



University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Service Learning, General

Service Learning

11-1-2005

Does the Service Matter? Comparative Benefits of Direct and Indirect Service Learning Experiences

Susan M. Coomey

University of Massachusetts, Boston

Felicia L. Wilczenski

University of Massachusetts, Boston

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceslgen>

Recommended Citation

Coomey, Susan M. and Wilczenski, Felicia L., "Does the Service Matter? Comparative Benefits of Direct and Indirect Service Learning Experiences" (2005). *Service Learning, General*. 248.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceslgen/248>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Service Learning at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Service Learning, General by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



Does the Service Matter?
Comparative Benefits of
Direct and Indirect Service Learning Experiences

Susan M. Coomey

Felicia L. Wilczenski

University of Massachusetts Boston

Paper presented at the International Service Learning Research Conference, Michigan State University, November, 2005.

Please address correspondence to: Felicia L. Wilczenski, Ed.D., Graduate College of Education, Department of Counseling and School Psychology, University of Massachusetts, Boston, MA 02125.

Abstract

This pilot study compared students' perceptions of their experiences in direct versus indirect service-learning. Middle through high school students in a suburban school district in the Northeast were surveyed about their direct and indirect service-learning experiences along personal, social, and academic dimensions. In this study, direct service experiences had a stronger positive impact on students' perceptions of their social growth than indirect service experiences. Female students rated personal and social outcomes higher than their male counterparts. Female students rated personal and social outcomes higher than their male counterparts.

Related Studies

- Growing evidence of the social, emotional, and academic benefits of service-learning.

Billig, S.H. (2004). Heads, hearts, and hands: The research on K-12 service-learning. In J. Kielsmeier, M. Neal, & M. McKinnon (Eds.), *Growing to greatness: The state of service-learning project* (pp. 12-25). St. Paul, MN: National Youth Leadership Council.

- Students who engaged in direct service are more attached to their communities whereas students who engaged in indirect service show higher levels of academic engagement.

Billig, S., Root, S., & Jesse, D. (May, 2005). The impact of participation in service-learning on high school students' civic engagement. Denver, CO: RMC Corporation: Circle working paper 33. Retrieved: August 1, 2005 from <http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP33Billig.pdf>.

- Two aspects of K-12 service-learning most closely associated with positive academic results are linkage with the curriculum and direct contact with those being served.

Billig, S.H. (2003). *Using evidence to make the case for service-learning as an academic achievement intervention in K-12 schools*. Retrieved August, 1, 2005 from <http://www.seanetonline.org/images/UsingEvidencetoMakeTheCaseforService.doc>.

- Middle school girls consistently expect more positive personal growth such learning to care for others, better understanding of people, and improvements in the community than boys. Middle school boys are more motivated by grades and course credit than are middle school girls.

Hecht, D., & Fusco, D.R. (1995). *Gender differences among early adolescents' motivations and expectations for service-learning*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED 417 009).

Operational Definitions

Direct service

- Serving food
- Visiting a nursing home
- Tutoring

Indirect service

- Fundraising
- Recycling
- Advocacy

Delve, C.I., Mintz, S.D., & Stewart, G.M. (1990). Promoting values development through community service: A design. In C.I. Delve, S.D. Mintz, & G.M. Stewart (Eds.), *Community service as values education: New directions for student services*, no. 50 (pp. 7-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dunlap, N.C., Drew, S.F., & Gibson, K. (1994). *Serving to learn: High school manual and lesson plans*. Columbia, SC: South Carolina State Department of Education.

Purpose

- Program evaluation for a school district

Research Questions

- What are the psychometric properties of a developed service learning scale for grades 5 - 12?
- Are there different personal and social as well as academic outcomes for students engaged in direct vs. indirect service learning?

Method

Participants

- 268 surveys administered
- Random sample of middle, junior high, and high school students
- Suburban community in Northeast

Procedures

- Direct and indirect service determined by two raters
- 100% inter-rater agreement
- 20 surveys were unusable
- N = 248

Results

Service Learning Outcome Survey Development

- Initial 22 item service learning survey
- Principal component analysis
- Items selected based on highest factor loadings
- Three-factor solution with 14 items
- Factors: academic, social, and personal

Survey

Survey # _____

Check one: Boy _____ Girl _____

What was your service project? _____

Think about your service project. Let us know how you feel about what you did. Tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the number that goes with your answer.

