

Mainstreaming Disaster-Relief Service-Learning in Communication Departments: Integrating Communication Pedagogy, Praxis, and Engagement

Vinita Agarwal¹

Communication is the primary mode through which students inculcate critical thinking skills for (re)construction of social reality and engagement with communities in need (Craig, 1989). Thus it is well-suited to disaster-relief service-learning approaches that provide a pathway for democratic engagement with the material consequences of inequality evidenced in disaster-struck communities. Communication administrators can advocate for disaster-relief service-learning programs by aligning theoretically-informed student input in faculty-administration partnerships to construct transformative learning experiences sustaining trusting relationships. This study is the first to employ the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1986) to identify themes comprising student composite disaster-relief volunteering belief-structure and disaster-relief volunteering intentions elicited by surveys (N=352) and theme analyses of qualitative data. The findings center the role of communication administrators in integrating disaster-relief pedagogies and advocating for institutional initiatives that bridge “thought to action, theory to practice” (Boyer, 1994, p. A48) around the vital social issues evoked by disaster-relief contexts.

Keywords: higher education institutions, scholarship of engagement, civic engagement, service-learning, disaster-relief, theory of planned behavior, theme analysis

Natural disasters destroy homes and devastate local communities where they strike, but their impact ranges from the global (e.g., environmental—the Japan 2011 earthquake shifted the earth’s axis; NASA, 2011), regional (e.g., economic—Hurricane Katrina, estimated \$209 billion loss, BLS, 2007), to individual (mental health, Norris et al., 2002). It is also disproportionately borne by the marginalized (e.g., by gender, Neumayer & Pumper, 2007; or income, Kahn, 2005), underscoring how disparities (e.g., in access to resources) shape ability to withstand adversity. Post-Hurricane Katrina, the American Association for Colleges and Universities (AACU, 2005) tasked the academy with the “civic obligation not only to provide expertise to prepare for and respond to disasters,” but also to provide a pathway for democratic engagement with the material consequences of inequality made explicit in disaster-struck communities. Disaster-relief service-learning projects address this call for stronger, equitable, and sustainable communities by providing students an opportunity to reflect upon issues of social justice and to achieve improved academic understanding and an ability to reframe social issues through civic engagement (Novak, Markey, & Allen, 2007). With each disaster, there is an increasing need for disaster-relief service-learning programs to help communities prepare, respond, and recover from disasters (Corporation for National and Community Service, CNCS, 2013).

Administrative support plays a pivotal role in successful faculty implementation of disaster-relief service-learning programs (Gibson, 2006; Johnson & Hoovler, 2015). Through coordinating with local government and communities and allocating financial resources toward nurturing disaster-relief service-learning programs, communication administrators can assist with connecting faculty expertise to urgent social need in ways that contribute to the

¹ Salisbury University

ethos of the connected New American College (Boyer, 1994). For communication as a field, examining disaster-relief service-learning as scholarship of engagement to address real-life issues (Boyer, 1994) provides an opportunity to inculcate civic consciousness through dialogic engagement with deliberative principles in the construction of knowledge (McDevitt & Kiouisis, 2006). For communication administrators, they constitute a programmatic resource to connect praxis and civic engagement with student recruitment efforts (Carpenter & McEvan, 2013). Although service-learning pedagogies are widely accepted in communication departments (Oster-Aaland et al., 2004), disaster-relief service-learning programs can be seen in departments ranging from geography (Mitteager & Drake, SUNY, Oneonta), behavioral sciences (University of Texas, Brownsville), to medicine (Temple University) or offered through civic engagement offices while integrated into discipline-based courses (Bentley University; Binghamton University).

This paper argues that with its disciplinary focus on engaging theory and praxis, communication as a discipline and communication administrators at all levels of the academy are in a unique position to advocate for the implementation of disaster-relief service-learning by aligning such programs with student expectations and motivations and presenting their enhanced capacity for promoting reflexivity, engagement, and experience with pedagogy in the curriculum (Frey, 2009; Frey, Pearce, Pollock, Artz, & Murphy, 1996). Toward this goal, this research identifies student motivational factors contributing to intentions to participate in disaster-relief programs, illuminating their composite belief structure, and providing recommendations for the design of disaster-relief service-learning initiatives. In doing so, the findings provide guidance for communication administrators to support disaster-relief service-learning and scholarship of engagement in communication departments by bridging “thought to action, theory to practice” (Boyer, 1994, p. A48) around the vital social issues evoked by disaster-relief contexts.

Institutionalizing Disaster-Relief Service-Learning Programs

In this section, I first provide an overview of scholarship of engagement and service-learning to discuss the unique potential and challenges of institutionalizing disaster-relief service-learning in higher education. Then, I outline how communication administrators can contribute toward connecting civic engagement with the potential of democratic engagement in disaster-relief service-learning contexts. I conclude with the research questions and hypotheses identifying student motivations for institutionalization of disaster-relief service-learning.

In Boyer’s (1994) description of the scholarship of engagement, “professors apply knowledge to real-life problems, use that experience to revise their theories, and become...‘reflective practitioners’” (p. A48). Thus, in Boyer’s (1994) vision of the connected “New American College,” academic institutions participate in real-life field projects and bridge the academy and the community through direct engagement constituted as service-learning. This is in line with the ethos of communication departments, where service-learning pedagogies embrace the “dialectics between communication theory and practice, between the individual and the social” and are thus uniquely suited to the study of communication praxis (Applegate & Morreale, 1999, p. xi). Service-learning as a credit-bearing experiential pedagogical design offers students an “organized service activity that meets identified community needs [to] gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility” (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, p. 222). For successful institutionalization, service-learning requires careful consideration of

institutional mission and administrative leadership for coordination among faculty, students, and formation of community partnerships (Campus Compact, 2015). The role of administrators is crucial in order to support an ethos of learning incorporating community service by garnering faculty involvement and student ownership (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000).

