generation X respondents. More than 80% of Millennial students reported doing community service work in high school and 26% indicated plans to volunteer during college, which rates higher than both Baby Boomers and Generation X groups (Twenge et al., 2012). However, more U.S. high schools began requiring community service as a graduation requirement during this time period, possibly explaining this anomaly in the data (Newmann & Rutter, 1985; Planty, Bozick, & Regnier, 2006; Skinner & Chapman, 1999).

Advocates for volunteerism and civic engagement have encouraged institutions of higher education to revisit the core values of civic responsibility and moral education. As a result, the last two decades have seen a resurgence of civic education activities and programming efforts by college administrators and faculty members (Bryant et al., 2012; Millican & Bourner, 2011; Prentice, 2011). Today, more than 90% of U.S. higher education institutions mention service or civic engagement explicitly in mission and/or vision statements (Campus Compact, 2016). Additionally, a growing number of colleges and universities are requiring students to participate in service-learning and volunteer activities as part of a course or graduation requirement (Beehr, LeGro, Porter, Bowling, & Swader, 2010; Moely & Ilustre, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

Since the traditional college age range, 18-23 years of age (Justice & Dornan, 2001; Paulin, 2001; Wilsey, 2013), coincides with the peak of the formative developmental years, institutions of higher education often play a major role in molding the next generation of leaders and citizens. Several theories note the important developmental milestones that occur during the college years and how a student's identity is shaped through his/her experiences during this time period. Erikson's (1980) life span model suggested that individuals discover how to integrate their identities with the various social roles and expectations they encounter during the period of late adolescence, which he defined as ages 18-22 years of age. Sanford (1962) noted that students' identities are shaped during the transitional period between adolescence and adulthood as they learn to understand and accept their own personality characteristics. Chickering's (1969) theory of identity development described several stages, or vectors, that a student moves through as he/she experiences increasingly complex emotional, interpersonal, ethical, and intellectual challenges. Although the vectors are not necessarily sequential, the theory posits that students build upon their previous experiences as they move through the seven stages (Chickering, 1969).

An individual's experiences affect identity formation through the process of establishing, questioning, and reconstructing his/her beliefs to form personal values, morals, and goals (Arnett, 2000; Erikson, 1968; Kohlberg, 1973; Turiel, 1974). This developmental process also influences how an individual views the world and perceives his/her responsibilities to the greater community (Arnett, 2000). As part of facilitating a student's moral and civic development, college campuses encourage student involvement in various activities as a means of developing positive social, academic, and personal growth (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). For young adults, engaging in service experiences in a

collegiate environment stresses the importance of empathy and can have a tremendous impact on overall development (Arnett, 2000, 2004; Greenberg & Weber, 2008; Howe & Strauss, 2000; Osiemo, 2012).

Research suggests that engaging in community service during the formative college years has the potential to influence students' attitudes regarding civic responsibility, which is further enhanced by a formal postservice reflection process (Arnett, 2000; Densten & Gray, 2001; Erikson, 1968; Kohlberg, 1973; Leonard, 2004; Raelin, 2006; Tomkovick, Lester, Flunker, & Wells, 2008; Turiel, 1974). Such activities may also modify or reinforce the political and community involvement values modeled by one's parents or other role models (Janoski & Wilson, 1995; Moely & Ilustre, 2011; Perry & Katula, 2001). A renewed interest in leadership and civic development, as well as the growing body of research on the positive developmental outcomes of engaging in service-learning curriculum and volunteerism, has resulted in a rising number of required service programs at colleges and universities across the United States (Campus Compact, 2012; Klink & Athaide, 2004; Moely & Ilustre, 2011; Tomkovick et al., 2008). Unfortunately, there is a dearth of research on the outcomes of required service programs, particularly in evaluating the extent to which participation in such activities influences a student's perceptions of civic responsibility or general concern for the greater community (Bryant et al., 2012; Moely & Ilustre, 2011; Tomkovick et al., 2008).

Objectives of the Study

This study examined the relationship between service participation in one institution's required service program and students' self-reported perceptions of civic responsibility. It investigated the role of precollege and other attribute variables, college service-learning courses,

and the number of hours volunteered during college in altering a student's perception of civic responsibility. Further, this study examined whether or not implementing a graduation service requirement achieves the desired outcome of heightened civic responsibility by examining students' responses to a survey given at three different points during their participation in the program.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Studies on volunteerism and service-learning pedagogy have shown many positive effects on the development of civic-minded attitudes. However, very few studies have examined these activities as part of a required service program. This study explored the following questions:

1. To what extent does enrollment in service-learning courses relate to students' views of civic responsibility over time?

    o H_1: There is a significant relationship between service-learning coursework and students' perceptions of civic responsibility.

2. To what extent does the number of hours of service completed relate to students' perceptions of civic responsibility over time?

    o H_2: There is a significant relationship between the number of hours served and students' perceptions of civic responsibility.

3. To what extent do attribution factors (e.g., gender, family responsibilities, work location and responsibilities, ethnicity, religious affiliation, residence, voting habits, knowledge of the service requirement, prior service experience, and satisfaction of the institution's service program) relate to students' views of civic responsibility?

o H_3: There is a significant relationship between attribution factors and students'

perceptions of civic responsibility.

Rationale for the Study

Implementing a graduation service requirement has been identified as one way to ensure

that all students participate in community service and civic development activities at some point

during college (Jones, Segar, & Gasiorski, 2008; Metz & Youniss, 2003; Stukas, Snyder, &

Clary, 1999). However, there are conflicting views among academicians and researchers

regarding whether service activities should or should not be required of college students (Butin,

2006; Egger, 2008; Jones et al., 2008; Metz & Youniss, 2003; Stukas et al., 1999). Little research

has been conducted on mandatory service programs and whether or not they are actually able to

achieve the desired outcomes. Still, many campus and community leaders believe that quality

student service experiences can lead to the establishment of a morally developed and civically

engaged population with the skills and interest needed to improve communities, even if the

service is required (Brisbin & Hunter, 2003; Metz & Youniss, 2003, 2005; Perry & Katula, 2001;

Wilson, 2011). The number of high schools and institutions of higher education implementing

graduation service requirements also continues to grow, despite the lack of empirical research

supporting its efficacy (Jones et al., 2008; Newmann & Rutter, 1985; Skinner & Chapman,

1999). This points to the need for additional exploration on the effectiveness of mandatory

service programs.

In 2010, the small, private, religiously affiliated liberal arts institution examined in this

study implemented a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), as part of the reaccreditation process

required by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

(2012). This QEP was designed with the explicit goal of transforming students into servant leaders who display a commitment to serving others (Condon, 2009). The institution is accountable for determining the success of the initiative by measuring the extent to which implementing a graduation service requirement and service-learning curriculum achieved the learning outcome of producing civic-minded graduates. A longitudinal study that examines the potential influence of required volunteerism and service-learning pedagogy on perceptions of civic responsibility might also benefit other institutions considering the implementation of a public service graduation requirement, a service-learning program, or another type of mandatory service experience.

Theoretical Framework

The notion that service-learning and volunteerism can be used to teach citizenship skills and encourage a sense of civic responsibility employs a constructivist framework where students connect what they learn in the classroom to what they experience in their everyday lives (Evans et al., 1998; Jones & Abes, 2004; Phelps & Kotrlik, 2007). Constructivism emphasizes both the experiences and the situations of the learner (Jones & Abes, 2004; Kolb & Kolb, 2005; Kolb, 1984; Vrasidas, 2000). Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory notes the importance of situated learning with the concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD). ZPD is the amount of learning that can occur based on the previous experiences and developmental level of the participant (Vygotsky, 1978). By referencing previous experiences, learners can build on their knowledge base and construct new meanings (Densten & Gray, 2001; Kolb, 1984; Vygotsky, 1978).

9

In many collegiate settings, well-developed service experiences provide students the opportunity to apply classroom content and challenge their beliefs in ways that can transform their thinking (Bradley & Saracino, 2013; Colby, Bercaw, Clark, & Galiardi, 2009; Jones & Abes, 2004). Service-learning pedagogy offers the framework needed for students to create applicable rather than passive knowledge, which is the depth of comprehension encouraged by cognitive psychologists (Bransford, 1993; Giles & Eyler, 1994). Through facilitated activities, service-learning allows students to "*experience* issues instead of simply reading about them" (Pleasants, Stephens, Selph, & Pfeiffer, 2004, p. 17), as well as construct new knowledge by integrating their level of previous awareness and new information acquired through the service project (Newman, Bruyere, & Beh, 2007). While this pedagogy utilizes service as a learning method, the most effective programs also emphasize the importance of learning to serve (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009). This approach encourages students to be active participants in their communities long after the formal service experience is over (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009).

Importance of the Study

Community, industry, and academic leaders believe that institutions of higher education have a responsibility to graduate intelligent, skilled, and involved citizens (Brisbin & Hunter, 2003; Chapedelaine et al., 2005). Many members of society posit that colleges and universities have the capacity to facilitate such change through service initiatives (Brisbin & Hunter, 2003; Perry & Katula, 2001; Tomkovick et al., 2008). This research will add to the body of knowledge on service-learning, volunteerism, and identity development by providing information on whether or not these programs result in the outcomes they seek such as encouraging long-term volunteerism and producing empathetic, civically engaged community members (Campbell,

2000; Metz & Youniss, 2003; Weerts et al., 2014; Wilson, 2011). Additionally, this research responds to the request for more longitudinal studies regarding the outcomes of college service activity (Brudney & Gazley, 2006; Tomkovick et al., 2008) and the need for more research on required service programs (Moely & Ilustre, 2011; Tomkovick et al., 2008).

Overview of Methodology

The following discussion provides a brief overview of the research design, population, instrumentation, data collection process, methodological assumptions, and delimitations. This was a mixed-methods, longitudinal study of a single cohort, which followed a within-subjects, repeated-measures design. This study included 87 traditional college-aged students at a small, private, faith-based institution in the southeast United States. All students entered the institution as first-time, first-year students in 2012. A longitudinal research design was utilized in an attempt to distinguish between recruitment and socialization effects, as recommended by Pascarella (2006). The quantitative portion of the study was nonexperimental and associational. The study explored associations and correlations between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The possible role or connection between the dependent variable and various extraneous influences was also examined. The qualitative portion of the study utilized historical focus group data. The focus group data was mined to further explore the possible connections between the independent variables and the dependent variables. During these interviews, respondents were asked to reflect on their service-learning and volunteer experiences.

The 9-item Civic Responsibility subscale of the Higher Education Service-Learning Survey (Furco, 2000), which utilizes a 4-point Likert scale, was used for the quantitative portion of this study (see Appendix A). Participants completed this survey at three specific points during

11

their collegiate career. Precollege influences were measured through a pretest given during the first month of the cohort's first year of college. The survey was completed again during the students' last month of their first year, serving as a midpoint marker to identify any changes after one year of participation in the college's service program. The posttest survey was taken during the students' first semester of their fourth year. The posttest included demographic questions regarding family responsibilities, work location and responsibilities, past voting experience, future voting plans, precollege service experiences, satisfaction of the institution's service program, and whether or not the student knew the institution had a service requirement prior to attending new student orientation. Additional data, including gender, ethnicity, citizenship, and religious affiliation variables, were collected from the institution's secure database through collaboration with its Office of Institutional Research and Retention (OIRR). The institution's Residence Life Office provided information regarding whether or not the student lived on campus at any point during his/her collegiate career, and the Center for Servant Leadership provided service activity data. Finally, participants' service-learning course enrollment information was collected from the Registrar's office.

There are a number of methodological assumptions in this study that are important to note. The first is that only one cohort of students were examined. Therefore, this study assumed that the group is equivalent and representative of other cohorts at the same institution. A second assumption was that respondents were honest with their answers to the survey questions. Finally, since this study utilized extant data, the assumption was made that the data are correct.

There were also a number of delimitations within this study. The first one was the time period in which the postsurvey was completed. The survey was given at the beginning of the cohort's senior year. Therefore, the study only examined three years of participation in the

volunteer and service-learning program and did not consider relevant experiences that might have occurred during the students' senior year. Additionally, only respondents who are United States citizens and are completing college within a normal four-year timeframe were included. Responses from non-U.S. citizens and early graduates were not considered. Finally, this study only examined one cohort of students from one U.S. higher education institution. The institution is a small, private, religiously affiliated liberal arts college located in the southeast United States. The institution offers both bachelor's and master's degrees, but only undergraduate students participated in this study.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations of this study. While the demographic and background portion of the survey attempted to collect relevant information on a range of extraneous variables, it was not possible to account for all variables that might influence someone's perceptions of civic responsibility. Researchers are unable to thoroughly account for family history or bias that might influence one's perception of civic responsibility (Cruce & Moore, 2007). The study was further limited by the willingness of the respondents to give honest answers to questions on the assessment tool (Gliner, Morgan, & Leech, 2009).

The institution in this study requires students to complete a minimum of 10 service hours per academic year and highly encourages students to complete at least one service-learning course prior to graduation (Condon, 2009), but some students choose to participate in more than the required number of service-learning and volunteer hours each year. For example, students at the institution completed an average of 43.8 service hours during the 2014-2015 academic year (T. Williams, personal communication, February 24, 2016). Once the service requirement has

been met each year, however, a student might not continue to track his/her service activities. As a result, I was unable to account for the potential influence of volunteer experiences that were not reported to the institution.

Students in this study chose to attend a private, religiously affiliated institution, which might have an unknown influence on one's beliefs (Pampaloni, 2010). The participants' religious affiliations and their experiences through religious organizations may have predisposed them to community service and other civic engagement activities (Cruce & Moore, 2007; Serow & Dreyden, 1990). Finally, the number of service-learning classes available in each major or minor area limited the number of courses accessible to the student.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

Baby Boomer: A nickname given to the birth cohort of individuals born between 1943-1961 (Twenge et al., 2012).

Citizenship: Although there is no formally agreed upon definition of citizenship, in this study the term was operationally defined as community attachment and connectedness that encourages citizens to move beyond simply understanding government to actively participating in public life, including volunteering, charitable giving, and a desire to improve societal issues (Battistoni & Hudson, 1997; Eyler, Giles, Root, & Price, 1997; Perry & Katula, 2001).

Civic Responsibility and Civic Engagement: In this study, terms used to represent the attitudinal (i.e., responsibility) and action (i.e., engagement) products existing within a community. Komives et al. (2007) defined civic responsibility as "the sense of personal responsibility individuals should feel to uphold their obligations as part of any community" (p.

20). Civic engagement is expressed through an individual's actions to intentionally participate in community life (Boyd & Brackmann, 2012; Doolittle & Faul, 2013; Lough, McBride, & Sherraden, 2009; Perry & Katula, 2001).

Community Service and Volunteerism: Services offered by individuals that are provided without payment and are intended to benefit a community (Cruce & Moore, 2012). Since this study considered the number of service hours a student participates in as a potential change agent in his/her view of civic responsibility, service activity included all hours tracked through individual community service, campus-wide service events, service-learning coursework, social justice activities, et cetera.

Generation X: A nickname given to the birth cohort of individuals born between 1961 and 1981 (Twenge et al., 2012).

Millennials: A nickname given to the birth cohort of individuals born between 1982 and 1999 (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Twenge et al., 2012).

Service-learning: A pedagogical approach that connects service activities with academic coursework to enhance students' learning (Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hanover Research, 2011). As recommended by (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009; Cone & Harris, 1996; Mayhew & Engberg, 2011), the hyphenated version of service-learning is used to emphasize the necessary connection of service and learning as equal components in this constructivist educational method.

Summary

Although civic education has always been a goal of postsecondary education, the focus on achieving this goal changed throughout the 20th century (Hartley, 2009; Nuss, 2003; Thelin,

2011; Weerts et al., 2014). Society continues to rely on colleges and universities to produce civically and politically engaged graduates even as the landscape of higher education evolves (Brisbin & Hunter, 2003; Bryant et al., 2012; Hatcher, 2011; Misa et al., 2005; Nuss, 2003; Prentice, 2011). This mixed-methods study explored whether or not engaging in service-learning coursework and participating in volunteerism activities has the potential to influence an individual's views on civic responsibility. Specifically, this study evaluated one U.S. higher education institution's implementation of service-learning pedagogy and a graduation service requirement, which were activities selected in an attempt to meet the civic responsibility and moral development aspects of the institutional mission (Condon, 2009). These activities were chosen for the institution's Quality Enhancement Plan as part of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (2012) reaccreditation process.