Personal

1. I did something helpful for the community.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

2. I liked the purpose of the project.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

3. I liked doing the project.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

4. I learned what I can do well.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

Social

5. I learned about people who were different from me.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

6. I learned how to get along with others.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

7. I liked working with others on the project.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

8. I had a chance to be a leader.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

9. I learned about problems in my community.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

10. I learned that I have a responsibility to help others in my community.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

Academic

11. I learned things that helped me with math.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

12. I learned things that helped me with reading.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

13. I learned things that helped me with writing.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

14. I learned things that helped me with science.

4	3	2	1	0
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix Showing Factor Loadings, Reliabilities, and
Summary Statistics for Service Learning Outcome Survey

Item Topics	Factor Loadings			Total
	I	II	III	
Academic				
Writing	.904	.137	.055	
Reading	.896	.184	-.001	
Math	.825	.097	.078	
Science	.825	.073	.121	
Social				
Diversity	.124	.724	-.113	
Collaboration	.256	.696	.152	
Responsibility	.077	.634	.215	
Community	-.014	.566	.101	
Enjoyable	.066	.476	.446	
Leadership	.150	.393	.327	
Personal				
Rewarding	-.019	.200	.788	
Purposeful	.098	.011	.771	
Helpful	.005	.049	.660	
Achievement	.175	.329	.453	
Eigenvalues	4.163	2.263	1.317	
Percent of Variance	29.736	16.164	9.407	55.307
Alpha Coefficients	.898	.695	.677	.810
Mean	6.934	17.194	12.850	36.980
Standard Deviation	3.256	3.872	2.464	7.205
Total Scale and Factor Intercorrelations				
I	---	.31	.20	.69
II		---	.49	.85
III			---	.69
Total				

Descriptive Statistics and Multivariate/Univariate Analyses of Variance for
Measures of Academic, Social, and Personal Outcomes of Service Learning
According to Service Type

Variables	Direct Service		Indirect Service		MANOVA				ANOVA		
	M	SD	M	SD	<i>Lambda</i>	F	df	p	F	df	p
					.88	10.4	3,217	<.01			
Academic	6.7	3.5	7.1	2.9					.87	1	ns
Social	18.5	3.4	16.3	3.7					20.43	1	<.01
Personal	13.0	2.4	12.8	2.1					.29	1	ns

Direct vs. Indirect Service Learning

- Students participating in direct service learning rated the social benefits significantly higher than students participating in indirect service learning.

Descriptive Statistics and Multivariate/Univariate Analyses of Variance for
Measures of Academic, Social, and Personal Outcomes of Service Learning
According to Gender

Variables	Female		Male		MANOVA				ANOVA		
	M	SD	M	SD	<i>Lambda</i>	F	df	p	F	df	p
					.91	7.0	3,216	<.01			
Academic	7.2	3.0	6.6	3.6					2.23	1	ns
Social	18.0	3.6	16.1	4.0					14.95	1	<.01
Personal	13.4	1.9	12.0	3.0					15.30	1	<.01

Gender Differences

- Females rated the social and personal benefits of service learning significantly higher than males.

Other Findings

- No grade level differences were found among middle, junior high, and high school students on the three factors.
- All participants rated the academic benefits lowest of the 3-factors.

Conclusions, Caveats, and Questions

- Direct service learning experiences seem to promote comparatively greater social than personal or academic benefits.
- Limited generalizability.
- Further exploration needed in regard to gender differences in personal and social outcomes.
- Need to investigate reason for low academic ratings.
- Survey instrument needs further conceptual and psychometric development.

Implications

- Personal, social, career, and academic goals of service learning need to be made clear to students.
- Personal, social, career, and academic goals of service learning may have different saliency for males and females.
- Benefits of service learning may increase with adequate preparation of students and opportunities for reflection.