Effective service-learning pedagogies consider the relationship of service-learning context with goals and outcomes in promoting transformational learning (Oster-Aaland et al., 2004; Sellnow & Oster, 1997). Current work on service-learning pedagogies has focused on (a) sustainability of programs (Campus Compact, 2010), (b) developmental benefits of civic engagement to the student (Howard, 2001), and (c) faculty-or university-specific outcomes (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999). Other models have distinguished service-learning orientations (skill building, civic engagement, social justice, Britt, 2012) or identified its phases (exploration, naïve excitement; clarification, values clarification; realization, insight into meaning of service; activation, advocacy; and internalization; career and life choices, Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990). By integrating social and academic experiences, service-learning courses offer students numerous benefits including positive perception of the college, student retention, motivation to meet goals, earning credit, and student-faculty interaction in first-generation students (AACU, 2016; McKay & Estrella, 2008); identity development (Bowman, Brandenberger, Lapsley, Hill, & Quarantino, 2010), social responsibility (Yates & Youniss, 1996), teamwork (Larson, Hansen, & Moneta 2006), democratic engagement (Droge & Murphy, 1999), transformative learning outcomes (Reynolds et al., 2014); and increased civic engagement (Dewey, 1938).

However, student motivations for other-directed behaviors depend on the context and can range from intrinsic (motivated by internal enjoyment; e.g., prestige, self-esteem, a sense of belonging, Brehm & Rahm, 1997) to purely extrinsic (motivated by external contingencies, e.g., course credit requirements, Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen et al., 1998; Deci & Ryan, 1985). Furthermore, these can arise from developmental identity-based outcomes (e.g., feeling good about oneself, Grube & Piliavin, 2000) to functional goal-based outcomes (e.g., civic pride, Haski-Leventhal et al., 2008). Student participation in service-learning projects has been found to draw upon self development, civic responsibility, and academic grades as motivational drives as distinct from volunteerism, understood as unpaid civic participation with one's own free will (Ashcraft & Kedrowicz, 2002; Britt, 2012; Seifer & Connors, 2007). In this study, service-learning is understood as a form of either mandatory volunteerism (engagement in service-learning projects for limited periods of time), or interim volunteerism (giving "service regularly for up to six months and then disassociate from the organization," Lewis, 2005, p. 260), or episodic volunteerism (providing short term one-time or recurring services, Macduff, 2004). As scholarship of engagement, service-learning objectives, assessments, and outcomes that integrate with student learning goals can foster knowledge through discovery (research), integration (interdisciplinary connections), sharing (among scholarly and non-scholarly audiences), and application (critical reflection whereby theory and practice inform each other, Boyer, 1996). Service-learning pedagogies constitute scholarship of engagement by integrating student and organizational factors in reflexive and engaged forms of other-directed learning (Astin et al., 2000; for public relations students, Gleason & Violette, 2012).

Specifically, disaster-relief service-learning programs enable students to respond to inequality, democracy, and disasters with "reasoned inquiry, creative problem solving, compassionate concern, and a strong sense of social and civic responsibility for the long-term health of the democracy" (AACU, 2005). When the delivery of innovative disaster-relief service-learning programs is aided by appropriate institutional structures, the academy can act

on the promise of harnessing the transformative potential of experiential learning rooted in real-world challenges. Disaster-relief service-learning engages learners in a “combination of psychological, cognitive, and behavioral processes in ways that challenge and ultimately change their preconceived assumptions, beliefs, interpretations, and perspectives of the world around them” (Reynolds, Sellnow, Head, & Anthony, 2014, p. 18). With students at the center, the structure of disaster-relief programs comprises a highly-networked community (faculty, peers) to emphasize iterative design-driven processes that, given administrative support, can achieve sustainable integration of social justice advocacy in the curriculum (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996).

In response to the urgent need for disaster-relief service-learning programs post-Katrina, several universities across the U.S. sought to implement disaster-relief experiential pedagogies, not just for the devastated community, but also to build sustainable communities across the country. Such programs mitigate social stratification and link action and research for transformative engagement to build sustainable cities that can better respond to and recover from disasters. Tulane University focused its academic resources in service-learning programs building sustainable communities locally, regionally, and nationally by fostering civic leadership and combating racism and poverty (Devine, Chaisson, & Ilustre, 2007). Others further understanding of diversity and environment such as by helping New Orleans residents redesign communities through face-to-face conversations (e.g., Global Design Studio, Cowan, 2009; see also McArthur, 2013). The New School’s social innovation platform helped communities’ disaster response through creating a visualization and communication kit that builds local capacity (Kahane, 2016). These service-learning programs connect higher education institutions and communities to address universal issues of social justice evoked by disaster-relief contexts.

Successful programmatic implementation of disaster-relief programs requires institutional support (e.g., organizational resources, coordination pathways, networks) and advocacy and constitutes an important challenge of higher education (Cruz, Ellern, Ford, Moss, & White, 2013). Communication administrators can advocate for institutionalization of disaster-relief service-learning programs through policies addressing faculty tenure and promotion and provision of funding for preparation and formalization of programs (e.g., Citizen Scholars programs; Garver, Divine, & Spralls, 2009). In reframing the discourse surrounding disaster-relief service-learning institutionally, communication administrators can serve as important advocates in strategic planning connecting department faculty, students, community, and senior administration in several ways (Kilgo, Sheets, & Pascarella, 2015). Through garnering tangible benefits such as the ability to conduct full-time hires in service-learning, supporting faculty development initiatives that incorporate disaster-relief service-learning (e.g., reassigned time), and creating initiatives to advance community service as a norm (e.g., assistance to integrate disaster-relief service-learning; NCA toolkit, Conville & Weintraub, n.d.), communication administrators can advocate for high-impact practices for diffusion of curricular reform and aid adoption of service-learning principles (Holland, 2004; Ward, 1996). These principles include engagement (meeting public good, including community voices), reflection (linking service experience to course content), reciprocity (seeing participants as colleagues, not clients), and public dissemination (presentation to public, open for public dialogue, Campus Compact, 2010).