The next chapter provides a review of literature relevant to this study, which includes a discussion of citizenship as a fundamental goal of higher education and an overview of the programmatic responses by colleges and universities to address the decline of volunteer intentions among college students. A number of student-level variables that might influence a student's involvement in civic engagement activities and perceptions of civic responsibility are discussed, such as campus activities and experiences, family and work responsibilities, and several additional demographic variables. Additionally, the critical perspective of required volunteerism and service-learning pedagogy is presented.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although developing responsible, engaged citizens has always been a primary goal of

U.S. higher education, the changing landscape of college and university campuses has caused the

priorities of U.S. higher education to shift. This literature review presents a historical overview

of the mission and purpose of higher education in the United States and how the priorities of

students and institutions have changed. The renewed interest in civic engagement over the last

three decades and the programs implemented by U.S. colleges and universities to promote a

sense of civic responsibility in graduates are also examined. The mixed results of research on the

efficacy of these programs are presented, and the critical response of service-learning and

required volunteerism by some academicians are discussed. Finally, the student-level variables

that might influence one's level of involvement in community engagement activities and

perception of civic responsibility are explored.

Citizenship as a Fundamental Goal of Higher Education

Higher education's role in promoting civic responsibility and developing engaged

citizens has been challenged over the years as the expectations of U.S. colleges and universities,

as well as the agendas of academic leaders, has changed (Brisbin & Hunter, 2003; Bryant et al.,

2012; Hatcher, 2011; Prentice, 2011). The first colleges established in the United States sought

to educate students for lives of public service, which was a mission that was often tied to the

espoused religious beliefs of the institution (Bryant et al., 2012; Felten & Clayton, 2011; Harkavy & Hodges, 2012; Prentice, 2011; Thelin, 2011). With the introduction of nondenominational, land-grant institutions in the late 19th century, the focus changed from developing morally responsible clergymen to serving a broader public good by instilling a sense of social responsibility in students (Felten & Clayton, 2011; Harkavy & Hodges, 2012; Osiemo, 2012; Prentice, 2011). Encouraging the development of civic values and citizenship skills were considered to be essential components of the curriculum for more than 100 years (Morse, 1989; Sax, 2004).

After World War I, U.S. institutions of higher education experienced another shift as returning war veterans pursued higher education as nontraditional-aged students (Nuss, 2003; Thelin, 2011). Instead of only providing a traditional liberal arts education, colleges and universities started offering more vocationally focused programs meant to prepare students for specific careers (Hartley, 2009; Nuss, 2003; Thelin, 2011; Weerts et al., 2014). This change in institutional focus opened higher education to the masses by making it more accessible and practical for the common citizen (St. John & Parsons, 2004; Thelin, 2011; Weerts et al., 2014). College enrollment increased from approximately 250,000 in 1914 to approximately 1.3 million in 1945 (Snyder, 1993; Thelin, 2011). The growing number of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds and the diverse reasons for obtaining a college degree drastically changed the makeup of the student body between World War I and World War II (Bok, 2001; Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Thelin, 2011).

The importance of civic education has slowly declined over time as U.S. colleges and universities have adapted to the changing landscape of higher education (Bok, 2001; Bryant et al., 2012; Harkavy & Hodges, 2012; Hartley, 2009; Nuss, 2003; Weerts et al., 2014). As the

curriculum evolved to include more vocational and scientific study, some academicians grew concerned that the movement away from learning for the sake of learning threatened higher education's commitment to developing quality citizens (Bok, 2001; Bryant et al., 2012; Cowley, 1940). To maintain a common learning experience, many universities in the United States designed and implemented general education programs (Bryant et al., 2012). However, the importance placed on civic education and how those activities are infused into the curriculum continues to vary broadly across institutions (Bryant et al., 2012; Millican & Bourner, 2011; Thelin, 2011).

The priorities of college-aged students have also changed over the last several decades (Pryor et al., 2007; Twenge et al., 2012). Several studies show that college students' concern for and participation in public service, politics, and community engagement activities started to decline in the 1980s (Astin & Sax, 1998; Jacoby, 2009; Pryor et al., 2007; Twenge et al., 2012). Instead, college students began prioritizing personal and financial success over concern for the public good (Astin & Sax, 1998; Jacoby, 2009; Pryor et al., 2007; Twenge et al., 2012). In response to these trends, there has been a renewed interest in the public purposes of higher education over the past three decades, particularly regarding civic responsibility (Bryant et al., 2012; Gayles, Rockenbach, & Davis, 2012; Hatcher, 2011; Mayhew & Engberg, 2011; Prentice, 2011). Educational leaders have worked to find a balance between vocational training and a student's personal development (Evans et al., 1998).

This movement inspired the creation of Campus Compact (2016), which was founded in 1985 by university presidents who believed that service-learning and volunteerism were effective approaches to developing civic responsibility in students. Campus Compact (2016) promotes the development of networks and partnerships in an effort to advance "the public purposes of

19

colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate

students for civic and social responsibility" (para. 1). The organization provides various

resources to assist member institutions, such as professional development opportunities for

faculty and staff and an online library with access to sample syllabi, assessment tools, and

research on community-based learning (Campus Compact, 2016). Today, there are over 1,100

member institutions connected through 34 state affiliations, collectively working to ensure that

producing engaged and ethical citizens remains one of the primary goals of higher education

(Campus Compact, 2016).

Defining Civic Engagement

Chapedelaine et al. (2005) posited that moral and civic education is "critical for the

continuation of a self-governing society" (p. 5). The United States relies on its colleges and

universities to graduate civically engaged individuals (Boyd & Brackmann, 2012; Hatcher, 2011;

Jacoby, 2009; Prentice, 2011). However, the definitions assigned to civic engagement and

methods of assessing the goal of graduating moral and active citizens vary broadly (Hatcher,

2011; Prentice, 2011). Jacoby (2009) suggested that institutions should establish a definition that

best suits their mission, culture, and programmatic goals. Other scholars argued that the lack of a

common definition makes it difficult to advance the body of research on civic engagement

educational programs (Hatcher, 2010; Keen, 2009; Prentice, 2011).

A primary difficulty in defining civic engagement is that each institution approaches the

subject differently based on location, culture, and values (Boyd & Brackmann, 2012; Dugan &

Komives, 2010; Jacoby, 2009). Faith-based institutions are often drawn to a social justice

definition that is tied to religiosity and moral education (Jacoby, 2009). For example, The United

Methodist Church (2017) encourages individual and communal acts of mercy, such as "seeking justice, ending oppression and discrimination…and addressing the needs of the poor" (para. 5). Community colleges, public universities, and historically black institutions often believe that civic engagement is a leadership-related outcome and choose to focus on encouraging students to develop a sense of personal and social responsibility to address community issues (Boyd & Brackmann, 2012; Dugan & Komives, 2010). Private and Ivy League institutions often utilize a political and public service approach (Jacoby, 2009).

While developing the Civic Engagement Value Rubric for the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) in 2009, a team of faculty and staff worked together to establish a broad definition that could be utilized by any institution (Hatcher, 2011). This was a challenging task for the team, as Hatcher (2011) explained, "we could all agree on what a civically engaged student 'looked like,' but it was much more challenging to come to an agreement on a common definition" (p. 82). Ultimately, the group decided to utilize the following definition for AACU's Civic Engagement Rubric:

> Civic engagement is working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, though both political and non-political processes. (Ehrlich, 2000, p. vi)

Another team of researchers and practitioners embraced a different definition while collaborating to write *Civic Engagement in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices* (Jacoby, 2009). The authors stated that they wanted to develop a definition that embraced three popular educational reform movements: diversity, global learning, and civic engagement (Jacoby, 2009; Musil, 2009). It was decided that civic engagement would be defined as an action guided by "a heightened sense of responsibility to one's communities that encompasses the notion of global citizenship and interdependence, participation in building civil society, and empowering

21

individuals as agents of positive social change to promote social justice locally and globally"
(Musil, 2009, pp. 58-59).

Both definitions of civic engagement encompass two separate, but equally important
components: attitudes and behaviors. Civic attitudes are an individual's' values and beliefs
(Doolittle & Faul, 2013; Perry & Katula, 2001). Positive civic attitudes are expressed through
feelings of connectedness with one's community (Battistoni & Hudson, 1997), recognizing and
showing concern for social problems (Eyler et al., 1997), and "believing one can and should
make a difference in enhancing his or her community" (Doolittle & Faul, 2013, p. 2). Civic
behaviors are the actions individuals intentionally take to participate in community life (Doolittle
& Faul, 2013). These behaviors include a range of activities in political and community affairs
through volunteerism, donating to a charity or political campaign, voting in local and national
elections, or running for a public office (Boyd & Brackmann, 2012; Lough et al., 2009; Perry &
Katula, 2001).

Declining Volunteer Intentions

It appears that volunteerism among young adults is on the rise. For the last 50 years, the
Higher Education Research Institute (2015) has surveyed first-year college students to "measure
the changing character of entering students and American society at large" (para. 1). Part of the
survey focuses on the service engagement of students during their high school years and whether
or not students intend to engage in service during their collegiate years (Vogelgesang, Ikeda,
Gilmartin, & Keup, 2002). Data show that there has been a steady increase in the proportion of
students indicating that they engaged in service during high school, from 63% in 1990 to 81% in
2000 (Vogelgesang et al., 2002). However, the growth in volunteerism rates among high school

graduates could be the result of an increasing number of high schools with a graduation service requirement (Newmann & Rutter, 1985; Planty et al., 2006; Skinner & Chapman, 1999).

Since the late 1990s, many high schools have shifted from simply encouraging students to engage in service and volunteerism to requiring students to complete a certain number of service-learning classes or community service hours (Jones et al., 2008; Metz & Youniss, 2003; Stukas et al., 1999). Griffith (2012) explored the context, obligatory nature, and longevity of service experiences among recent high school graduates attending college by examining data from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study survey, which is conducted about every four years. He examined changes and trends in responses from the 1996, 2000, 2004, and 2008 surveys. The percentage of students reporting participation in service activities rose from 39.1% in 1996 to 47% in 2008 (Griffith, 2012). Of those students, the percentage reporting participation in required service activities grew from 7% in 1996 to 18.7% in 2008, while the percentage of students who participated in service voluntarily remained roughly the same, from 31% to 38% of the overall sample (Griffith, 2012). The mandatory involvement in community engagement activities, through service-learning or other program requirements, could account for the rise in service participation among the U.S. teenagers in the last two decades (Griffith, 2012; Newmann & Rutter, 1985; Planty et al., 2006; Skinner & Chapman, 1999).

However, a significant number of college students are not involved in community service and have no plans to volunteer in the near future (Cruce & Moore, 2007; National Survey of Student Engagement, 2005). In the Higher Education Research Institute's survey conducted in 2000, only 24% indicated that they would likely participate in service during college (Vogelgesang et al., 2002). This is consistent with finding from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012) that only 22.5% of the population ages 16-24 years of age volunteered during 2011.

Research suggests that having a high school graduation service requirement negatively impacts plans for future volunteerism (Marks & Jones, 2004; Stukas et al., 1999), which could explain the lack of service participation among traditional-aged college students.

Integrating Values: Developing Civic Responsibility

The concept of student development, which looks at all aspects of development specifically as it relates to enrollment, guides many of the programming efforts of higher education institutions (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010). Over the past three decades, student development has been considered through three lenses: involvement, engagement, and integration (Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Kinzie, 2009). Involvement reflects the amount of energy a student invests in his/her own development while engagement considers the mutual efforts of students and institutions (Astin, 1984; Kuh, 2009; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2009). Integration refers to the institutional culture that values both social and intellectual connections and relies on the commitment of students, faculty, and staff (Astin, 1984; Kuh, 2009; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2009). Integration of values into the organizational culture is the result of active involvement and meaningful engagement experiences by members of the institution (Wolf-Wendel et al., 2009). Institutions must be committed to practices, both curricular and extra-curricular, that enhance student development and model the values they wish to instill in their students, such as civic and social responsibility (Osiemo, 2012). The need for such learning opportunities is highlighted by recent studies of civic learning, which note that students are arriving to college without a deep sense of personal and social commitment (Hurtado, Ruiz, & Whang, 2012). Institutions can be intentional in developing civic engagement programming by creating methods for students to become involved in community activities.

Service Learning

Service learning is a pedagogical concept that utilizes service and reflection to enhance academic material (Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hanover Research, 2011; Mariappan et al., 2005; Mayhew & Engberg, 2011; Molee, Henry, Sessa, & McKinney-Prupis, 2010; Perry & Katula, 2001). Proponents suggest that it is an educational practice that promotes civically engaged attitudes and practices of open-mindedness, equality, and community responsibility (Campus Compact, 2016; Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Kuh, 2009). Students who participate in service experiences that connect academic and social content may develop new knowledge that has the capacity to transform their thinking (Colby et al., 2009; Jones & Abes, 2004). The National Survey of Student Engagement (2010) found that 49% of students surveyed participated in at least one service-learning class and noted that "participation in these practices can be life-changing" (p. 22). Service-learning experiences that link learning and real-world situations allow students to practice communication, decision-making, goal-setting, conflict resolution, and leadership skills (Lai, 2009; Osiemo, 2012; Pleasants et al., 2004).

Faculty and student life administrators agree that linking students' academic and personal development experiences is a critical function of higher education (Evans & Reason, 2001; Nuss, 2003). Service-learning has become a popular pedagogical method of facilitating holistic development, social responsibility, and citizenship by connecting course content to community needs through service activities (Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Hanover Research, 2011; Mariappan et al., 2005; Mayhew & Engberg, 2011; Perry & Katula, 2001). Experiences that allow students to practice citizenship skills reinforce learned concepts, while service-learning provides an avenue to engage in experiential learning opportunities (Brisbin & Hunter, 2003; Kellogg Commission, 1996; Perry & Katula, 2001). Through a meta-analysis of service and citizenship

research, Perry and Katula (2001) found that service-learning "produces the most consistent positive results" (p. 360) in changing one's views of civic responsibility. Furthermore, the Association of American Colleges & Universities (2018) ranked service-learning among the 10 high impact practices, which are the top pedagogical strategies found to be the most effective for student learning (Kuh, 2008).

Although service-learning has been found to produce a number of positive development outcomes, Einfeld and Collins (2008) warned that if service-learning is done incorrectly, it can actually be damaging to student development as well as the community. Many times, faculty members see service-learning as an additive to the curriculum rather than an effective pedagogical method (Boyle, 2007). In those circumstances, the projects rarely provide the deep learning experiences necessary to challenge the students' knowledge or perception toward service or the community (Boyle, 2007). To create effective projects that have a meaningful impact on students and the community, the instructor should work closely with a community partner (Boyle, 2007; Einfeld & Collins, 2008). However, faculty members often perceive service-learning projects from a charity perspective (Einfeld & Collins, 2008). Boyle (2007) argued that mutual reciprocity cannot be achieved when service is approached from a charity perspective. Faculty members and student volunteers can easily become critical of society and decide what services are needed rather than listening to the voices of community members or nonprofit and governmental organizations (Boyle, 2007; Einfeld & Collins, 2008). Additionally, the charity perspective encourages an *us and them* mindset rather than helping students assimilate into the community and truly feel a connection that makes them want to be active, engaged citizens (Einfeld & Collins, 2008).

Boyle (2007) suggested that institutions utilize the university as the leader approach. Colleges and universities can serve as the example in promoting collaboration and inspiring activism. In this approach, institutions leverage their resources to improve the community, but they do not tell the community what they need or how things will be done (Boyle, 2007). This perspective on service-learning also helps students learn how to be active participants in society (Boyle, 2007; Einfeld & Collins, 2008).

Critics of Required Volunteerism and Service Learning

Whether or not institutions of higher education should try to foster the development of civic attitudes and behaviors is a controversial topic. At the most basic level, volunteerism is defined as giving one's time freely for the benefit of another (Beehr et al., 2010; Brudney, 2010; Nesbit & Brudney, 2010; Simha, Topuzova, & Albert, 2011; Wilson, 2000). However, like high schools across the country, many institutions of higher education are requiring students to complete a certain number of service-learning classes or community service hours (Bok, 2001; Jones et al., 2008; Klink & Athaide, 2004; Metz & Youniss, 2003; Moely & Ilustre, 2011; Stukas et al., 1999). These initiatives are often designed to promote lifelong civic engagement by teaching students about the importance of actively participating in community life (Stukas et al., 1999). There are conflicting views regarding whether or not service activities should be required of students (e.g., Butin, 2006; Egger, 2008; Jones et al., 2008; Metz & Youniss, 2003, 2005). Yet, little research has been conducted on mandatory service programs, particularly at the collegiate level, and whether or not engaging in such programs result in the desired outcomes.

There are several critics of the notion that required volunteerism or service-learning pedagogy might produce more morally developed and engaged citizens (Butin, 2006; Egger,

27

2008; Fish, 2004). There is also a lack of consensus among academicians regarding whether or not service-learning pedagogy is appropriate in higher education. Cooper (as cited in Moely & Ilustre, 2011) suggested that requiring service as a means to develop citizenship skills might lead students to believe they are incomplete in some way, possibly lacking civility or strong work ethic (Egger, 2008). Some academicians contend that mandatory service requirements minimize personal responsibility and might actually reduce students' long-term interest in volunteerism when it is no longer being required or rewarded (Butin, 2006; Egger, 2008; Fish, 2004; Jones et al., 2008; Marks & Jones, 2004; Moely & Ilustre, 2011; Stukas et al., 1999).

Critics also suggest that service-learning allows instructors and administrators to promote certain political and social agendas in the classroom, which they believe contradicts higher education's goal of seeking out empirical truths (Battistoni, 2002; Boyd & Brackmann, 2012; Butin, 2006; Egger, 2008; Fish, 2004; Jacoby, 2009). Battistoni (2002) explained, "faculty on the left complain that citizenship education tends to convey images of patriotic flag-waving. More conservative faculty see civic engagement as masking a leftist, activist agenda" (p. 10). Butin (2006) further posited that an institution of higher education should be seen "as a site of knowledge production and dissemination rather than of something as nondefinable [sic] and potentially partisan as moral and civic betterment" (p. 479). Even though service-learning pedagogy has grown in popularity over the last two decades, many academicians are still skeptical (Butin, 2006; Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Egger, 2008; Hanover Research, 2011; Mariappan et al., 2005; Mayhew & Engberg, 2011; Perry & Katula, 2001; Prentice, 2007).

The results of research on required volunteerism are mixed, which adds to the debate between advocates and critics. Several studies have found that students benefit from their service experiences even if they only participated in the activities to fulfill a requirement (Jones et al.,

2008; Metz & Youniss, 2003; Moely & Ilustre, 2011; Stukas et al., 1999). For example, Metz and Youniss (2003) found that students who were required to participate in community service made the same gains in perceptions of civic responsibility as those who served voluntarily, and after completing the 40-hour graduation service requirement, more than 80% of students continued to volunteer on their own. Even though students might only participate in service to fulfill a requirement, the experiences can be transformational (Simha et al., 2011). Community service projects can challenge students' perspectives on social justice issues and teach them to be more empathetic toward marginalized or oppressed populations (Battistoni & Hudson, 1997; Simha et al., 2011). These activities can also inspire or reaffirm career choices as students develop new skills, interests, and attitudes (Simha et al., 2011; Weinreich, Kafer, Tahara, & Frishman, 2015). Additionally, some participants might question their previous career intentions after engaging in service-learning projects related to their major. As one focus group member explained, "I found out that I wouldn't be cut out to be a good social worker. I found out a lot of things that I wouldn't be good at or wouldn't enjoy" (Simha et al., 2011, p. 119).

Other studies have found that requiring students to participate in community service activities might lead to negative feelings about service and ultimately reduce the likelihood of future volunteerism (Beehr et al., 2010; Cruce & Moore, 2007, 2012; Jones et al., 2008; Stukas et al., 1999). Students might start to resent the experience, especially if they feel as though the requirement takes up too much of their time (Beehr et al., 2010). Further, despite the intended outcomes of the requirement, the service experience might not change students' perceptions of civic responsibility, particularly if they would not have participated in such activities on their own (Stukas et al., 1999).

Student-Level Variables

In addition to the institutional influences on community service participation through service-learning curriculum and graduation service requirements, there are a number of student-level variables that have been shown to affect volunteerism and perceptions of civic responsibility (Cruce & Moore, 2007; Hurtado & DeAngelo, 2012; Johnson, 2014; Sax, 2004). Student-level variables include demographic, academic, and behavioral attributes that might predict the likelihood of a student to participate in service activities during college (Cruce & Moore, 2012; Johnson, 2014).

Religious Affiliation

Several studies have found that religiosity is a predictor of service participation in college students (Astin & Sax, 1998; Bryant et al., 2012; Fitch, 1991; Marks & Jones, 2004; Serow & Dreyden, 1990). Approximately 50% of the high school seniors who took the Monitoring the Future survey between 1976 and 1993 responded that religion was "pretty" or "very" important to them (Bachman, Johnston, & O'Malley, 1993). Three-fourths of those students also reported participating in community service activities at least once per month, compared to only 25% of students who responded that religion was "not" or "a little" important (Bachman et al., 1993). Additionally, a student's choice to attend a religiously affiliated college or university reflects a student-level value that might influence perceptions of civic responsibility (Cruce & Moore, 2007; Serow & Dreyden, 1990).

Gender

Studies on the role of gender in predicting service participation in college and measuring civic values have shown mixed findings. Several studies have found that being female is a positive predictor of volunteerism in college (Astin & Sax, 1998; Cruce & Moore, 2007; Fitch, 1991; Marks & Jones, 2004; Serow & Dreyden, 1990). Given the research showing that volunteerism has a positive impact on the development of civic and social responsibility (Dugan & Komives, 2010; Lott, 2013), one might assume that women would score higher than men in measures of civic values as a result of increased volunteerism. However, research does not support this assumption. Rhee and Dey (1996) and Pascarella, Ethington, and Smart (1988) found that gender did not significantly influence civic values. Lott (2013) also found there was no difference in civic value measures between men and women, but that only held true during their first year in college. In their fourth year, female students scored significantly lower than male students (Lott, 2013). Additionally, Dugan and Komives (2010) found that being a woman was a significant predictor of an individual's capacity for socially responsible leadership in all measures except citizenship and change.

Campus Activities and Experiences

It has been well documented that various forms of campus involvement positively contribute to student development (Astin, 1984; Chesbrough, 2011; Colby et al., 2009; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Feldman et al., 2006; Jones & Abes, 2004; Newman et al., 2007; Phelps & Kotrlik, 2007). Dugan and Komives (2010) found that a student's collegiate experiences, rather than demographic or institutional characteristics, had the strongest influence on citizenship outcomes related to socially responsible leadership. Experiences, such as membership in student

organizations, interactions with peers and faculty, participation in community service activities, and living in an on-campus residence hall, help facilitate the development of community and group-oriented skills and values (Dugan & Komives, 2010; Lott, 2013).

Living on campus has shown to be a positive influence on civic values (Lott, 2013). For many students, living in campus-based housing exposes them to a more diverse population of students they might not otherwise interact with in such a personal way (Lott, 2013). Discussing personal values, multicultural concerns, political ideologies, and social issues can help students develop socially responsible leadership skills (Bryant et al., 2012; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Lott, 2013). Studies also show that living on campus is a positive predictor of participation in a variety of campus activities and organizations, which might further influence volunteerism (Cruce & Moore, 2007; Fitch, 1991). Students who become involved in organizations that value and encourage community service, such as Greek organizations, student government, and religious groups, are more likely to participate because of peer involvement (Cruce & Moore, 2007; Marks & Jones, 2004; Serow & Dreyden, 1990).

Work Responsibilities

Job responsibilities are often seen as a detriment to volunteer intentions (Markham & Bonjean, 1996). However, several studies indicate the connection between employment and volunteerism is influenced by a number of different variables. Individuals who are unemployed volunteer less than those who have a job (Taniguchi, 2006; Wilson, 2000), and having more than one job actually increases the likelihood of volunteerism (Freeman, 1997; Taniguchi, 2006). Additionally, professional and managerial level individuals (Wilson & Musick, 1997), as well as

individuals who are self-employed (Freeman, 1997), are more likely to volunteer than other types of employees.

A student's plans to volunteer might be impacted by how many hours he/she works and whether the student's job is on- or off-campus (Cruce & Moore, 2007). While examining connections between service-learning pedagogy and civic engagement outcomes, Prentice (2007) observed that students who elected to enroll in service-learning courses were more likely than their non-service-learning counterparts to work part-time or full-time. Similarly, Cruce and Moore (2007) found that having a part-time job is a positive predictor of students' intentions to volunteer. They explained, "only when the number of hours per week exceeds 30 for on-campus work and 15 for off-campus work does time spent working start to have no impact or a negative impact on students' plans to volunteer during college" (Cruce & Moore, 2007, p. 670). This is consistent with findings that part-time workers volunteer more than full-time workers (Taniguchi, 2006; Wilson, 2000).

Family Responsibilities: Marital and Parental Status

Similar to work responsibilities, the role of marital and parental status on an individual's propensity to volunteer is influenced by a number of factors. In general, single individuals are less likely to volunteer than those who are married (Freeman, 1997; Sundeen, 1990; Taniguchi, 2006). However, when grouped by gender, the positive effect of marriage on volunteerism only holds true for men (Taniguchi, 2006). As Wilson (2000) stated, "if only one spouse volunteers, it is most likely to be the wife" (p. 225).

The effect of parental responsibility on the likelihood of volunteerism depends on marital status, the number of children, and the age of the children (Sundeen, 1990; Taniguchi, 2006;

Wilson, 2000). Having a child over the age of six increases one's likelihood of volunteering because parents and their children connect to new social groups through schools, sports teams, and other youth-oriented activities (Damico, Damico, & Conway, 1998; Taniguchi, 2006; Wilson, 2000). Taniguchi (2006) found that each additional child over the age of six "increases the likelihood of volunteerism by 7% to 10%" (p. 95), which might be a result of the parents having more free time while the children are in school (Wilson, 2000). However, being a single parent negates the positive effect of having school-aged children on one's propensity to volunteer (Sundeen, 1990).

Summary

Developing and graduating engaged citizens with a commitment to participating in community life has always been a goal of higher education (Bok, 2001; Felten & Clayton, 2011; Morse, 1989; Nuss, 2003; Prentice, 2011; Sax, 2004). However, the priorities of students, as well as institutions of higher education, have changed over the last century (Bok, 2001; Bryant et al., 2012; Hunter & Brisbin, 2000; Jacoby, 2009; Misa et al., 2005; Prentice, 2007). This literature review examined these changes and how declining volunteer intentions among college-aged students has led to a renewed interest in civic education and community engagement activities over the last three decades (Hatcher, 2011; Jacoby, 2009). Graduation service requirements and service-learning courses have become popular methods of trying to engage students in community activities and promote a sense of civic responsibility (Bok, 2001; Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Jones et al., 2008; Metz & Youniss, 2003; Moely & Ilustre, 2011). Still, critics argue that community service is a voluntary activity and, therefore, should not be an institutional requirement (Butin, 2006; Egger, 2008; Fish, 2004). These approaches, as well as the critical

response, were explored. Finally, religious affiliation, gender, campus activities and experiences, and work and family responsibilities were examined as student-level variables that might affect an individual's participation in community engagement activities and perception of civic responsibility.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to determine to what extent a relationship exists between service participation and students' perceptions of civic responsibility. The following chapter discusses the plan for conducting this mixed-methods study utilizing extant survey and focus group data. The population of the study and the research design are reviewed, along with the rationale for selecting the research design. Finally, the plan for obtaining and analyzing the data is described.

Population

The participants in this study were all first-time, first-year students in 2012, and they attended a private, religiously affiliated institution in the southeast. The institution has a graduation service requirement and utilizes service-learning pedagogy in a variety of courses in each department. Only respondents who were U.S. citizens and students who were completing college within a normal four-year timeframe were included. Responses from non-U.S. citizens and early graduates were not considered.

All participants were required to take the survey instrument as part of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) assessment protocol (Condon, 2009). Participants were also required to complete at least 40 hours of service, a minimum of 10 hours per year, prior to graduation (Condon, 2009). Therefore, respondents' student identification numbers were recorded on each survey and service activity tracking form to verify the completion of institutional requirements.

Research Design

This research utilized a mixed-methods design with several components. It was a longitudinal study sampling a single cohort, and it utilized archival data that was collected by the institution over the course of four years. There were both quantitative and qualitative elements. The Civic Responsibility subscale of the Higher Education Service-Learning Survey was the dependent variable of the quantitative portion. The independent, or predictor, variables were the number of service-learning courses taken over successive years, the number of volunteer hours tracked during the collegiate experience, and certain demographic variables (see Appendix B). Data collection for the quantitative component was completed at three different intervals between the respondents' first year and the fourth year. These archival data were collected by the institution as part of the QEP survey protocol (Condon, 2009) and were analyzed using correlation and multiple regression procedures. The qualitative portion of the study utilized data mined from focus groups, which took place during the respondents' fourth year. The institution's research review committee granted permission to conduct the focus groups. Focus group participants were asked to reflect on their service-learning experiences.

A longitudinal approach was chosen for this study in an effort to separate recruitment effects and socialization effects. The inability to control for precollege effects has been a methodological limitation of many studies investigating how college experiences, including service-learning coursework and volunteer activities, impact student development (Brandes & Randall, 2011; Kiely, 2005; Myers-Lipton, 1998; Pascarella, 2006). Research on the effect of college experiences on student development is often limited to one course, semester, or activity, and many studies fail to adequately account for demographic variables or students' experiences prior to the program or intervention (Brandes & Randall, 2011; Myers-Lipton, 1998; Pascarella,

2006). These limitations in the research design make it difficult to determine what role, if any, the program or intervention had in altering students' attitudes or values (Brandes & Randall, 2011; Myers-Lipton, 1998; Pascarella, 2006; Tryon et al., 2008).

Longitudinal studies provide a method for differentiating between recruitment and socialization effects when random sampling is not an option (Pascarella, 2006). Precollege experiences, demographics, and other confounding variables can be controlled for in the data analysis process, which can provide "a more internally valid estimate of the socialization effect" (Pascarella, 2006, p. 509). Although the internal validity of longitudinal studies is not as strong as randomized experiments, Pascarella (2006) explained, "longitudinal, pretest–posttest designs with accompanying statistical controls…have provided the most credible body of evidence available on college impact" (p. 509). However, even though longitudinal research designs have the potential to strengthen the body of literature on college student development, researchers seldom utilize pretest, posttest designs because the duration and intensity required is too cumbersome, expensive, or time-consuming (Brandes & Randall, 2011; Kiely, 2005; Myers-Lipton, 1998; Pascarella, 2006).

Instrumentation

The instrument used for this study was the 9-item Civic Responsibility subscale of the Higher Education Service Learning Survey (HESLS), which utilizes a four-point Likert scale. The Civic Responsibility subscale has high reliability, Cronbach's $\alpha = .79$, $n = 228$, and a test-retest reliability coefficient $= .71$, $n = 228$ (Furco, 2000). The reliability measures of this subscale indicate an instrument that is internally consistent (Gliner et al., 2009) and "can be interpreted consistently across different situations" (Field, 2009, p. 11). A complete copy of the

survey instrument can be found in Appendix A. Additionally, a letter to Dr. Andrew Furco, the author of the survey, requesting permission to utilize it for the purposes of this study can be found in Appendix C, and his response granting permission can be found in Appendix D.

Data Collection

The institution collected the pre- and midtest scores during the cohort's first month (September 2012) and last month of the first year (April 2013), respectively. These assessments were completed as part of the institution's yearlong, first-year experience course to meet a requirement of the QEP assessment protocol (Condon, 2009). The posttest data were collected during the fall semester of the cohort's fourth year (Fall 2015). A reminder to complete the posttest was sent to fourth-year students in September 2015 by the Center for Servant Leadership per the QEP assessment protocol (Condon, 2009). The posttest included demographic questions regarding family responsibilities, work location and responsibilities, past voting experience, future voting plans, precollege service experiences, satisfaction regarding the institution's service program, and whether or not the student knew the institution had a service requirement prior to attending new student orientation. Each assessment was completed online using the institution's intra-campus network, and the Office of Institutional Research and Retention (OIRR) collected and stored the data.