Identifying student beliefs and motivational factors for participation in disaster-relief service-learning programs can help align administrative support, student involvement, and institutional perceptions for sustainable integration (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Roy & Oludaja, 2009). In particular, because disaster-relief volunteering is distinct in its ideological and risk-based (e.g., isolation, Agarwal & Buzzanell, 2015) or individual characteristics (e.g.,

younger workers, Rotolo & Berg, 2011), it draws upon a distinct set of student motivations. The theory of planned behavior (TPB, Ajzen, 1986) offers a framework for investigating the contribution of factors influencing disaster-relief participation intentions and illuminating the belief-structure constituting student motivations to participate in disaster-relief service-learning. The TPB proposes that motivation for human action is guided by three kinds of beliefs, which lead to the formation of behavioral intention: (a) beliefs and their evaluations about outcomes (behavioral-beliefs; attitudes), (b) beliefs about normative expectations and motivations to comply with these expectations (normative-beliefs; norms), (c) beliefs about factors that may facilitate or impede performance of the behavior (control-beliefs; control).

The study tests the following hypothesis (H1): Behavioral beliefs and subjective norms will predict disaster-relief volunteering intentions, and poses the following research questions (RQs): (a) RQ1: What are the themes comprising the behavioral-beliefs of members toward disaster-relief volunteering intentions of college students through their university? (b) RQ2: What are the themes comprising the normative-beliefs of members toward disaster-relief volunteering intentions of college students through their university?, and (c) RQ3: What are the themes comprising the control-beliefs of members toward disaster-relief volunteering intentions of college students through their university?

Method

Upon obtaining approval from the researcher's institutional review board, responses to open-ended questions eliciting behavioral, normative, and control-beliefs were gathered alongside 5-point Likert scale items (1=*lowest* and 5=*highest value of the construct*) in a 20 minute survey administered online to participants in return for extra credit during Spring 2009 ($N=352$). Participants were primarily female ($N=259$, 73.6%) and Caucasian ($N=283$, 80.4%) undergraduate communication students at a large Mid-Western university, who voluntarily self-selected into the study after reading a brief study description informing them the study would ask "questions about your attitude, and behaviors toward participating in disaster-relief programs...[t]rust in your organization and how you identify with it."

Survey items for behavioral-beliefs (attitude), normative-beliefs (subjective norms; norms, SN), control-beliefs (perceived behavioral control; control, PBC), and behavioral intention (BI) were adapted from Ajzen's (1986) scale. These demonstrated good to excellent reliability ($\alpha_{Attitude} = .87$; $\alpha_{Control} = .78$; $\alpha_{Norms} = .71$; $\alpha_{BI} = .90$). Alongside the 5-point Likert scales, open-ended responses were obtained to elicit behavioral, normative, and control-belief constructs (3 open-ended questions each) based on Ajzen's (1986) questionnaire. Examples include: What do you believe are the *advantages* of your volunteering in a disaster-relief capacity at your educational institution in the forthcoming year? (Attitudes, Advantages: 606 sentences; Disadvantages: 410 sentences); Are there any individuals or groups who would *approve* of your volunteering in a disaster-relief capacity at your educational institution in the forthcoming year? (Norms, Approve: 626 sentences; Disapprove: 352 sentences; Other individuals that come to mind: 385 sentences); and, what factors or circumstances would enable you to volunteer in a disaster-relief capacity at your educational institution in the forthcoming year? (Control; Enabling circumstances: 703 sentences; Difficulty in volunteering: 631 sentences; Other: 397 sentences).

Attitude. Participants were asked to think about: "your feelings toward volunteering in a disaster-relief capacity at your educational institution." Responses were obtained to 5

items: “For me to volunteer in a disaster-relief capacity at my educational institution in the forthcoming year is” (*extremely harmful/ extremely beneficial; extremely pleasant/ extremely unpleasant*, recoded; *extremely good/ extremely bad*, recoded; *extremely worthless/ extremely valuable*, and *extremely enjoyable/ extremely unenjoyable*, recoded; $N=350$, $M=2.57$, $SD=1.04$, items averaged).

Subjective norms. Participants were asked to think about “what you feel important people around you feel about volunteering in a disaster-relief capacity at your educational institution in the forthcoming year” before responding to six items including: “Most people who are important to me think that I should volunteer in a disaster-relief capacity at my educational institution in the coming year” (*strongly disagree/strongly agree*), “The people in my life whose opinions I value would approve of volunteering in a disaster-relief capacity at my educational institution in the forthcoming year” (*strongly disapprove/strongly approve*), or “Most people who are important to me volunteer in a disaster-relief capacity for some days every year” (*strongly disagree/strongly agree*; $N=350$, $M=4.5$, $SD=1.09$; items averaged to create scale).

Perceived behavioral control. Participants read the statement: “This set of questions will ask you to think about your ability to volunteer in a disaster-relief capacity at your educational institution” before responding to four statements that were averaged to create control. Items included: “For me to volunteer in a disaster-relief capacity at my educational institution for a few days in a year would be” (*impossible/possible*), “If I wanted to I could volunteer in a disaster-relief capacity at my educational institution for a few days in a year” (*definitely false/definitely true*, after recoding) ($N=350$, $M=3.12$, $SD=1.25$).

Behavioral intention. 3 items: “I intend to. . .,” (*extremely unlikely/ extremely likely*), “I will try to. . .,” (*definitely false/definitely true* after recoding), and “I plan to volunteer in a disaster-relief capacity at my educational institution in the coming year” (*strongly disagree/ strongly agree*) were averaged to create behavioral intention ($N=350$, $M=4.5$, $SD=1.09$).