Each respondent's service records through December 2015 were collected from the Center for Servant Leadership. The registrar's office provided information regarding the number of service-learning courses each student completed. Gender, ethnicity, citizenship, and religious affiliation variables were collected from the institution's secure database through collaboration with OIRR. The Residence Life Office provided information regarding whether or not the

student lived on campus at any point during his/her collegiate career. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

The qualitative portion of this study utilized data mined from focus groups held during Spring 2016. A total of 20 students participated in the three focus groups, and participants in each session were asked the same set of open-ended questions. The focus groups were asked to discuss their experiences with the service-learning program at the institution as well as their opinions on civic responsibility.

Measurement and Coding of Variables

The survey used for this study measured the dependent variable of perception of civic responsibility based on responses to the 9-item Civic Responsibility subscale of the HESLS (Furco, 2000). There are three data points for each participant, which were collected at specific intervals over the course of four years. Responses to the survey items were coded as 1 = Strongly Agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Disagree; and 4 = Strongly Disagree. The sum of each student's responses to the subscale questions provided the scores for each data point, and the potential range for each score is 9-36. A lower score indicates a higher perception of civic responsibility.

The independent variables for this study were the number of service-learning courses completed and the number of hours tracked through the Center for Servant Leadership. Between Fall 2012 and Fall 2015, the institution offered 136 service-learning designated courses (T. Williams, personal communication, March 24, 2016), which serves as the highest possibility of service-learning courses taken during the respondent's collegiate career. The institution offered 36 service-learning designated courses between Data Point 1 and Data Point 2, and 100 service-learning courses were offered between Data Point 2 and Data Point 3 (T. Williams, personal

communication, March 24, 2016). The lowest possible number of service-learning courses taken

is zero. For reference, 26% of students who graduated during the 2013-2014 academic year and

46% of students who graduated during the 2014-2015 academic year participated in at least one

service-learning course while enrolled at the institution utilized in this study (T. Williams,

personal communication, October 29, 2015).

Each participant was required to complete a minimum of 10 service hours each year

during his/her collegiate career (Condon, 2009). Therefore, 30 hours of service tracked is the

lowest end of the potential range between Data Point 1 and Data Point 3. Students should have

tracked a minimum of 10 hours of service between Data Point 1 and Data Point 2 and a

minimum of 20 service hours between Data Point 2 and Data Point 3. There is no maximum

number of service hours completed by each participant. Many students at the institution complete

more than the required amount of service hours each year. In the 2012-2013 academic year, each

student at the institution completed an average 28 service hours. For the 2013-2014 and 2014-

2015 academic years, the average number of service hours completed by each student rose to

43.5 and 43.8, respectively (T. Williams, personal communication, February 24, 2016).

There were a number of attribution variables measured during the last iteration of the

survey in Fall 2015. Participants were asked to select only one from the following list to identify

their family responsibilities: None; Married; Married with Children; Unmarried with Children.

Respondents were asked to select their work location from the following list: None; On-campus;

Off-campus; Both On- and Off-Campus. In addition to work location, participants were asked to

identify their average level of work responsibility during the academic year from the following

list: None; 10 or fewer hours per week; 11-20 hours per week; 21-30 hours per week; 31-40

hours per week; More than 40 hours per week. Participants were also asked whether or not they

voted in the 2012 Presidential Election, if they were 18 at the time of the election, and whether or not they planned to vote in the 2016 Presidential Election. Finally, students were asked about their level of satisfaction with the institution's mandatory service program. Respondents were asked to select from the following choices: Highly Satisfied; Satisfied; Unsatisfied; Highly Unsatisfied. Appendix A provides full details regarding the specific coding of the attribution variables examined in this study, including the gender, religious affiliation, ethnicity, and residential history variables collected from the Office of Institutional Research Retention and the Residence Life Office.

Statistical Analysis

The names of participants were removed from the databases and only student identification numbers were used to organize the information. The data for each respondent was organized on a single row of an Excel sheet that corresponds with his/her random identification number. In addition to listing the respondent's HESLS scores at the three data points, the amounts of change in score between Data Point 1 and Data Point 2, two and three, and one and three were calculated and noted. Once the data were appropriately coded and organized, the Excel database was uploaded to SPSS for analysis.

Correlation was conducted to explore the potential associations between students' enrollment in service-learning courses and/or the number of service hours completed and changes in students' views of civic responsibility over time. Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine to what extent attribution factors and service participant are potential predictors of students' views of civic responsibility at the final data point. Repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to further examine aggregate changes in the HESLS scores over time.

Research Question 1: To what extent does enrollment in service-learning courses relate to students' views of civic responsibility over time?

- o H1$_0$: There will not be a significant relationship between service-learning coursework and students' perceptions of civic responsibility.

- o H1$_A$: There will be a significant relationship between service-learning coursework and students' perceptions of civic responsibility.

For Research Question 1, Pearson correlation coefficients were examined to assess whether frequency of participation in service-learning courses correlates with the amount of change in scores on the HESLS. Bivariate correlation analysis was conducted on the amount of change in a student's score between Data Point 1 and Data Point 2 and the number of service-learning courses in the student's first year to determine whether or not a significant relationship existed between participation and his/her perception of civic responsibility. The amount of change between Data Point 2 and Data Point 3 and the number service-learning courses taken during that same time period was analyzed through correlation analysis to determine the relationship between service-learning after the first college year and his/her perception of civic responsibility. Finally, the amount of change between Data Point 1 and Data Point 3 was used to examine the relationship of service-learning courses on students' perception of civic responsibility over the course of the entire collegiate career through correlation analysis.

Research Question 2: To what extent does the number of hours of service completed relate to students' perceptions of civic responsibility over time?

- o H2$_0$: There will not be a significant relationship between the number of hours served and students' perceptions of civic responsibility.

- H2$_A$: There will be a significant relationship between the number of hours served and students' perceptions of civic responsibility.

For Research Question 2, Pearson correlation coefficients were examined to assess whether frequency of participation in community service correlates with the amount of change in scores on the HESLS. Bivariate correlation analysis was conducted on the amount of change in a student's score between Data Point 1 and Data Point 2 and the number of service hours tracked in the student's first year to determine whether or not a significant relationship exists between participation and his/her perception of civic responsibility. The amount of change between Data Point 2 and Data Point 3 and the number service hours tracked taken during that same time period was analyzed through correlation analysis to determine the relationship between service activity after the first college year and his/her perception of civic responsibility. Finally, the amount of change between Data Point 1 and Data Point 3 was used to examine the relationship of service hours tracked on students' perception of civic responsibility over the course of the entire collegiate career through correlation analysis.

Research Question 3: To what extent do attribution factors (e.g., gender, family responsibilities, work location and responsibilities, ethnicity, religious affiliation, residence, voting habits, knowledge of the service requirement, prior service experience, and satisfaction of the institution's service program) relate to students' views of civic responsibility?

- H3$_0$: There will not be a significant relationship between attribution factors and students' perceptions of civic responsibility.

- H3$_A$: There will be a significant relationship between attribution factors and students' perceptions of civic responsibility.

For Research Question 3, correlation and multiple regression methods were used. Correlation analysis was conducted to determine if a significant relationship exists between the various attribution factors and students' views of civic responsibility at the three different data points. A multiple linear regression analysis was used to examine which combination of attribution factors are most likely to be associated with high levels of civic responsibility. These analyses also assisted with exploring Research Question 1 and Research Question 2.

Summary

A mixed-methods study was conducted to examine to what extent a relationship exists between student participation in service activities and their perceptions of civic responsibility. The longitudinal study utilized extant survey and focus group data from a single cohort of students at a U.S. higher education institution. The quantitative data were analyzed through a variety of methods, including correlation, multiple regression, and repeated measures ANOVA. Qualitative data were mined from focus group transcripts.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between service participation and students' self-reported perceptions of civic responsibility. The investigation included the role of precollege and other attribute variables, college service-learning courses, and the number of hours volunteered during college in relation to students' perception of civic responsibility. Specifically, the respondents' scores on the Higher Education Service Learning Survey (HESLS) were compared to the number of service hours tracked and the number of service-learning courses completed by each respondent. Participants completed the survey at three specific points during their collegiate career. The relationship between the number of service hours completed, as well as the number of service-learning courses taken during the same intervals, and students' scores on the HESLS were examined.

This chapter presents the analysis of quantitative data through correlation, multiple regression, and repeated measures ANOVA tests utilizing SPSS software. The data presented assisted in evaluating the relationships between service participation and perceptions of civic responsibility. The relationships between a number of attribute variables, service participation, and perceptions of civic responsibility were also reviewed. Additionally, qualitative data were analyzed using Provalis software to identify common themes. The data analysis was utilized to answer the three research questions that guided this study.

Research Questions

1. To what extent does enrollment in service-learning courses relate to students' views of civic responsibility over time?

2. To what extent does the number of hours of service completed relate to students' perceptions of civic responsibility over time?

3. To what extent do attribution factors (e.g., gender, family responsibilities, work location and responsibilities, ethnicity, religious affiliation, residence, voting habits, knowledge of the service requirement, prior service experience, and satisfaction of the institution's service program) relate to students' views of civic responsibility?

Participant Characteristics

Although the original 2012 cohort included 220 incoming first-year students, only 91 members of the original population were still enrolled at the institution in Fall 2015 when the final iteration of the survey was conducted. Four of the remaining 91 were international students who were eliminated from the study. As a result, there were 87 student participants included in the final sample for this study. Demographic information for participants is provided in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1   Participant Demographics

Variable	Value	*n*	%
Gender	Female	61	70.1
	Male	26	29.9
	Total	87	100
Religious Affiliation	Not Reported	31	35.6
	Reported	56	64.4
Live on Campus	No	37	42.5
	Yes	50	57.5
Ethnicity	African American	5	5.7
	Caucasian	76	87.4
	Hispanic	1	1.1
	Other	5	5.7
Family Responsibilities	None	79	90.8
	Married	3	3.4
	Unmarried with Children	2	2.3
	Did Not Report	3	3.3
Work Location	None	9	10.3
	On-Campus	7	8
	Off-Campus	42	48.3
	Both	26	29.9
	Did Not Report	3	3.4
Work Hours	None	9	10.3
	10 or fewer hours per week	22	25.3
	11-20 hours per week	25	28.7
	21-30 hours per week	20	23
	31-40 hours per week	8	9.2
	Did Not Report	3	3.4
Voted in 2012 Election	No	35	40.2
	Yes	46	53
	Not 18 at the time of the election	3	3.4
	Did Not Report	3	3.4
Plan to Vote in 2016 Election	No	6	6.9
	Yes	66	75.9
	Unsure	12	13.8
	Did Not Report	3	3.4
Knowledge of Service Requirement Prior to Orientation	No	32	36.8
	Yes	52	59.8
	Did Not Report	3	3.4
Prior Service Experience	No	16	18.4
	Yes	68	78.2
	Did Not Report	3	3.4
Overall Satisfaction with Service Program	Highly Unsatisfied	3	3.4
	Unsatisfied	13	14.9
	Satisfied	48	55.2
	Highly Satisfied	20	23
	Did Not Report	3	3.4

Of the 87 respondents in the final sample, 61 (70.1%) were female and 26 (29.9%) were male. In Fall 2015, women comprised 64.4% of the institution's overall undergraduate population, while men accounted for 35.6%. The racial distribution of respondents was 87.4% (76) Caucasian, 5.7% (5) African American, 5.7% (5) Other, and 1.1% (1) Hispanic. This is comparable to the general population of the institution, which reported its overall racial distribution in Fall 2015 as 69.9% Caucasian, 5.8% African American, 3.6% Other, and 1.6% Hispanic, with 19.4% of the overall undergraduate population reported as Unknown ethnicity.

The majority of respondents, 57.5% (50), lived on campus at some point during their collegiate career. The institution has a three-year residency requirement for students whose permanent home addresses are more than 50 miles away from campus unless the student is married, has a child, or has an immediate relative living within a 50-mile radius. In Fall 2012, during this cohort's freshman year, 61% of first-time, first-year students lived on-campus.

Three respondents (3.4%) were not 18 at the time of the 2012 Presidential Election, and three respondents (3.4%) did not provide a response to the question. Of the remaining 81 respondents, 46 (53%) reported that they voted in the election, while 35 (40.2%) responded that they did not vote. Sixty-six respondents (75.9%) indicated their intention to vote in the 2016 Presidential Election. Six respondents (6.9%) reported they did not plan to vote, and 15 (17.2%) were still unsure or did not respond to the question.

Fifty-two respondents (59.8%) indicated knowledge of the service requirement prior to attending new student orientation. Sixty-eight respondents (78.2%) reported participation in service activities prior to attending college. The majority of respondents, 86.2% (75), worked at least part-time with 48.3% (42) working off-campus and 29.9% (26) working both on- and off-campus. Of these respondents, 25.3% (22) worked 10 or fewer hours per week, 28.7% (25)

worked 11-20 hours per week, 23% (20) worked 21-30 hours per week, and 9.2% (8) worked 31-40 hours per week.

Summary of Descriptive Results

A respondent's score on the 9-item Civic Responsibility subscale of the HESLS can range from 9 to 36. The survey utilizes a 4-point Likert scale where a lower score would indicate a higher level of civic responsibility. The mean score of the first iteration of the HESLS, which was given in Fall 2012, was 16.89. In Spring 2013, the mean score of the second iteration of the HESLS was 16.30. The mean score of the Fall 2015 iteration of the survey was 15.88. The reduction of the mean score over time indicates a slight aggregate increase in civic perception among the respondents.

The average number of service hours completed by respondents during their first year at the institution was 23.78, and the average number of service hours completed by respondents over the duration of their college career was 149.76. This indicates that students, on average, completed more service hours than required. The institution requires that students complete a minimum of 10 hours per academic year and a total minimum of 40 hours prior to graduation. Respondents completed an average of two service-learning designated courses during their collegiate careers. The institution does not require students to enroll in service-learning designated courses, but students are encouraged to take at least one prior to graduation.

Analyses for Each Research Question

The following section describes the quantitative and qualitative results of the data analyses for each of the research questions. Quantitative data were analyzed using correlation

and multiple regression, and qualitative data from focus groups were analyzed using Provalis to identify themes.

<div align="center">Research Question 1</div>

Research Question 1 was, "To what extent does enrollment in service-learning courses relate to students' views of civic responsibility over time?"

Correlation analysis was conducted to explore Research Question 1. The results indicated that service-learning courses did not have a significant relationship with students' scores on the HESLS at any iteration point. There was a nonsignificant correlation of $r = .171$, $p = .123$ between the scores of the second iteration of the HESLS and the number of service-learning designated courses taken during the entire first-year of college. There was also a nonsignificant correlation of $r = .072$, $p = .515$ between the final iteration of the HESLS, completed during the respondents' senior/fourth-year, and the number of service-learning courses taken over the duration of the respondents' collegiate career. The data analysis suggests there is no significant relationship to a student's enrollment in service-learning designated courses and his/her perception of civic responsibility (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2   Correlations Between Enrollment in Service-Learning Courses and HESLS Scores

Variable	HESLS 1	HESLS 2	HESLS 3	*M*	*SD*
SL Courses 1-2	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.60	0.75
SL Courses 2-3	0.19	0.14	0.07	1.67	1.67
SL Courses 1-3	0.20	0.16	0.11	2.26	2.19
M	16.89	16.30	15.88		
SD	3.69	3.63	3.48		

Note. Means and standard deviations for the HESLS scores (HESLS 1, $n = 82$; HESLS 2, $n = 83$; HESLS 3, $n = 84$) are presented in the vertical columns. Means and standard deviations for student enrollment service-learning designated courses ($n = 87$) are presented in the horizontal rows.

Analysis of focus group data provided similar results. Six focus group participants noted that they either did not enroll in a service-learning designated course or could not remember if they had ever completed one. Of the students who did take service-learning courses, several noted that their course-related service experiences were not memorable. One student who was enrolled in a service-learning designated course during the same semester the focus group was held said, "Oh right, our senior seminar course is (laughs). We tutor." While trying to remember whether or not he had taken a service-learning designed course, one student said, "Uh, was it, it was a lit class. I can't remember what it was, though (laughs), to be honest. But, it was world lit. I think it was."

Some participants did not find their service experiences to be relevant to the course material. One student explained, "Fundamentals of Biology was one, but I felt like the project we did wasn't really correlated to the class at all. Like, it was really random." While discussing other service-learning designed courses in the Natural Sciences department, another student added, "As far as what they do on-campus, it's very limited." The lack of connection to course material sometimes led to experiences they did not perceive to be meaningful. In describing the project she completed for a fundamentals of biology course, one respondent explained, "I didn't feel this was related to the subject at all. Like, there was no plan, there was nothing…I was disappointed and unfulfilled. I didn't feel like I helped anybody. It didn't feel like service to me."

Only two respondents discussed having positive experiences with service-learning designated courses. Describing her experiences with tutoring children in the local school system through her education courses, one student said, "That was kind of cool because it was service but also helped me grow myself for my future career, which I really liked and needed." Another student described being positively influenced through fine arts courses that allowed her to

participate in a music ministry project. Both students discussed taking multiple service-learning courses, which is consistent with the analysis of data examining student enrollment in service-learning designated courses at multiple points throughout his or her collegiate experience.

The number of service-learning designated courses taken during the respondents' first-year significantly correlated with the number of service-learning courses taken during the sophomore, junior, and senior years, $r = .567$, $p < .01$. This result suggests that students who enroll in a service-learning designated course during their first year in college were more likely to enroll in service-learning courses in subsequent years (see Table 4.3). Additionally, enrollment in service-learning designated coursework significantly correlated with participation in service activities prior to enrolling at the institution, $r = .251$, $p < .05$. The data indicate that students who were involved in prior service activities were more likely to enroll in service-learning designated courses during their collegiate career (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3   Correlations Between Service-Learning Course Enrollment and Prior Service Experience

	Variable	1	2	3	4
1.	SL Courses 1-2	-			
2.	SL Courses 2-3	.57**	-		
3.	SL Courses 1-3	.78**	.96**	-	
4.	Prior Service	.16	.26*	.25*	-

Note. For Prior Service, 0 = no and 1 = yes.
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 was, "To what extent does the number of hours of service completed relate to students' perceptions of civic responsibility over time?"

Correlation analysis was conducted to answer Research Question 2. The number of service hours completed did not have a significant relationship with students' scores on the HESLS at any iteration point. There was a nonsignificant correlation of $r = -.038, p = .735$ between the scores of the second iteration of the HESLS, completed during the spring semester of the respondents' first-year, and the number of service hours completed during the respondents' first-year of college. There was also a nonsignificant correlation of $r = -.158, p = .151$ between the final iteration of the HESLS, completed during the respondents' senior/fourth-year, and the total number of service hours completed throughout the respondents' collegiate career. The results of the data analysis indicate that there is no significant relationship between the number of service hours a student completes and his/her perception of civic responsibility (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4   Correlations Between Number of Service Hours Tracked and HESLS Scores

Variable	HESLS 1	HESLS 2	HESLS 3	M	SD
Service Hours 1-2	-.04	-.04	-.06	23.78	19.59
Service Hours 2-3	-.12	-.00	-.16	125.98	162.71
Service Hours 1-3	-.12	-.01	-.16	149.76	173.90
M	16.89	16.30	15.88		
SD	3.69	3.63	3.48		

Note. Means and standard deviations for the HESLS scores (HESLS 1, $n = 82$; HESLS 2, $n = 83$; HESLS 4, $n = 84$) are presented in the vertical columns. Means and standard deviations for number of service hours tracked ($n = 87$) are presented in the horizontal rows.

The number of service hours completed during the respondents' first-year significantly correlated with the number of service hours completed during the sophomore, junior, and senior years, $r = .530$, $p < .01$. This indicates that students were likely to serve at a similar rate each year throughout their collegiate career. Prior service engagement significantly correlated with the number of service hours completed in the respondents' first-year, $r = .253$, $p < .05$. This suggests that students who already had habits of volunteerism or service behaviors were more likely to continue those in college than students who did not participate in service activities prior to college.

The number of service hours completed during the first-year also significantly correlated to the number of service-learning courses taken over the course of the respondents' collegiate career, $r = .338$, $p < .01$. The results suggest that students with higher levels of service were also likely to enroll in service-learning designated courses. Additionally, the number of service hours completed during the respondents' collegiate career significantly correlated with overall satisfaction of the institution's service program, $r = .302$, $p < .01$. The data analysis indicates that the more service a student participated in, the higher their overall satisfaction with the institution's service program. Students who were active participants in service activities were more satisfied with the program than their peers who were not as active. Finally, the number of service hours completed significantly correlated with gender at each data point, with the most significant correlation occurring in the first year, $r = -.296$, $p < .01$. These results indicate that women were more likely than men to engage in service activities. Table 4.5 provides a complete overview of these correlations.

Table 4.5   Correlations Between Number of Service Hours Tracked, Prior Service Experience, Service-Learning Course Enrollment, Gender, and Overall Satisfaction With the Service Program

	Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Service Hours 1-2	-						
2.	Service Hours 2-3	.53**	-					
3.	Service Hours 1-3	.61**	.99**	-				
4.	Prior Service	.25*	.11	.13	-			
5.	SL Courses 1-3	.34**	.11	.14	.25*	-		
6.	Gender	-.30**	-.25*	-.27*	-.10	-.16	-	
7.	Satisfaction	.22*	.30**	.30**	.01	.01	-.15	-

Note. Prior Service, 0 = no, and 1 = yes. Gender, 0 = female and 1 = male. Satisfaction, 0 = highly unsatisfied, 1 = unsatisfied, 2 = satisfied, and 3 = highly satisfied.
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Analysis of focus group data revealed that many participants felt that the requirement to complete 10 service hours annually was sufficient. One respondent explained, "I think 10 hours [per year] is an appropriate amount because it allows you to get more than one experience or more than one day of experience, but it's not too much to handle." Another student added, "Yeah, especially when broken down to a minimum of 5 [hours] a semester, it's extremely easy to get." Only one respondent said she did not agree with the service requirement and posited she would have participated in more service during her collegiate career had it not been required.

Some focus group participants discussed personal growth that resulted from participating in service activities while in college. One participant explained that, although he initially felt the requirement was a burden, his perception has changed as he reflects on his service activities over the last four years. He said, "It's kind of like, now I look back on it, and it's definitely something that kinda adds to who I am. You know, you're stepping out of your comfort zone and helping someone else." Another respondent added, "I think it's a good way to meet people, like just out

in the community…going out and, like, doing stuff and meeting people, it is how you expand

yourself, too." Although civic responsibility was not specifically discussed, many students noted

how the service requirement helped expand their community engagement activities. For

example, one participant discussed his experiences volunteering in his hometown with a Remote

Area Medical Clinic event while on winter break. Another participant worked with the Student

Government Association to organize a voter registration drive on campus in preparation for the

2016 elections. One respondent explained, "I think it [the service requirement] is a great

opportunity for people to get an idea of what it is like to help others and the community."

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 was, "To what extent do attribution factors (e.g., gender, family

responsibilities, work location and responsibilities, ethnicity, religious affiliation, residence,

voting habits, knowledge of the service requirement, prior service experience, and satisfaction of

the institution's service program) relate to students' views of civic responsibility?"

Respondents' scores on the first iteration of the HESLS significantly correlated with

whether or not the student lived on campus at any point during his/her collegiate career, $r =$

$-.328, p < .01$, whether or not he/she voted in the 2012 presidential election, $r = -.225, p < .05$,

knowledge of the service requirement prior to new student orientation, $r = -.236, p < .05$, and

overall satisfaction with the institution's service program, $r = -.225, p < 0.05$. The data analysis

indicates that students with a greater sense of civic responsibility were more likely to live on

campus and vote in the 2012 presidential election. Students with greater perceptions of civic

responsibility were also more likely to know about the service requirement prior to attending

new student orientation and to be more satisfied with the institution's service program (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.6   Correlations Between HESLS Iteration 1 and Select Attribute Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. HESLS 1	-				
2. Live On Campus	-.33**	-			
3. Voted in 2012 Election	-.26*	-.17	-		
4. Knowledge of Service Requirement	-.24*	.20	.08	-	
5. Satisfaction	-.23*	.18	-.11	.11	-

Note. For variables Lived on Campus, Voted in 2012 Election, and Knowledge of Service Requirement, 0 = no and 1 = yes. For Satisfaction, 0 = highly unsatisfied, 1 = unsatisfied, 2 = satisfied, and 3 = highly satisfied.
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Prior service engagement significantly correlated to whether or not a respondent reported a religious affiliation on his/her admissions application, $r = .285$, $p < 0.1$, as well as whether or not he/she voted in the 2012 presidential election, $r = .378$, $p < .01$. The results suggest that respondents who previously participated in service activities were more likely to report a religious affiliation on his/her admissions application and to vote in the 2012 presidential election. Finally, the number of hours per week a student works significantly negatively correlated with overall satisfaction of the service program, $r = -.227$, $p < .05$. This suggests that as the number of hours worked per week increased, the overall satisfaction with the service program decreased. Table 4.7 provides an overview of correlations between select extraneous variables relevant to this study.

Table 4.7   Correlations Between Select Extraneous Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Prior Service	-				
2. Religion Listed on Application	.29**	-			
3. Voted in 2012 Election	.38**	.13	-		
4. Average Work Hours Per Week	-.05	.01	.03	-	
5. Satisfaction	.01	-.06	-.11	-.23*	-

Note. For variables Prior Service, Religion Listed on Application, and Voted in 2012 Election, 0 = no and 1 = yes. For Average Work Hours Per Week, 0 = None, 1 = 10 or fewer, 2 = 11-20, 3 = 21-30, 4 = 31-40, 5 = More than 40. For Satisfaction, 0 = highly unsatisfied, 1 = unsatisfied, 2 = satisfied, and 3 = highly satisfied.
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Participating in annual service events with one's church was the most common precollege service activity for focus group participants. There were 14 mentions of annual service experiences, such as mission trips and youth camps, and 16 mentions of completing service through a church group or activity. Sports teams and student organizations were the next most mentioned connection to service activities in the focus groups. Many respondents explained that they participated in service activities because someone else either asked them, such as family members or youth group leaders, or required them to participate, such as coaches, teachers, or student clubs. One student explained, "I grew up in the church and my family was big on volunteering, so I was always doing something with my family and church and volunteering somehow in the community."

There were six mentions of not participating in service at all prior to enrolling in college. One respondent explained, "I never knew of any opportunities because no one pointed me in the direction of volunteer work." Another student added that he would not have participated in service activities unless someone at church or in his high school had directly asked him. Table

4.8 provides an overview of mentions regarding frequency of precollege service experiences and connection to service activities by participants in the focus groups.

Table 4.8   Precollege Service Experience Frequencies and Connections

Variable	Value	n	%
	None Prior to College	6	22.2
	Rarely	2	7.4
Frequency of Service	Annually	14	51.9
	Monthly	2	7.4
	Weekly	3	11.1
	Church	16	43.2
	Course	2	5.4
Connection to Service	Family	2	5.4
	Sports	9	24.4
	Student Organization	8	21.6

Additional Analysis

As described in the summary of descriptive results, the mean HESLS score decreased with each iteration of the assessment, signifying a slight aggregate increase in civic perception among the respondents. A repeated measures ANOVA indicated that the mean scores for the first and third iterations of the assessment were significantly different, $p < .05$. The difference between the mean score of the first iteration of the HESLS, which was given in Fall 2012, and the mean score of the second iteration of the HESLS, which was given in Spring 2013 was not significant. Additionally, the difference between the mean score of the second iteration, which was given in Spring 2013, and the third iteration, which was given in Fall 2015, was not significant (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.9 Pairwise Comparisons of HESLS Scores

(I) HESLS	(J) HESLS	Mean Difference (I-J)	SE	Sig.[b]	95% Confidence Interval for Difference[b] Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval for Difference[b] Upper Bound
1	2	0.67	0.29	0.08	-0.05	1.38
	3	1.04[*]	0.40	0.03	0.07	2.01
2	1	-0.67	0.29	0.08	-1.38	0.05
	3	0.37	0.40	1.00	-0.61	1.36
3	1	-1.04[*]	0.40	0.03	-2.01	-0.07
	2	-0.37	0.40	1.00	-1.36	0.61

Based on estimated marginal means

[*] The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

[b] Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

However, the significance test for sphericity indicated that there were significant differences between the variances in the repeated measures analysis. This could be a threat to the repeated measures and is a limitation to the findings. Table 4.10 provides the results of the test for sphericity.

Table 4.10 Mauchly's Test for Sphericity[a]

Within Subjects Effect	Mauchly's W	Approx. Chi-Square	df	Sig.	Epsilon[b] Greenhouse-Geisser	Epsilon[b] Huynh-Feldt	Epsilon[b] Lower-bound
HESLS	0.865	11.026	2	0.004	0.88	0.90	0.50

Tests the null hypothesis that the error covariance matrix of the orthonormalized transformed dependent variables is proportional to an identity matrix.

[a] Design: Intercept

[b] May be used to adjust the degrees of freedom for the averaged tests of significance. Corrected tests are displayed in the Tests of Within-Subjects Effects table.

Within Subjects Design: HESLS

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine whether the model is useful in predicting last iteration HESLS scores. Table 4.11 shows the overall regression model, and Table

4.12 provides the best-fit model. There is little difference between the two models except that the

level of significance is lower in the best-fit model. Overall, there is not much difference between

the two in terms of being predictive models.

Table 4.11   Overall Regression Model[a]

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	b	SE	β		
Constant	11.03	2.85		3.88	0.00
HESLS 1	0.16	0.14	0.18	1.13	0.27
HESLS 2	0.25	0.13	0.28	1.88	0.07
Service Hours 1-2	0.01	0.02	0.07	0.62	0.54
Service Hours 2-3	0.00	0.00	-0.08	-0.70	0.49
SL Courses 1-2	0.34	0.52	0.08	0.66	0.51
SL Courses 2-3	-0.09	0.24	-0.05	-0.39	0.70
Gender	-0.39	0.77	-0.05	-0.52	0.61
Family Responsibilities	0.94	0.69	0.14	1.37	0.18
Work Location	0.43	0.50	0.12	0.85	0.40
Work Hours	-0.25	0.39	-0.09	-0.65	0.52
Religious Affiliation	-0.49	0.70	-0.07	-0.70	0.48
Live On Campus	0.59	0.68	0.09	0.87	0.39
2012 Election	0.32	0.66	0.05	0.48	0.63
2016 Election	1.38	0.78	0.18	1.76	0.08
Knowledge of Service Req.	-0.36	0.67	-0.05	-0.54	0.59
Prior Service	0.60	0.93	0.07	0.65	0.52
Satisfaction	-2.16	0.53	-0.44	-4.11	0.00

Note. $R^2 = .526$
[a] Dependent Variable: HESLS 3

Table 4.12   Best Fit Regression Model[a]

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	b	SE	β		
Constant	12.05	2.00		6.03	0.00
HESLS 1	0.21	0.12	0.23	1.73	0.09
HESLS 2	0.20	0.12	0.22	1.72	0.09
Family Responsibilities	0.77	0.58	0.12	1.32	0.19
Live On Campus	0.57	0.61	0.09	0.94	0.35
2016 Election	1.13	0.67	0.15	1.70	0.09
Satisfaction	-2.25	0.43	-0.46	-5.25	0.00

Note. $R^2 = .502$
[a] Dependent Variable: HESLS 3

Summary

This chapter presented the analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data examined through this study. Quantitative data were analyzed through correlation, multiple regression, and repeated measures ANOVA utilizing SPSS software. The relationships between service participation, enrollment in service-learning courses, students' self-reported perceptions of civic responsibility, and several precollege and other extraneous variables were examined. Provalis software was used to identify common themes in the qualitative data. The data analysis assisted in answering the research questions posed in the study.