Data Analyses

The self-report data ($N=352$) were downloaded on the researcher’s computer and IBM SPSS 19 was employed for data analysis. The open-ended responses were downloaded on separate Microsoft word files labeled by the constructs (behavioral-beliefs, normative-beliefs, and control-beliefs). Participant responses ranged from single word responses (e.g., “family”) to a phrase or string of phrases (e.g., “knowing I’m helping others”), to a sentence or a few sentences separated by bullet points (e.g., “you are helping another person who greatly needs it”). Data reduction of all open-ended responses were carried out by the researcher working with an experienced disaster-relief volunteer through generating etic and emic categories and a coding scheme that guided the construction of emergent themes (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002) and keeping the theoretical generalizability of the data in mind (Holsti, 1969).

As participants responded to specific TPB constructs, these constructs were examined for themes by the researcher during the open-coding process by moving iteratively back and forth comparing and contrasting the responses until thematic saturation was reached (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The researcher and the disaster-relief volunteer discussed each participant response until a concise set of categories was established, integrated into stable heuristic themes, and revised for preciseness or accuracy. For example, under norms, a theme for responses focusing on those who were affected by the disaster was added as the “*client*” (drawing from the volunteer’s experience where “clients” were the recipients). Similarly, under

control, “*legitimacy*” was added to include responses that spoke to the credibility of the efforts, e.g., “proof of the results,” or “if it was proven to help people.” Because of the non-repeatable nature of the open-ended questions and the unique, interdependent, and inductive nature of the categories, inter-coder reliability was not calculated (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002).

Results

H1 posited that positive behavioral-beliefs and subjective norms toward disaster-relief volunteering (but not control beliefs) will predict positive disaster-relief volunteering intentions in the university context (H1). A regression model was constructed with attitude, norms, and control entered together as the independent variables (IVs) and intention as the dependent variable (DV). The model explained a substantial and significant 43.6% ($p < .001$) amount of variance in intentions. The regression coefficients demonstrate that while attitude and norms make significant contributions to intentions, control does not. Thus H1 was supported (Table 1).

Table 1

Regression Models for Hypotheses 1

Regression Model	IV	DV	<i>B</i>	<i>p</i>	Overall Model $\Delta R^2, \Delta F (df), p$
	Attitude	Intention	.526 ^a	$p < .000$	$N = 348, \Delta R^2 = .436, \Delta F (1, 348) = 89.102,$
	Subjective Norms		.668 ^a	$p < .000$	
	Behavioral Control		-.002,	$p = .977$	
			ns		

^a = $p < .001$, ^b = $p < .01$, ^c = $p < .05$; $N = 348$

Themes Comprising Behavioral, Normative, and Control-beliefs

Salient behavioral-belief themes. Theme analyses of the responses to the primary behavioral-belief motivations (RQ 1) reveal that participant motivations toward disaster-relief volunteering comprise a composite of categories balancing their assessment of *returns* to the self and *costs* to the self. As Table 2 illustrates, the two main themes of the behavioral-beliefs can be characterized under *loci of returns to self*, and *loci of costs to self*, defined along a continuum of intrinsic to extrinsic motivations (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and costs for anticipated behavior.

The following sub-themes were identified for the theme “*loci of returns to self*” (Table 2):

Table 2

Theme Analysis of Individual Motivations: Behavioral-belief Themes

Theme	Description	Salient Participant Examples
<u>Advantages: Self-directed Loci of Returns</u>		
1. Moral good	Helping others, altruistic	knowing I'm helping others, helping rebuild a little part of someone's life who was negatively affected
2. Character-building	Experience with life situations	you can learn a lot from others helping, a sense of accomplishment, you are gaining another perspective
3. Self-growth	Training	advance planning about emergencies, readiness, preparedness, learning more about the disaster-relief
4. Civic duty	Civic duty	it is a civic duty to help where needed
5. Social	Networking	Building friendships, making relationships
6. Professional	Resume' enhancement	volunteer work looks good on a resume, it looks good to jobs, put volunteering on your resume
7. Organizational	Good citizen	Positive effect on (<i>University name</i>)'s public relations,
8. Societal	positive example	gaining respect, others would be proud of you
<u>Disadvantages: Loci of costs to self</u>		
2. Returns		not being appreciated, may not make a big difference
3. Risks	Health, safety	possibility of getting injured, putting my life at risk
4. Qualifications	Training	not being qualified, requires hard labor
5. Organizational	Support	having to deal with angry professors, attendance
6. Social	Social networks	not knowing anyone else on the trip

(a) moral good, defined as the satisfaction of helping individuals, such as by “being a positive force in the world” (# 23); a sense of doing the right thing; (b) character building, defined as the gain in knowledge of a range of life experiences/ situations illustrating the experiential nature of disaster-relief service-learning as “making oneself more rounded” (#267) through exposure to the life-situations of those affected by a disaster; (c) self-growth, defined as the pragmatic knowledge gained of work done, e.g., through gaining skills, “being prepared in case of a disaster, knowing what to do in future situations, knowledge and readiness” (#212); (d) civic duty, defined as a belief in positive civic engagement as reflected in “giving back to the

community” (#552); (e) social, defined as the psychological benefits derived from meeting people and building relationships and friendships as reflected in the pleasure of socialization, building friendships and “spending time with friends” (#109); (f) professional, defined as perceived benefits on career goals such as work that “looks good on resume” (# 142) to future employers ; (g) organizational, defined as the benefits of contributing to the organization’s positive reputation and climate as an indirect reflection of a positive benefit to the self, such as “help make this campus more secure” (#430); and (h) societal, defined as setting a worthy role model for building social capital as reflected through a gain in social status through civic engagement, “having people look up to you, gaining respect” (#135).