Overall, there were no significant correlations found between enrollment in service-learning courses or the number of service hours completed and a student's perception of civic responsibility. There was a significant relationship between enrollment in service-learning courses in the first year and the number of service-learning courses taken in subsequent years. Additionally, there was a significant relationship in the number of service hours completed in the first year and the number of service hours completed during the sophomore, junior, and senior years. Data analysis also indicated there were a number of significant relationships between

precollege variables and students' scores on the first iteration of the HESLS, including whether or not he/she lived on campus, voted in the 2012 Presidential Election, had prior knowledge of the institution's service requirement, and overall satisfaction with the service program.

While the mean scores of the first iteration and the third iteration were significantly different, the differences between the first and second iterations and the second and third iterations were not significant. However, there were significant differences between the variances in the repeated measures analysis, which limits the applicability of the findings. Finally, multiple regression analysis indicates that the attribute factors examined in this study were not predictors of students' perceptions of civic responsibility.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between college students'
service experiences and their perceptions of civic responsibility. This dissertation examined two
approaches, service-learning pedagogy and a graduation service requirement, that were
implemented at one institution in an effort to promote civic responsibility and moral
development. A variety of attribute variables were also explored for additional insight into what
factors might influence student perceptions of civic responsibility and to determine whether or
not these variables might provide some predictive value for practitioners. This chapter presents
the conclusions drawn from the data analysis of this study as well as limitations.
Recommendations for future research are also presented.

College and universities have the opportunity to play a key role in developing the next
generation of leaders and citizens since the traditional college age range, 18-23 years of age
(Justice & Dornan, 2001; Paulin, 2001; Wilsey, 2013), coincides with several developmental
milestones where key aspects of an individual's identity are shaped through his/her experiences
(Arnett, 2000; Chickering, 1969; Erikson, 1980; Kohlberg, 1973; Turiel, 1974). Institutions of
higher education often seek to engage students in a variety of activities to promote social,
academic, and personal development (Evans et al., 1998; Komives et al., 2007). Research on
service-learning curriculum and volunteerism suggests that participating in community service
during these formative years has the potential to positively influence students' perceptions of

civic responsibility (Leonard, 2004; Tomkovick et al., 2008). Although there is limited research on the outcomes of required service programs, a rising number of colleges and universities across the United States have implemented service-learning and graduation service requirements in recent decades in an effort to inspire students to begin service-related behaviors that will continue in their lives after graduation (Beehr et al., 2010; Moely & Ilustre, 2011).

This longitudinal study examined one cohort of students who participated in a required service program while enrolled at a private, faith-based liberal arts college in the United States. This institution implemented a graduation service requirement as part of a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) designed to develop servant leaders committed to serving others and the greater community (Condon, 2009). The institution also encouraged students to complete service-learning coursework designed to connect classroom material with real-world learning experiences. This study was designed to explore the potential relationship between students' service experiences and their perceptions of civic responsibility.

Historical survey data collected through the QEP's assessment protocol were utilized for this study. Participants completed the 9-item Civic Responsibility subscale of the HESLS at three specific data points throughout their collegiate careers. The first iteration of the survey was given during the first month of the cohort's first year and served as a pretest to assist with measuring precollege influences. The second iteration was completed during the last month of the second semester of the first year and was used as a midpoint marker to measure any changes after one year in the institution's service program. The final iteration was given during the fall semester of the cohort's senior/fourth year and included several demographic questions to identify family responsibilities, work location and responsibilities, past voting habits and future voting plans, precollege service experiences, satisfaction with the institution's service program, and whether

or not the student knew about the service requirement prior to new student orientation. Additional data were collected in collaboration with various departments on campus, including gender, ethnicity, citizenship, and religious variables as well as residential status, the number of service-learning courses taken, and the number of service hours completed. Historical focus group data were mined to further explore potential correlations between students' service experiences and perceptions of civic responsibility.

Discussion of the Findings

Service-Learning Pedagogy and Civic Responsibility

This study examined the potential relationship between students' enrollment in service-learning designated coursework and perception of civic responsibility and found that no significant relationship existed at any iteration point, which was reinforced through examination of focus group data. Although 81.6% (71) of survey respondents took at least one service-learning designated course at some point during their collegiate career, 30% (6) of focus group participants stated that they did not take a service-learning course or could not remember taking one. Several focus group participants noted that the service projects included in the course did not seem relevant to the course material, which ultimately did not provide the learning experiences necessary to make service-learning an effective teaching method. Comments from focus group members indicated that some faculty members treated service-learning as an additive to the curriculum rather than fully incorporating the service project as part of the overall teaching strategy.

These findings are inconsistent with much of the current literature and ideology regarding academic best practices. The Association of American Colleges & Universities (2018) included

service-learning among the 10 most high-impact pedagogical approaches to student learning, and Perry and Katula (2001) noted that service-learning is the most consistent academic strategy for changing student views on civic responsibility. Only 10% (2) of focus group participants indicated positive and meaningful experiences with service-learning coursework and noted taking additional service-learning courses in subsequent years because they enjoyed them.

Although this study found no significant relationship between service-learning coursework and participants' perceptions of civic responsibility, or the attitudinal aspects of participating in the broader community (Komives et al., 2007), students' actions indicate a willingness to engage in civic-related activities. Results of this study show that taking a service-learning designated course in the first year of college was positively correlated with enrollment in service-learning courses in the sophomore, junior, and senior years. Overall, participants in this study took an average of two service-learning designated courses each throughout their collegiate careers.

Course design is a critical factor in the success of a service-learning course (Boyle, 2007; Butin, 2010; Einfeld & Collins, 2008). The most successful courses fully integrate the project or activity into the course and provide direct connections to the course material (Butin, 2010; Colby et al., 2009; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jones et al., 2008; Mariappan et al., 2005). Butin (2010) stated:

> The service must be relevant to the academic content of the course. This is not simply to say that course credit is based up learning rather than service; more forcefully, the service should be a central component of the course and help students engage with, reinforce, extend, and/or question its content. (p. 5)

Further, faculty need to ensure ample opportunities for students to reflect on their service experiences and how they relate to the content of the course (Butin, 2010; Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jones & Abes, 2004). If faculty are intentional about the link between course content and the service experience, students might report more satisfaction with

the experience and an increased likelihood to take more service-learning courses. The results of this study may indicate a potential lack of buy-in from the faculty members offering service-learning designated courses based on students' perceptions of their course experiences. Instead, focus group participants suggested service-learning pedagogy was treated as a course additive rather than an integral part of the course design, which can limit opportunities for students to engage in learning experiences that challenge their knowledge or perceptions (Boyle, 2007).

Service Hours and Civic Responsibility

This study examined the relationship between the number of service hours completed and students' perception of civic responsibility and no significant relationship was found between the two variables. Based on the findings of this study, it seems that respondents' developed their beliefs about the importance of community service prior to attending college. A majority of students, 78.2% (68), participated in community service prior to enrolling at the institution, and prior service positively correlated with the number of service hours a student completed in his/her first year. Several focus group participants noted doing community service with their church groups, sports teams, student organizations, and families prior to enrolling in the institution. It is possible that students who engaged in service activities prior to attending college might continue participating in activities they were already involved in or be more open to exploring new service opportunities. Those without prior service experience might not know how to identify potential service opportunities, or they might be uncomfortable being required to participate in an unfamiliar activity. Overall, participation in service activities prior to college did not correlate with the number of service hours completed after the first year.

Participants' amount of service in the first year positively correlated with the number of service hours completed in subsequent years. Students were only required to complete 10 hours annually and at least 40 hours prior to graduation. However, participants' averaged 23.78 service hours each in the first year and completed an average total of 149.76 hours each during their college years. There was also a significant relationship between the number of service hours completed and participants' satisfaction with the institution's service program. It is unsurprising that students who enjoy participating in service activities would complete more hours and have positive feelings about the institution's program. Students who were not satisfied with the program or who did not like being told they had to complete service hours might only do the minimum number required.

It is important that students be informed of the service expectations from the beginning of their interactions with the institution. Although this program was implemented two years prior to this cohort's enrollment, 36.8% (32) of respondents indicated they did not know the institution had a service requirement prior to attending new student orientation. If students were informed during the recruitment and application phase, they would not be surprised by the requirement. Instead, they might see the value of the service expectation as part of the college's mission.

<center>Student-Level Attribute Variables</center>

A number of student-level variables were examined to explore the role of precollege experiences as well as additional attribute variables that might influence one's perception of civic responsibilities. These variables included gender, work location and hours, religious affiliation, voting habits, knowledge of the service requirement, prior service, and overall satisfaction with the institution's service program. Two variables, family responsibility and

ethnicity, did not ultimately include enough variation between participants to adequately analyze as a potential influential factor.

The two political variables examined, whether or not a student voted in the 2012 election and intentions to vote in the 2016 election, did not correlate with the number of service hours completed or the number of service-learning courses taken. The first and second iterations of the HESLS positively correlated with students voting in the 2012 election, but there was no relationship between future plans to vote and students' perception of civic responsibility at any iteration point. The 2012 election was the first national election that traditionally-aged respondents would have been eligible to vote in, which might account for the correlations between voting and the two iterations of the survey given during their first year. Participants might have been more excited to vote in their first election than in the second one.

As previously noted, prior service was positively correlated with enrollment in service-learning coursework and the number of service hours completed in the first year. Students who engaged in service prior to college enrollment were also more likely to list a religious affiliation on their application. Church-related service activities were mentioned 16 times during the focus groups, and 64.4% (56) of respondents listed a religious affiliation on his/her college application. Based on these findings, it seems that students may find that being active in a church community provides avenues for engaging in the broader community. However, it is important to note that participants in this study were attending a private, faith-based institution, limiting the strength of this finding and its application to students at nonreligiously affiliated colleges and universities.

Living on campus was positively correlated with respondents' scores on the first and second iterations of the HESLS. Campus-based housing provides a venue for students to discuss personal values, political beliefs, and social issues and creates an opportunity for students to

develop a sense of community with fellow residents (Dugan & Komives, 2010; Lott, 2013). Being a part of a residential community can help students develop citizenship skills and teach them how to interact civilly with individuals from various backgrounds. Living on campus is also a positive predictor of overall campus involvement (Cruce & Moore, 2007; Fitch, 1991). Students might be more comfortable participating in a service activity with their roommate or other members of the residence hall rather than pursuing an activity on their own.

Students' work responsibilities had a negative relationship with their satisfaction with the service program at the institution, but there was no significant relationship between work responsibilities and the number of service hours completed. Prior research suggests that when students work more than 15 hours per week off-campus or more than 30 hours per week on-campus, the number of hours worked has a negative impact on students' intentions to volunteer (Cruce & Moore, 2007). The majority of participants, 82.6% (75), worked at least part-time during college, and 60.9% (53) worked between 11 and 40 hours each week. Almost half of participants, 48.3% (42) worked solely off-campus, and 29.9% (26) held both on- and off-campus jobs. Students' work schedules, in addition to their class schedules, might have made it difficult to find time to complete the service requirement.

Limitations

The role of religious affiliation and church-related activities in this study is a limitation. Participants in this study chose to enroll in a private, religiously affiliated college, which might have an influence on their beliefs (Pampaloni, 2010). As noted before, several focus group participants mentioned church-related activities when discussing their prior service experiences. Individuals who are very active in a church community prior to attending college might be more

72

inclined to pursue a degree at a private, faith-based institution, particularly if the institution is the same denomination or espouses religious beliefs that align with those of the student or his/her family. Therefore, religious affiliation might not be a significant factor for students attending a secular private institution or a public college or university.

Overall Conclusions

The results of this study suggest that required volunteerism and service-learning at the collegiate level may not be effective methods of enhancing students' perceptions of civic responsibility. The data from this study suggest that much of a student's perception of civic responsibility is developed prior to attending college, and that students with a history of service experiences found the program easier and more useful. However, I posit that the required service programs were still valuable learning opportunities for the students, even if the results of this study were not statistically significant. Analysis of the quantitative data shows that there was a significant different in the aggregate HESLS scores between iterations one and three. Although the correlations between service activity and service-learning curriculum were not significant, this overall finding indicates that positive change in perceptions of civic responsibility did occur. The focus group data support this notion as well. Several participants stated they were glad the institution required them to get out of their comfort zones, meet new people, and participate in activities they were not used to doing through the service program.

I also maintain that service-learning pedagogy may be an effective method of enhancing student perceptions of civic responsibility when it is fully integrated into the course curriculum and includes an intentional reflective component (Butin, 2010; Colby et al., 2009; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jones & Abes, 2004; Mariappan et al., 2005; Molee et al., 2010). Projects that are

developed in collaboration with community partners and include activities that are directly linked

to the course material provide students with the opportunity to apply their classroom learning in

a meaningful way in a real-world environment (Colby et al., 2009; Einfeld & Collins, 2008;

Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jones & Abes, 2004; Lai, 2009; Perry & Katula, 2001; Pleasants et al.,

2004). Postservice reflection also helps students process their experiences, work through what

they have learned, and construct new knowledge (Butin, 2010; Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Eyler

& Giles, 1999; Hanover Research, 2011). Molee et al. (2010) stated, "Reflections are rich

sources for documenting students' descriptions about what they are learning in a course, the

depth of their learning, and how critically they are thinking about it" (p. 241).

However, when a service-learning project is treated as an add-on to the course, students

are more likely to resent the service experience and consider it be a waste of time (Boyle, 2007;

Einfeld & Collins, 2008). Service-learning pedagogy can only contribute to the learning

experience when implemented correctly. Institutions considering a service-learning program

should work with faculty to create standard course and service project guidelines to ensure the

teaching method is utilized consistently and effectively.

Implications of the Study

The results of this study have implications for potential policy and programmatic changes

for the institution examined. The mandatory service program analyzed in this study was

implemented as part of the institution's 2010 Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which is a

component of the reaccreditation process required by the Commission on Colleges of the

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (2012). The QEP was designed with the explicit

goal of transforming students into servant leaders who display a commitment to serving others

(Condon, 2009). The findings of this study indicate that instituting a graduation service requirement and service-learning curriculum were not effective approaches to altering students' perceptions of civic responsibility. Since the mandatory service program was found to be unsuccessful in achieving the desired outcomes, the policy of requiring students to participate in community service activities needs to be reconsidered. It is important to note that the results of this study are limited to the single cohort that was examined, and as of Fall 2018, four additional cohorts have completed the institution's service program and the QEP's assessment protocols. Additional analysis should be conducted to determine if the results of this study are consistent across multiple cohorts. If the findings continue to show that the graduation service requirement and service-learning curriculum at this institution are not achieving the intended goals, it would be unethical to continue the programs as they are currently designed knowing they are not doing what they claim.

In lieu of discontinuing the graduation service requirement and service-learning curriculum, the results of this study have programmatic implications for the institution. The university should explore opportunities to implement a critical reflection process as part of the graduation service requirement. Critical reflection has been shown to enhance the learning potential of students' community service experiences (Arnett, 2000; Densten & Gray, 2001; Erikson, 1968; Kohlberg, 1973; Leonard, 2004; Raelin, 2006; Tomkovick et al., 2008; Turiel, 1974). Additionally, the institution should review its current standards for designating a course as service-learning and work with faculty to ensure they are utilizing the best practices set forth by current research. The service projects should be fully integrated into the course design (Boyle, 2007; Butin, 2010; Einfeld & Collins, 2008; Eyler & Giles, 1999) and have a clear connection to the course material (Butin, 2010; Colby et al., 2009; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jones et al., 2008;

75

Mariappan et al., 2005). Service-learning designated courses should also provide ample opportunities for critical reflection (Butin, 2010; Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jones & Abes, 2004). Courses that do not include these components should not be designated as service-learning.

Finally, this study adds to the body of knowledge on service-learning, volunteerism, and identity development by providing information on whether or not these programs result in the outcomes they seek, such as encouraging long-term volunteerism and producing empathetic, civically engaged community members (Campbell, 2000; Metz & Youniss, 2003; Weerts et al., 2014; Wilson, 2011). Additionally, this study responds to the request for more longitudinal studies regarding the outcomes of college service activity (Brudney & Gazley, 2006; Tomkovick et al., 2008) and the need for more research on required service programs (Moely & Ilustre, 2011; Tomkovick et al., 2008).

Recommendations for Further Study

Students' involvement in campus activities, such as living on campus, joining a student organization, and participating in community service, is known to positively contribute to their overall development (Astin, 1984; Colby et al., 2009; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Jones & Abes, 2004; Lott, 2013). Current research suggests that students who become involved in organizations that value and encourage community service (e.g., Greek organizations, student government, and religious groups) are more likely to participate because of peer involvement (Cruce & Moore, 2007; Marks & Jones, 2004; Serow & Dreyden, 1990). While some aspects of involvement were explored in this study, future research should examine how involvement in student organizations might relate to citizenship outcomes and perceptions of civic responsibility over time.

Interaction with faculty and peers is another type of campus involvement that positively relates to student development (Astin, 1984). Research suggests that service-learning experiences that link classroom material with real-world experiences have the potential to teach students a variety of citizenship and leadership skills (Colby et al., 2009; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jones & Abes, 2004; Kuh, 2008; Lai, 2009; Osiemo, 2012; Perry & Katula, 2001; Pleasants et al., 2004). This requires faculty members to work closely with community partners and students to develop and implement the course project (Boyle, 2007; Einfeld & Collins, 2008). Based on the discussion of service-learning designated courses in the focus groups utilized in this study, it seems that many faculty members treated service-learning as an additive to the course rather than a fully integrated aspect of the course design. This approach limits the opportunities for students to connect with each other and the faculty member in a meaningful service experience. Future research on service-learning pedagogy should explore the role of faculty interaction in these types of courses.

Critical postservice reflection is a best practice of implementing service-learning pedagogy (Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hanover Research, 2011; Mariappan et al., 2005; Mayhew & Engberg, 2011; Molee et al., 2010; Perry & Katula, 2001). Reflection helps students process their experiences, work through what they have learned in the classroom and through the service project, and construct new knowledge (Butin, 2010; Chapedelaine et al., 2005; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hanover Research, 2011). Molee et al. (2010) explained, "Reflections are rich sources for documenting students' descriptions about what they are learning in a course, the depth of their learning, and how critically they are thinking about it" (p. 241). However, there is little research on the best methods for incorporating reflection in service-learning coursework to challenge students to reflect beyond surface-level learning. Additionally,

community service completed outside of the scope of formal service-learning courses may not include a critical reflection component, even when it is completed as part of a mandatory service program. In this study, service hours tracked through general community service activities and service hours completed through a service-learning course were unable to be differentiated for specific analysis. As a result, the role of critical reflection in changing students' perceptions of civic responsibility was unable to be analyzed. Future research should examine the different ways reflection is incorporated into service-learning curriculum, analyze whether or not the methods of reflection in service-learning courses challenge students to think critically about their experiences, and explore opportunities to utilize critical reflection when community experiences occur outside of a course.

Future studies should include more longitudinal research that includes multiple cohorts and a variety of different institutions. Although longitudinal studies can be time-consuming, the results can provide a wealth of data for institutions. This type of research design can help control for precollege influences and help distinguish between recruitment and socialization effects (Pascarella, 2006). More of this type of research can help practitioners better understand how mandatory service programs impact student learning and development. For instance, the results of this study indicated no significant relationship between the number of service hours completed or the number of service-learning courses taken and students' perceptions of civic responsibility. Studying multiple cohorts could provide more information on the outcomes of a mandatory service program and whether or not they are achieving their intended goals. Future studies might also investigate mandatory service programs at secular private institutions and public colleges and universities.

Summary

       This chapter presented a general review of the study and a discussion of the findings. Although no significant relationship was identified between service participation or service-learning pedagogy and students' perceptions of civic responsibility, I posit that the required service program still provided overall developmental value for participants. Several recommendations for future study were offered, including the need for more longitudinal research and the inclusion of multiple cohorts.

REFERENCES

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55*(5), 469–480.

Arnett, J. J. (2004). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. New York, NY: Oxford Press.

Association of American Colleges & Universities. (2018). *High-impact educational practices*. Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(4), 297–308.

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 39*(3), 251–263.

Bachman, J., Johnston, L., & O'Malley, P. (1993). *Monitoring the future: A continuing study of the life styles and values of youth*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Survey Research Center.

Battistoni, R. M. (2002). *Civic engagement across the curriculum: A resource book for service-learning faculty in all disciplines*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Battistoni, R. M., & Hudson, W. E. (1997). *Experiencing citizenship: Concepts and models for service-learning in political science*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Beehr, T. A., LeGro, K., Porter, K., Bowling, N. A., & Swader, W. M. (2010). Required volunteers: Community volunteerism among students in college classes. *Teaching of Psychology, 37*(4), 276–280.

Bok, D. (2001). Universities and the decline of civic responsibility. *Journal of College and Character, 2*(9), 1–5.

Boyd, K. D., & Brackmann, S. (2012). Promoting civic engagement to educate institutionally for personal and social responsibility. *New Directions for Student Services, 2012*(139), 39–50.

Boyle, M.-E. (2007). Learning to neighbor? Service-learning in context. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 5*(1), 85–104.

Boyte, H. C., & Hollander, E. L. (1999). *Wingspread declaration on renewing the civic mission of the American research university*. Paper presented at the Wingspread Conference, Racine, WI. Retrieved from http://compact.org/wingspread-declaration-on-the-civic-responsibilities-of-research-universities/

Bradley, C. L., & Saracino, M. (2013). The case for service-learning: Overcoming the obstacles. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences, 105*(2), 41–43.

Brandes, K., & Randall, K. (2011). Service learning and civic responsibility: Assessing aggregate and individual level change. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 23*(1), 20–29.

Bransford, J. (1993). Who ya gonna call? Thoughts about teaching problem solving. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy (Eds.), *Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 171–191). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2009). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2009*(147), 37–46.

Brisbin, R. A., & Hunter, S. (2003). Community leaders' perceptions of university and college efforts to encourage civic engagement. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(4), 467–486.

Brudney, J. L. (2010). Using volunteers in the workplace. In S. E. Condrey (Ed.), *Handbook of human resources management* (3rd ed., pp. 231–255). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brudney, J. L., & Gazley, B. (2006). Moving ahead or falling behind? Volunteer performance in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 16*(3), 259–276.

Bryant, A. N., Gayles, J. G., & Davis, H. A. (2012). The relationship between civic behavior and civic values: A conceptual model. *Research in Higher Education, 53*(1), 76–93.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2012). *Volunteering in the United States – 2011*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Labor.

Butin, D. W. (2006). The limits of service-learning in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 29*(4), 473–498.

Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Campbell, D. E. (2000). Social capital and service learning. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 33*(3), 641–646.

Campus Compact. (2012). *Creating a culture of assessment: 2012 annual member survey*. Boston, MA: Campus Compact.

Campus Compact. (2016). *Who we are*. Retrieved from http://campuscompact.org/about/history-mission-vision/

Chapedelaine, A., Ruiz, A., Warchal, J., & Wells, C. (2005). *Service-learning code of ethics*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Chesbrough, R. D. (2011). College students and service: A mixed methods exploration of motivations, choices, and learning outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development, 52*(6), 687–705.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Colby, S., Bercaw, L., Clark, A. M., & Galiardi, S. (2009). From community service to service-learning leadership: A program perspective. *New Horizons in Education, 57*(3), 20–31.

Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (2012). *Principles of accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement*. Retrieved from http://www.sacscoc.org/principles.asp

Condon, S. (2009). *The development of servant leaders: A Quality Enhancement Plan designed to prepare students to learn, serve, lead ... and believe*. Athens, TN: Tennessee Wesleyan College.

Cone, D., & Harris, S. (1996). Service-learning practice: Developing a theoretical framework. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*, 31–43.

Cowley, W. H. (1940). The history and philosophy of student personnel work. *Journal of the National Association of Deans of Women, 3*(1), 153–162.

Cruce, T. M., & Moore, J. V. (2007). First-year students' plans to volunteer: An examination of the predictors of community service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(6), 655–673.

Cruce, T. M., & Moore, J. V. (2012). Community service during the first year of college: What is the role of past behavior? *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(3), 399–417.

Damico, A. J., Damico, S. B., & Conway, M. M. (1998). The democratic education of women: High school and beyond. *Women and Politics, 19*(2), 1–31.

Densten, I. L., & Gray, J. H. (2001). Leadership development and reflection: What is the connection? *International Journal of Educational Management, 15*(3), 119–124.

Doolittle, A., & Faul, A. C. (2013). Civic engagement scale: A validation study. *SAGE Open, 3*(3), 1–7. doi: 10.1177/2158244013495542

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2010). Influences on college students' capacities for socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(5), 525–549.

Egger, J. B. (2008). No service to learning: "Service-learning" reappraised. *Academic Questions, 21*(2), 183–194.

Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Einfeld, A., & Collins, D. (2008). The relationships between service-learning, social justice, multicultural competence, and civic engagement. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(2), 95–109.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York, NY: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1980). *Identity and life cycle* (vol. 1). New York, NY: Norton.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Evans, N. J., & Reason, R. D. (2001). Guiding principles: A review and analysis of student affairs philosophical statements. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*(4), 359–377.

Eyler, J., Giles, D., Root, S., & Price, J. (1997). *Service-learning and the development of expert citizens*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED408506.pdf

Eyler, J. S., & Giles, D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Feldman, A. M., Moss, T., Chin, D., Marie, M., Rai, C., & Graham, R. (2006). The impact of partnership-centered, community-based learning on first-year students' academic research papers. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 13*(1), 16–29.

Felten, P., & Clayton, P. H. (2011). Service-learning. *New directions for teaching and learning, 2011*(128), 75–84.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Loudon, England: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Fish, S. (2004, February 13). "Intellectual diversity": The Trojan horse of a dark design. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* pp. B13–B14.

Fitch, R. T. (1991). Differences among community service volunteers, extracurricular volunteers, and nonvolunteers on the college campus. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*(6), 534–540.

Freeman, R. B. (1997). Working for nothing: The supply of volunteer labor. *Journal of Labor Economics, 15*(1), 140–166.

Furco, A. (2000). *Higher Education Service-Learning Survey*. Retrieved from
    http://servicelearning.org/filemanager/download/HEdSurveyRel.pdf

Gayles, J. G., Rockenbach, A. B., & Davis, H. A. (2012). Civic responsibility and the student
    athlete: Validating a new conceptual model. *Journal of Higher Education, 83*(4), 535–
    557.

Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (1994). The impact of a college community service laboratory on
    students' personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence, 17*(4), 327–
    339.

Gliner, J. A., Morgan, G. A., & Leech, N. L. (2009). *Research methods in applied settings: An
    integrated approach to design and analysis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Taylor and
    Frances Group, LLC.

Greenberg, E. H., & Weber, K. (2008). *Generation we: How millennial youth are taking over
    America and changing our world forever*. Emeryville, CA: Pachatusan.

Griffith, J. (2012). A decade of helping: Community service among recent high school graduates
    attending college. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 41*(5), 786–801.

Hanover Research. (2011). *Assessing service-learning impacts at higher education institutions*.
    Washington, DC: Author.

Harkavy, I., & Hodges, R. (2012). *Democratic devolution: How America's colleges and
    universities can strengthen their communities*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy
    Institute. Retrieved from http://www.progressivepolicy.org/2012/10/democratic-
    devolution-how-americas-colleges-and-universities-can-strengthen-theircommunities

Hartley, M. (2009). Reclaiming the democratic purposes of American higher education: Tracing
    the trajectory of the civic engagement movement. *Learning and Teaching, 2*(3), 11–30.

Hatcher, J. A. (2010). Defining the Catchphrase: Understanding the Civic Engagement of
    College Students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 16*(2), 95–100.

Hatcher, J. A. (2011). Assessing civic knowledge and engagement. *New Directions for
    Institutional Research, 2011*(149), 81–92.

Higher Education Research Institute. (2015). *CIRP Freshman Survey*. Retrieved from
    http://www.heri.ucla.edu/cirpoverview.php

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York, NY:
    Vintage.

Hunter, S., & Brisbin, R. A. (2000). The impact of service learning on democratic and civic
    values. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 33*(3), 623–626.

Hurtado, S., & DeAngelo, L. (2012). Linking diversity and civic-minded practices with student outcomes: New evidence from national surveys. *Liberal Education, 98*(2), 14–23.

Hurtado, S., Ruiz, A., & Whang, H. (2012). Advancing and assessing civic learning: New results from the Diverse Learning Environments survey. *Diversity and Democracy, 15*(3), 10–12.

Jacoby, B. (2009). *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Janoski, T., & Wilson, J. (1995). Pathways to voluntarism: Family socialization and status transmission models. *Social Forces, 74*(1), 271–292.

Johnson, M. (2014). Predictors of College Students Engaging in Social Change Behaviors. *Journal of College and Character, 15*(3), 149–164.

Johnston, L., Bachman, J., O'Malley, P., & Schulenberg, J. (2009). *Monitoring the future: A continuing study of American youth (12th-grade survey), 1976–2008 [Computer files and codebook]*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2004). Enduring influences of service-learning on college students' identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(2), 149–166.

Jones, S. R., Segar, T. C., & Gasiorski, A. L. (2008). "A double-edged sword": College student perceptions of required high school service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 15*(1), 5–17.

Justice, E. M., & Dornan, T. M. (2001). Metacognitive differences between traditional-age and nontraditional-age college students. *Adult Education Quarterly, 51*(3), 236–249.

Kamenetz, A. (2006). *Generation debt*. New York, NY: Riverhead.

Keen, C. (2009). New efforts to assess civic outcomes. *Journal of College and Character, 10*(7), 1–6.

Kellogg Commission. (1996). *Kellogg Commission on the future of state and land-grant universities*. Washington, DC: National Association of State and Land-Grant Colleges and the Kellogg Foundation.

Kezar, A. J. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*(4), 429–459.

Kiely, R. (2005). A transformative learning model for service-learning: A longitudinal case study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12*(1), 5–22.

Klink, R. R., & Athaide, G. A. (2004). Implementing service learning in the principles of marketing course. *Journal of Marketing Education, 26*(2), 145–153.

Kohlberg, L. (1973). States and aging in moral development: Some speculations. *Gerontologist, 13*(4), 497–502.

Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4*(2), 193–212.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.

Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2007). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Konrath, S., O'Brien, E., & Hsing, C. (2011). Changes in dispositional empathy in American college students over time: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15*(2), 180–198.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(6), 683–706.

Lai, K. H. (2009). Developing leadership and cultural competency through service exposure attachment program. *New Horizons in Education, 57*(3), 105–118.

Leonard, A. (2004). Service learning as a transgressive pedagogy: A must for today's generation. *Cross Currents, 54*(2), 61–72.

Lott, J. L., II. (2013). Predictors of civic values: Understanding student-level and institutional-level effects. *Journal of College Student Development, 54*(1), 1–16.

Lough, B. J., McBride, A. M., & Sherraden, M. (2009). *Measuring volunteer outcomes: Development of the international volunteer impacts survey*. St. Louis, MO: Center for Social Development, Washington University. Retrieved from http://csd.wustl.edu/Publications/Documents/WP09-31.pdf

Mallan, K. M. (2009). Look at me! Look at me! Self-representation and self-exposure through online networks. *Digital Culture and Education, 1*(1), 51–56.

Malone, W. C. (1968). Civic education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 46*(2), 110–114.

Mariappan, J., Monemi, S., & Fan, U.-J. (2005). *Enhancing authentic learning experiences through community-based engineering service learning*. Paper presented at the American Society of Engineering Education Pacific Southwest Regional ASEE Conference, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, CA. Retrieved from http://www.cpp.edu/~jmariappan/pdf/psw0527.pdf

Markham, W. T., & Bonjean, C. M. (1996). Employment status and the attitudes and behavior of higher status women volunteers, 1975 and 1992: A case study. *Sex Roles, 34*(9-10), 695–716.

Marks, H. M., & Jones, S. R. (2004). Community service in the transition: Shifts and continuities in participation from high school to college. *Journal of Higher Education, 75*(3), 307–339.

Mayhew, M. J., & Engberg, M. E. (2011). Promoting the development of civic responsibility: Infusing service-learning practices in first-year "success" courses. *Journal of College Student Development, 52*(1), 20–38.