Theme analysis of the “*loci of costs to self*” of behavioral-beliefs fell under the following five main sub-themes: (a) psychological returns, or uncertainty of value of volunteering effort for the victims, not receiving thanks from those helped , uncertainty regarding the “impact I/the group I would be with would have” (#225); (b) risks, or the costs related to personal health, safety, and well-being, the belief that engaging in disaster-relief work “might put myself at risk” (#185); (c) qualifications, or costs associated with physical and emotional training to perform labor, “not having the skills to volunteer,” or the emotional distress that participants would feel (#290); (d) organizational, or the negative effect on organizational performance such as through “missing classes, assignment; it would take time away from work and school” (#144); and (e) social, or the experience of negligible social interaction (#366: not having fun).

Salient normative-belief themes. Theme analysis for RQ 2 identified five motivational themes of normative-beliefs for volunteering intentions (Table 3):

Table 3

Theme Analysis of Individual Motivations: Norms—Relational Themes

Relational Foci		Salient Participant Examples	
		<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
Personal	Family/ friends	spouse, parents, friends, mom,	boyfriend/ girlfriend,
		dad, siblings, grandparents, family members, peers, friends	friends (wasting time), family (dangerous)
Professional	Superiors/co-workers/ peers/ employers	professors, teaching assistants,	professors, students,
		research assistants, bosses/co-workers, potential employers,	teachers who do not agree with disaster-relief
		instructors, teachers, future employers, sorority sisters	efforts, missing classes,
			boss, coach

Religious	Affiliations/ beliefs	God, Campus Crusade for Christ, people at my church	(<i>Name of Church</i>) Church, groups that have helping people against their beliefs
Associations	Groups/ Association	Residence hall association, ROTC, National Honors Society	Tae Kwon Do club, Neo-Nazis?
Experts	Individuals	environmental activists	None
Community	General, Everyone	Anyone would approve	Heartless people who do not like to help
Client	Those affected	The people we help when volunteering	-

(a) personal, from family and friends, e.g., “all my family and friends would approve” (#111); (b) professional, from organizational superiors and co-workers, such as at participant’s out-of-school work place e.g., “my employer, although I wouldn’t get paid time off” (#83); (c) educational, those at the educational organization such as professors, students, administrators, as indicated by individual professors’ attitudes or organizational policies toward service-learning and volunteering at “individual schools within the university:” (#117); (d) religious, or normative-beliefs of religious organizations such as the church, suggested by concerns whether “my church group would approve” (#148); (d) associational, or beliefs of student groups such as service hours requirements of student associations and “honors clubs” (#73); (e) expert/celebrity beliefs, such as beliefs of animal science ambassadors, activists (#118), or volunteers (#119); (f) client, the beliefs of those being helped, as whether “the people we help when volunteering would approve of us volunteering and taking the time out” (#144); and (g) the community, or whether society in general would approve e.g., “all groups and individuals would approve of this behavior” (#104).

Salient control-belief themes. Theme analysis for RQ 3 for salient control themes revealed the following eight themes of control factors (Table 4):

Table 4

Theme Analysis of Individual Motivations: Control Themes

Themes	Salient Participant Examples	
	<u>Enabling</u>	<u>Deterrents</u>
Functional	had more free time to volunteer; economic situation	convenient for my educational plan, if a program were not available at my school
Information	information on disaster is available, advertisements for volunteering	No knowledge of opportunities; Not knowing where to sign up to volunteer
Social	most of my friends are doing the volunteer work	less inclined to volunteer in a small group where I did not know anyone.
Organizational	If we had programs at my university that allowed students to volunteer	ability for my majors to be flexible with the situation
Relationships	occurred at my school, happens to someone close to me was affected	husband, whether or not i can identify with the victims
Moral conscience	something terrible were to happen to the community, passion to help others	None
Coercion	If someone forced me, or I had to do it because of trouble I got myself into	Health, injury
Constraints	None	too emotional, unable to deal with [such] sadness, witnessed a lot in my short [life]
Legitimacy	Effectiveness of the relief, if it was proven to save lives or help people	How much I think it would help victims, if [t]he program had very little impact

(a) functional, including factors such as time, finances, location, transportation, e.g., “if disasters happen far away it is difficult to actually go and help” (#70); (b) information, including knowledge and awareness of activities, e.g., “not knowing where volunteer programs take place, or when” (#63); (c) social or having friends engaged in volunteer work, such as when “more people to do it with me so i’m (sic) not alone” (#315); (d) organizational, or programs and processes in the university to facilitate disaster-relief volunteering, or if “programs are unavailable” (#161); (e) relationships, in particular if the disaster affected people close to the individual, organizations, or the community close to the participant, e.g.,

“: if my close friends are in need of help, I would rather do what I can do attend to them” (#160); (f) moral conscience, a civic duty to help individuals and the community, e.g., “just about any emergency compels me to volunteer and lend a hand” (#316); (g) coercion, such as if the participant were forced to volunteer as in a probationary context, e.g., “if someone forced me or I had to do it because of the trouble I got myself into” (#156); and, (h) physical or emotional constraints, as for example, “me getting emotionally involved” (#135).

Discussion

From an understanding of communication fundamentally as a practical discipline (Craig, 1989), applied communication scholarship and pedagogy have privileged practice informed by theory in ways that promote reflexive engagement and transformative practice for solving socially relevant problems (Barge & Craig, 2009). Communication administrators are thus well-positioned to champion for and integrate service-learning approaches in disaster-relief contexts. The study findings provide a rationale and theoretically grounded evidence for informing communication administrators’ efforts institutionally and departmentally to advocate for and promote disaster-relief service-learning initiatives. Such initiatives not only fill the needs of devastated communities post-disaster but also help build capacity to create sustainable communities that are better prepared to withstand disaster and adversity. In his thesis proposing the connected academy, Boyer envisioned a model of excellence that would “enrich the campus, renew communities, and give new dignity and status to the scholarship of service” (1994, p. A48). For communication administrators at all levels of the academy, innovative disaster-relief service-learning programs, when thoughtfully implemented by integrating student input and faculty voices and supported by administrator coordination with community and government stakeholders, can further the vision of scholarship of engagement in communication.

Carpenter and McEvan (2013) note that a fundamental concern of communication administrators is incorporating student perceptions in ways that help administrators and faculty frame their communications to “design appropriate and engaging curriculum and market both the program and the graduates of the program” (p. 2). Theoretically, the findings address this call in important ways by contributing to communication administrators’ goals of connecting institutional mission and vision to curricular offerings and student experiences. First, by providing communicative strategies in program implementation, the study provides a model for integrating disaster-relief service-learning within the student–faculty relationship to embody participatory leadership practices. By connecting student input for faculty within program implementation, communication administrators include curricular considerations in establishing a “direct connection with decisions and outcomes at the highest levels” (VanSlette, Schaefer, & Hagedorn, 2014, p. 12). Disaster-relief service-learning programs can exemplify one model for constructing faculty–administration partnerships that constitute the practice of communication in theoretically-grounded ways to promote transformative experiences for students, the academy, and the community. Incorporating theoretically-informed student input to guide faculty–administration partnerships for constructing transformative learning experiences is essential for sustaining the trusting relationships that are identified by the findings in the student themes. Furthermore, the student themes provide directions for administrators to coordinate connections between the government, administration, community, and faculty and student stakeholder groups to facilitate the pathways for implementing disaster-relief service-learning initiatives.

Second, the findings extend the literature on the TPB in disaster-relief service-learning contexts. The study is among the first to apply the TPB and demonstrate the contribution of behavioral and normative beliefs on student intentions to volunteer for disaster-relief programs (H1) and to identify the composite belief structure comprising student perceptions of disaster-relief service-learning initiatives (RQs 1, 2, and 3). They highlight the importance of the academic experience in shaping student attitudes as engaged citizens and constructing supportive relationships to assimilate and reflect upon their engagement the experience in transformative ways. The findings center the communication administrator's role in the coordination of strong, supportive stakeholder relationships and connecting these initiatives to the mission of the higher education institution. In doing so, the findings illuminate the potential and challenges of integrating disaster-relief service-learning learning with the goals of constructing sustainable communities, bridging disparities, and promoting the experiential learning outcomes of meeting real-life challenges through the deliberative application of service-learning course principles. The administrative involvement thus called forth helps meet the highest promise of service education as a high impact practice "in a twenty-first century liberal education...for a nation dependent on economic creativity and democratic vitality" (AACU, 2016).

Third, the study findings from the theme analyses are among the first to identify the themes comprising the composite disaster-relief belief-structure of students and to demonstrate the importance of behavioral-and norm-based beliefs for student disaster-relief volunteering intentions. Student perceptions of the disaster-relief service-learning context serve to illustrate the values (through the loci of returns and costs to the self) and relationships (normative beliefs) important for administrator efforts for institutionalization of strong, well-implemented disaster-relief service-learning engagements. The theme analyses reveal that behavioral beliefs toward disaster-relief volunteering of college students can be categorized under two themes: (a) the "*loci of returns to the self*" ranging from intrinsic to extrinsic rewards such as being morally good, building character, socializing, self-growth, performing a civic duty, professional benefits, and being a good organizational citizen and (b) the "*loci of costs to the self*" involving an assessment of the personal risks involved, appreciation from clients, not being physically or emotionally ready, being isolated, and negative organizational consequences. Normative beliefs, i.e., the perceptions of important referents, were found by the study to make the strongest contribution on college student disaster-relief volunteering intentions suggesting that parental concerns for safety and risk, acceptance from the community, or even the "clients," are important factors. Per expectations, the study did not detect a unique contribution by control beliefs. Its themes ranged from intrinsic, such as affecting relationships, and functional, such as provision of information from the organization, to purely extrinsic motivations, like coercion.

The study had a few limitations. Because the academic institution did not at the time of this research have a disaster-relief service-learning program, the study taps into hypothesized volunteering intentions of participants. As the sample was self-selected, non-response bias could not be assessed. As disaster-relief participants tend to be younger and organizationally-affiliated, the findings connect individual and organizational factors relevant to pedagogical efforts in academic institutions. Future research can (a) assess the reliability of the qualitative themes to extend generalizability of the qualitative data, (b) explore faculty perceptions and motivations for disaster-relief service-learning and how these can be aligned with pedagogical approaches to bolster university and student outcomes, and (c) explicate disaster-relief service-learning motivations for different forms of disasters (e.g., climate change or man-made disasters).

Recommendations for Communication Administrators

The survey findings and theme analyses can aid communication administrators' assessment and evaluation of disaster-relief service-learning programs to inform student disaster-relief civic engagement through design of scales based on the findings. They can also aid administrators in aligning the disciplinary ethos with institutional goals in designing recruitment material for students looking for critical engagement connecting content, coursework, and service for resume-building in theoretically meaningful ways. Specifically, communication administrators can incorporate the following message foci in their advocacy for disaster-relief service-learning institutionalization within departments and the academy: (a) connect the service-learning disaster-relief program with community engagement and humanitarian mission so students identify with the goals; (b) emphasize the moral good, character-building, self-growth, making friendships, enhancing professional qualifications, and civic pride while addressing negative perceptions of interference in routine, low appreciation by those affected, risks, and isolation during disaster-relief work; (c) obtain and highlight support from important others in the personal, professional, religious, and group associations; and (d) address organizational supervisor support and concerns of distance in intimate relationships of college students.