Metz, E. C., & Youniss, J. (2003). A demonstration that school-based required service does not deter but heightens volunteerism. *Political Sciences Politics, 36*(2), 281–286.

Metz, E. C., & Youniss, J. (2005). Longitudinal gains in civic development through school-based required service. *Political Psychology, 26*(3), 413–437.

Millican, J., & Bourner, T. (2011). Student-community engagement and the changing role and context of higher education. *Education & Training, 53*(2/3), 89–99.

Misa, K., Anderson, J., & Yamamura, E. (2005). *The lasting impact of college on young adults' civic and political engagement*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference, Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu

Moely, B. E., & Ilustre, V. (2011). University students' views of a public service graduation requirement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 17*(2), 43–58.

Molee, L. M., Henry, M. E., Sessa, V. I., & McKinney-Prupis, E. R. (2010). Assessing learning in service-learning courses through critical reflection. *Journal of Experiential Education, 33*(3), 239–257.

Morse, S. W. (1989). *Renewing civic capacity: Preparing college students for service and citizenship. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 8*. Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Musil, C. M. (2009). Educating students for personal and social responsibility. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 49–68). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Myers, D. G. (2001). *The American paradox: Spiritual hunger in an age of plenty*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Myers-Lipton, S. J. (1998). Effect of a comprehensive service-learning program on college students' civic resopnsibility. *Teaching Sociology, 26*(4), 243–258.

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2005). *Exploring different dimensions of student engagement*. Bloomington, IN.

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2010). *Major differences: Examining student engagement by field of study*. Bloomington, IN.

Nesbit, R., & Brudney, J. L. (2010). At your service? Volunteering and national service in 2020. *Public Administration Review, 70*(S1), S107–S113.

Newman, P., Bruyere, B. L., & Beh, A. (2007). Service-learning and natural resource leadership. *Journal of Experiential Education, 30*(1), 54–69.

Newmann, F. M., & Rutter, R. A. (1985). A profile of high school community service programs. *Educational Leadership, 43*(4), 65–71.

Nuss, E. M. (2003). The development of student affairs. . In S. R. Komives & D. B. Woodward (Eds.), *Student service: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 65–88). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Osiemo, L. B. (2012). Developing responsible leaders: The university at the service of the person. *Journal of Business Ethics, 108*(2), 131–143.

Pampaloni, A. M. (2010). The influence of organizational image on college selection: what students seek in institutions of higher education. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 20*(1), 19–48.

Pascarella, E. T. (2006). How college affects students: Ten directions for future research. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(5), 508–520.

Pascarella, E. T., Ethington, C. A., & Smart, J. C. (1988). The influence of college on humanitarian/civic involvement values. *Journal of Higher Education, 59*(4), 412–437.

Paulin, G. D. (2001). Expenditures of college-age students and nonstudents. *Monthly Labor Review, 124*, 46–50.

Perry, J. L., & Katula, M. C. (2001). Does service affect citizenship? *Administration & Society, 33*(3), 330–365.

Perry, J. L., Thomson, A. M., Tschirhart, M., Mesch, D., & Lee, G. (1999). Inside a Swiss army knife: An assessment of AmeriCorps. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 9*(2), 225–250.

Phelps, C. S., & Kotrlik, J. W. (2007). The relationship between participation in community service-learning projects and personal and leadership life skills development in 4-H leadership activities. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 48*(4), 67–81.

Planty, M., Bozick, R., & Regnier, M. (2006). Helping because you have to or helping because you want to? Sustaining participation in service work from adolescence through young adulthood. *Youth & Society, 38*(2), 177–202.

Pleasants, R., Stephens, K. R., Selph, H., & Pfeiffer, S. (2004). Incorporating service learning into leadership education: Duke TIP's Leadership Institute. *Gifted Child Today, 27*(1), 16–21.

Prentice, M. (2007). Service learning and civic engagement. *Academic Questions, 20*(2), 135–145.

Prentice, M. (2011). Civic engagement among community college students through service learning. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 35*(11), 842–854.

Pryor, J. H., Hurtado, S., Saenz, V. B., Santos, J. L., & Korn, W. S. (2007). *The American freshman: Forty year trends*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.

Raelin, J. (2006). Does action learning promote collaborative leadership? *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 5*(2), 152–168.

Rhee, B.-S., & Dey, E. L. (1996). *Collegiate influences on the civic values of students*. Paper presented at the 21st Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Memphis, TN.

Sanford, N. (1962). Developmental status of the entering freshman. In N. Sanford (Ed.), *The American college: A psychological and social interpretation of the higher learning* (pp. 253–282). New York, NY: Wiley.

Sax, L. J. (2004). Citizenship development and the American college student. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 122*, 65–80.

Serow, R. C., & Dreyden, J. I. (1990). Community service among college and university students: Individual and institutional relationships. *Adolescence, 25*(99), 553–566.

Simha, A., Topuzova, L. N., & Albert, J. F. (2011). V for volunteer(ing)—The journeys of undergraduate volunteers. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 9*(2), 107–126.

Skinner, R., & Chapman, C. (1999). *Service-learning and community service in K-12 public schools*. Washington, DC: National Center of Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

Snyder, T. D. (1993). *120 years of American education: A statistical portrait*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs93/93442.pdf

St. John, E., & Parsons, M. (2004). *Public financing of higher education: New contexts and changing rationales*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Stewart, K. D., & Bernhardt, P. C. (2010). Comparing Millennials to pre-1987 students and with one another. *North American Journal of Psychology, 12*(3), 579–602.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (1999). The effects of "mandatory volunteerism" on intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science, 10*(1), 59–64.

Sundeen, R. A. (1990). Family life course status and volunteer behavior: Implications for the single parent. *Sociological Perspectives, 33*(4), 483–500.

Taniguchi, H. (2006). Men's and women's volunteering: Gender differences in the effects of employment and family characteristics. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 35*(1), 83–101.

The United Methodist Church. (2017). *The Wesleyan means of grace*. Retrieved from http://www.umc.org/how-we-serve/the-wesleyan-means-of-grace

Thelin, J. R. (2011). *A history of American higher education* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tomkovick, C., Lester, S. W., Flunker, L., & Wells, T. A. (2008). Linking collegiate service‐learning to future volunteerism: Implications for nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 19*(1), 3–26.

Tryon, E., Stoecker, R., Martin, A., Seblonka, K., Hilgendorf, A., & Nellis, M. (2008). The challenge of short-term service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 14*(2), 16–26.

Turiel, E. (1974). Conflict and transition in adolescent moral development. *Child Development, 45*, 14–29.

Twenge, J. M. (2006). *Generation Me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled--and more miserable than ever before*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Freeman, E. C. (2012). Generational differences in young adults' life goals, concern for others, and civic orientation, 1966–2009. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*(5), 1045–1062.

Twenge, J. M., & Foster, J. D. (2010). Birth cohort increases in narcissistic personality traits among American college students, 1982–2009. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 1*(1), 99–106.

Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., Gilmartin, S. K., & Keup, J. R. (2002). Service-learning and the first-year experience: Outcomes related to learning and persistence. In E. Zlotkowski (Ed.), *Service-learning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility* (Vol. 34, pp. 15–26). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Vrasidas, C. (2000). Constructivism versus objectivism: Implications for interaction, course design, and evaluation in distance education. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications, 6*(4), 339–362.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (V. J.-S. M. Cole, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weerts, D. J., Cabrera, A. F., & Mejías, P. P. (2014). Uncovering categories of civically engaged college students: A latent class analysis. *The Review of Higher Education, 37*(2), 141–168.

Weinreich, M. A., Kafer, I., Tahara, D., & Frishman, W. H. (2015). Participants in a medical student-run clinic and career choice. *Journal of Contemporary Medical Education, 3*(1), 6–13.

Wilsey, S. A. (2013). Comparisons of Adult and Traditional College-Age Student Mothers: Reasons for College Enrollment and Views of How Enrollment Affects Children. *Journal of College Student Development, 54*(2), 209–214.

Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 215–240.

Wilson, J., & Musick, M. A. (1997). Work and volunteering: The long arm of the job. *Social Forces, 76*(1), 251–272.

Wilson, J. C. (2011). Service-learning and the development of empathy in US college students. *Education+ Training, 53*(2/3), 207–217.

Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., & Kinzie, J. (2009). A tangled web of terms: The overlap and unique contribution of involvement, engagement, and integration to understanding college student success. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(4), 407–428.

APPENDIX A

HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICE-LEARNING SURVEY

University of California-Berkeley Service-Learning Research & Development Center

Higher Education Service-Learning Survey

(4-Point Likert Scale)

Clusters & Reliability Alphas of Attitudinal Survey Items*

Item #	Clusters and Items
ACADEMIC = (Cronbach's Alpha = .66) (Test-Rest Reliability Coefficient = .58)	
25	I do not find courses in school relevant to my life outside of school. *(REVERSED)*
21	I enjoy learning in school when course materials pertain to real life.
1	I find the content in school courses intellectually stimulating.
5	I learn more when courses contain hands on activities.
11	The things I learn in school are useful in my life.
14	Courses in school make me think about real-life in new ways.
CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY = (Cronbach's Alpha = .79) (Test-Rest Reliability Coeff. = .71)	
4	Being involved in a program to improve my community is important.
29	It is important that I work toward equal opportunity (e.g. social, political, vocational) for all people.
13	It is not necessary to volunteer my time to help people in need. *(REVERSED)*
19	Giving some of my income to help those in need is something I should do.
7	It is important for me to find a career that directly benefits others.
22	I think that people should find time to contribute to their community.
27	I plan to improve my neighborhood in the near future.
20	I feel that I can have a positive impact on local social problems.
6	I am concerned about local community issues.
CAREER = (Cronbach's Alpha = .63) (Test-Rest Reliability Coefficient = .75)	
12	I have definite career plans.
3	I have a realistic understanding of the daily responsibilities involved in the jobs (careers) in which I am interested.
17	I possess the necessary personal qualities (e.g., responsibility, manners, initiative, etc.) to be a successful career
24	I feel well-prepared for my future career.
28	I am not sure about what skills are necessary for my career. *(REVERSED)*
16	I intend to work in a career that will make contributions to society.
EMPOWERMENT = (Cronbach's Alpha = .61) (Test-Rest Reliability Coefficient = .72)	
8	I can make a positive difference in my life.
15	What happens to me is my own doing.
10	I feel that I have little control over the things that happen to me. *(REVERSED)*
26	I am the person who makes decisions regarding what to do with my life.
2	The extent of my achievement is often determined by chance. *(REVERSED)*
8	Sometimes I am not as reliable as I should be.
23	When I am put in charge of a project, I sometime wonder whether I can succeed at it. *(REVERSED)*
9	I like it when I get to make decisions in my work. *(REVERSED)*

APPENDIX B

VARIABLES ANALYSIS

The Role of Required Volunteerism and Service-Learning on

Student Perceptions of Civic Responsibility

This study was designed to identify if correlations exist between the number of service-learning classes taken, the number of service hours tracked, and students' scores on the Civic Responsibility sub-scale of the Higher Education Service-Learning Survey (HESLS). This subscale of the HESLS measures perceptions of civic responsibility through nine items using a 4-point Likert scale. Scores on the subscale can range from 9 to 36. The number of volunteer hours tracked and number of service-learning classes taken were collected from historical data collected by the various departments at a small, private, religiously affiliated liberal arts college located in the southeast United States.

The study examined participants' pre-, mid-, and posttest scores from the HESLS to analyze changes in perception between the three data points. Respondents completed this survey during the first and last months of their freshman year and during the fall semester of their senior year. Attribution variable information was collected when students completed the posttest assessment during the fall of 2015.

	Variable Label	Levels of the Variable	Scale of Measurement
Dependent Variable(s)	Perceptions of Civic Responsibility (Data Points 1, 2, and 3)	Civic responsibility sub-scale on the HESLS scores ranging from 9-36	Ratio
Independent Variables	Number of Service Hours Tracked (Data Points 1, 2, and 3)	0-Unlimited	Ratio
	Enrollment in Service-Learning Designated Courses (Data Points 1, 2, and 3)	0-136	Ratio

	Variable Label	**Levels of the Variable**	**Scale of Measurement**
Attribution Variables	Gender	0 = Female 1 = Male	Nominal
	Family Responsibilities	0 = None 1 = Married 2 = Married with children 3 = Unmarried with children	Nominal
	Work Location	0 = None 1 = On-campus 2 = Off-campus 3 = Both	Nominal
	Work Responsibilities (On average during the academic year or while taking courses)	0 = None 1 = 10 or fewer hours per week 2 = 11-20 hours per week 3 = 21-30 hours per week 4 = 31-40 hours per week 5 = More than 40 hours per week	Nominal
	Ethnicity	0 = African American 1 = Asian 2 = Caucasian 3 = Hispanic 4 = Native American 5 = Other	Nominal
	Religious Affiliation	0 = Not Reported 1 = Reported	Nominal
	Live on campus (at any point during college)	0 = No 1 = Yes	Nominal
	Voted in 2012 Presidential Election	0 = No 1 = Yes 2 = Not 18 at the time of the election	Nominal
	Plan to vote in 2016 Presidential Election	0 = No 1 = Yes	Nominal
	Knowledge of Service Requirement at Orientation	0 = No 1 = Yes	Nominal
	Prior Service	0 = No 1 = Yes	Nominal
	Overall Satisfaction of Required Service Program	0 = Highly Unsatisfied 1 = Unsatisfied 2 = Satisfied 3 = Highly Satisfied	Interval

APPENDIX C

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY

THE UNIVERSITY OF
TENNESSEE
CHATTANOOGA

Amanda Beeler <qkr442@mocs.utc.edu>

Request for Permission to Use Survey

Amanda Beeler <qkr442@mocs.utc.edu>   Thu, Oct 1, 2015 at 4:31 PM
To: afurco@umn.edu
Cc: Elizabeth K Crawford <beth-crawford@utc.edu>

Dr. Furco,

I am a doctoral student from the University of Tennessee - Chattanooga, and I am in the process of writing my dissertation, which is tentatively titled "The Role of Required Volunteerism and Service-Learning on Student Perceptions of Civic Responsibility." My dissertation committee is chaired by Dr. Beth Crawford.

I am writing today to request your permission to use the Higher Education Survey Learning Survey in my research study. Specifically, I would like to use the Civic Responsibility subsection.

Thank you for considering this request. If you would like additional information about my research study, please let me know.

Best,
Mandie Thacker Beeler
Candidate, Learning and Leadership Doctoral Program
http://www.utc.edu/doctorate-learning-leadership/

APPENDIX D

PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY

THE UNIVERSITY OF
TENNESSEE
CHATTANOOGA

Amanda Beeler <qkr442@mocs.utc.edu>

Request for Permission to Use Survey

Andrew Furco <afurco@umn.edu>   Fri, Oct 2, 2015 at 12:10 AM
To: Amanda Beeler <qkr442@mocs.utc.edu>
Cc: Elizabeth K Crawford <beth-crawford@utc.edu>

Dear Mandie,

I'm delighted to hear about your research. By all means, please use the survey in any way that might be helpful to you.

I hope survey helps facilitates your data collection. I hope to have a chance to learn more about your study.

I wish you all the best with your work. If you have any questions about how to best cite the survey, please let me know.

Best wishes with your dissertation research.

Andy
[Quoted text hidden]
--
Andrew Furco
Associate Vice President for Public Engagement
Associate Professor, Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development
University of Minnesota
100 Church Street, S.E.
110 Morrill Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455
(612) 624-6876 (Diane Gihl, Executive Assistant)

VITA

Mandie Thacker Beeler was born in Knoxville, TN, to Roy and Kathy Thacker. She attended Seymour primary, middle, and high schools in Seymour, TN, graduating in 2002. She attended Middle Tennessee State University where she became involved in a variety of campus activities and developed an interest in student development and higher education administration. She completed a B.S. in May 2006 in Organizational Communication. That fall, Mandie accepted a graduate assistantship at the University of South Carolina in First-Year Experience Programs. She graduated with a M.Ed. in Higher Education and Student Affairs Administration in 2008. Mandie completed an Ed.D. in Learning and Leadership from the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga in Fall 2018. In the fall of 2018, Mandie also became the Director of Leadership and Service at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. She lives in Knoxville, TN, with her husband Patrick and daughter Easton.