Conclusion

The findings of the research emphasize the role communication administrators can play in integrating student beliefs and perceptions toward disaster-relief service-learning as curricular faculty-led pedagogies and in advocating for institutional initiatives that reward community engagement. As a high impact practice, disaster-relief service-learning inculcates intellectual and pragmatic skills practiced across the curriculum through engagement with diverse communities and real-world challenges (AACU, 2016). By mainstreaming disaster-relief service-learning institutionally and in communication departments, communication administrators can contribute toward fulfilling the promise of higher education institutions as a New American College (Boyer, 1994) meeting an urgent social need, equipping its graduates to interrogate practices constituting social justice, and building sustainable communities. By strengthening the fabric of our civic society through connecting praxis with pedagogy and engagement privileged by communication as a practical discipline (Craig, 1989), communication departments and administrators can lead by aiding reflection upon social challenges, renewing communities in times of need, and acting to inculcate social justice in our communities.

References

- Agarwal, V., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2015). Communicative reconstruction of resilience labor: Identity/identification in disaster-relief workers. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 43, 408–428. doi:10.1080/00909882.2015.1083602
- Ajzen, I. (1986). *Constructing a theory of planned behavior questionnaire*. Retrieved from <http://people.umass.edu/aizen/pdf/tpb.measurement.pdf>
- Applegate, J. L., & Morreale, S. P. (1999). Service-learning in communication: A natural partnership. In D. Droge & B. O. Murphy (Eds.), *Voices of strong democracy: Concepts and models for service-learning in communication studies* (pp. ix–xiv). Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education in cooperation with the National Communication Association.

- Ashcraft, K. L., & Kedrowicz, A. (2002). Self-direction or social support? Nonprofit empowerment and tacit employment contract of organizational communication studies. *Communication Monographs*, *69*, 88–110. doi:10.1177/1350508412464894
- Association of American Colleges & Universities (AACU; 2016). *Liberal education and America's promise*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/leap>
- Association of American Colleges & Universities (AACU; 2005). Statement of support in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. *Liberal Education*, *91*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/statement-support-aftermath-hurricane-katrina>
- Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service learning affects students*. Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved from <http://heri.ucla.edu/pdfs/hslas/hslas.pdf>
- Banerjee, M., & Hausafus, C. O. (2007). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for the human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning*, *14*, 32–45.
- Barge, K. J. & Craig, R. T. (2009). Practical theory in applied communication scholarship. In L. R. Frey & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of applied communication research* (pp. 55–78). New York: Routledge.
- Bentley University. *Teaching initiatives, NS 130—Natural disasters*. Alliance for Ethics and Social Responsibility. Retrieved from <http://www.bentley.edu/centers/alliance/teaching-initiatives>
- Binghamton University. (2014). *How can we help? Student civic learning through disaster recovery*. Retrieved from <https://www.naspa.org/rpi/posts/how-can-we-help-student-civic-learning-through-disaster-recovery>
- Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Outreach*, *1*, 11–20.
- Boyer, E. (1994, March 09). Creating the New American College. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *9*, A48.
- Bowman, N., & Brandenberger, J., Lapsley, D., Hill, P., & Quaranto, J. (2010). Serving in college, flourishing in adulthood: Does community engagement during the college years predict adult well-being? *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, *2*, 14–34.
- Brehm, J., & Rahm, W. (1997). Individual level evidence for the causes and consequences of social capital. *American Journal of Political Science*, *41*, 888–1023.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, *67*, 221–239.
- Britt, L. L. (2012). Why we use service-learning: A report outlining a typology of three approaches to this form of communication pedagogy. *Communication Education*, *61*, 80–88. doi:10.1080/03634523.2011.632017
- BLS. (June, 2007). *The effects of Hurricane Katrina on the New Orleans economy*. Monthly Labor Review, 3–18. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2007/06/art1full.pdf>
- Campus Compact. (2010). *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (2nd ed.). Campus Compact, 204.
- Campus Compact. (2015). *Research University Engaged Scholarship Toolkit*. Retrieved from <http://compact.org/initiatives/trucen/research-university-engaged-scholarship-toolkit/>
- Carpenter, C. J., & McEvan, B. (2013). Why are we educating? Why undergraduate students choose to major in communication. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, *32*, 2–13.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 516–530. doi:10.1111/1467-8721.00037
- Corporation for National and Community Service. (2013). *National Service-learning Clearinghouse. 2011—2015 Strategic plan focus areas*. Retrieved May 25, 2013 <http://www.servicelearning.org/topic/theory-practice/2011-2015-strategic-plan-focus-areas>
- Conville, R. L., & Weintraub, S. C. (Eds.) (n.d.). *Service-learning and communication: A disciplinary toolkit*. National Communication Association. Retrieved from <http://cnu.edu/engage/docs/toolkitforfaculty.pdf>
- Cowan, D. J. (2009). Global design studio: A holistic approach to international service learning. *Diversity & Democracy*, *12*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/global-design-studio-holistic-approach-international-service>
- Craig, R. T. (1989). Communication as a practical discipline. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, and E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Vol. I, Paradigm issues* (pp. 97–122). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cruz, L., Ellern, G. D., Ford, G., Moss, H., & White, B. J. (2013). Navigating the boundaries of the scholarship of engagement at a regional comprehensive university. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *17*, 3–26.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

- 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.), *New directions for student services: Community service as values education*, No. 50 (pp. 7–29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Devine, J. A., Chaisson, R., & Ilustre, V. (2007). Recommitting and re-energizing community engagement in post-disaster New Orleans. *Diversity and Democracy*, 10. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/2007/fall/devine>
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Driscoll, A. & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Droge, D., & Murphy, B. O. (Eds.). (1999). *Voices of strong democracy: Concepts and models for service-learning in communication studies*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education in cooperation with the National Communication Association.
- Frey, L. R. (2009). What a difference more difference-making communication scholarship might make: Making a difference from and through communication research. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 37, 205–214. doi:10.1080/00909880902792321
- Frey, L. R., Pearce, W. B., Pollock, M. A., Artz, L., & Murphy, B. A. O. (1996). Looking for justice in all the wrong places: On a communication approach to social justice. *Communication Studies*, 47, 110–127. doi:10.1080/10510979609368467
- Garver, M. S., Divine, R. L., & Spralls, S. A. (2009). Segmentation analysis of the volunteering preferences of university students. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 21, 1–23.
- Gibson, C. (2006). Research universities and engaged scholarship: A leadership agenda for renewing the civic mission of higher education. *Campus Compact 20th Anniversary Celebration: Research Universities and Engaged Scholarship*. Retrieved from <http://compact.org/resource-posts/research-universities-and-engaged-scholarship-a-leadership-agenda-for-renewing-the-civic-mission-of-higher-education/4250/>
- Gleason, J. P., & Violette, J. L. (2012). Integrating service learning into public relations coursework: Applications, implications, challenges, and rewards. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 24, 280–285.
- Grube, J., & Piliavin, J. A. (2000). Role-identity, organizational experiences, and volunteer performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 1108–1119. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/01461672002611007
- Haski-Leventhal, D., Cnaan, R., Handy, F., Brudney, J., Holmes, K., Hustinx, L., Kang, C., Meijs, L., Bhagyashree, R., Yamauchi, N., Yeung, A., & Zrinscak, S. (2008). Student's vocational choices and voluntary action: A 12-nations study. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 19, 1–21.
- Holland, B. A. (2004). Analyzing institutional commitment to engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning*, 4, 30–B41.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Howard, J. (2001). *Service-learning course design workbook*. Ann Arbor, MI: OCSL Press.
- Johnson, A., & Hoovler, D. (2015). Service-learning and disaster recovery: Implications for government, communities, and colleges. In W.J. Jacob, S.E. Sutin, J.C. Weidman, & J.L. Yeager (Eds.). *Pittsburgh Studies in Comparative and International Education* (pp. 41–49). The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kahane, M. (2016). New challenge: Developing entrepreneurial leaders for social impact. *Diversity & Democracy*, 19. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/2016/summer/kahane>
- Kahn, M.E. (2005). The death toll from natural disasters: The role of income, geography, and institutions. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 87, 271–284.
- Kilgo, C. A., Sheets, J. K., & Pascarella, E. T. (2015). The link between high-impact practices and student learning: Some longitudinal evidence. *Higher Education*, 69, 509–525. doi:10.1007/s10734-014-9788-z
- Larson, R., Hansen, D., & Moneta, G. (2006). Differing profiles of developmental experiences across types of organized youth activities. *Developmental Psychology*, 42, 849–863. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.42.5.849
- Lewis, L. (2005). The civil society sector: A review of critical issues and research agenda for organizational communication scholars. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19, 238–267. doi:10.1177/0893318905279190
- Lindlof, T., & Taylor, B. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- McArthur, J. A. (2013). Rethinking the classroom: One department's attempt to connect student learning and national events. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 32, 79–86.
- Macduff, N. (2004). *Episodic volunteering: Organizing and managing the short-term volunteer program*. Walla Walla, WA: MBA Publishing.

- McDevitt, M., & Kioussis, S. (2006). Deliberative learning: An evaluative approach to interactive civic education. *Communication Education, 55*, 247–264. doi:10.1080/03634520600748557
- McKay, V. C., & Estrella, J. (2008). First-generation student success: The role of faculty interaction in service-learning courses. *Communication Education, 57*, 356–372. doi:10.1080/03634520801966123
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Mitteager, W. A., & Drake, L. *Providing disaster-relief to local communities: Volunteerism and service-learning following Hurricanes Irene and Lee*. State University of New York, Oneonta. Retrieved from http://www.oneonta.edu/academics/research/PDFs/LOTM12_Mitteager.pdf
- NASA. (March 14, 2011). *Japan quake may have shortened earth days, moved axis*. Retrieved from <http://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/features/japanquake/earth20110314.html>
- Neumayer, E., & Plumper, T. (2007). The gendered nature of natural disasters: The impact of catastrophic events on the gender gap in life expectancy, 1981–2002. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 97*, 551–566. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.2007.00563.x
- Norris, F. H., Friedman, M. J., & Watson, P. J. (2002). 60,000 disaster victims speak: Part II. Summary and implications of the disaster mental health research. *Psychiatry, 65*, 240–260. doi:10.1521/psyc.65.3.240.20169
- Novak, J. M., Markey, V., & Allen, M. (2007). Evaluating cognitive outcomes of service learning in higher education: A meta-analysis. *Communication Research Reports, 24*, 149–157. doi:10.1080/08824090701304881
- Oster-Aaland, L. K., Sellnow, T. L., Nelson, P. E., & Pearson, J. C. (2004). The status of service learning in departments of communication: A follow-up study. *Communication Education, 53*, 348–356. doi:10.10/0363452032000305959
- Reynolds, M., Sellnow, D., Head, K., & Anthony, K. E. (2014). Exploring the education value of the undergraduate teaching apprentice (UTA) experience. *Journal of The Association for Communication Administration, 33*, 17–34.
- Rotolo, T., & Berg, J. A. (2011). In times of need: An examination of emergency preparedness and disaster-relief service volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 40*, 740–750.
- Roy, A., & Oludaja, B. (2009). Hans-Georg Gadamer's praxis: Implications for connections and action in communication studies. *Communication, Culture & Critique, 2*, 255–273.
- Seifer, S. D., & Connors, K. (2007). *Faculty toolkit for service-learning in higher education*. Scotts Valley, CA: National Service-learning Clearinghouse.
- Sellnow, T. L., & Oster, L. K. (1997, September). The frequency, form, and perceived benefits of service-learning in speech communication departments. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 3*, 190–197.
- Temple University, Lewis Katz School of Medicine. *Service learning trips—Alabama 2011*. Retrieved from <https://medicine.temple.edu/about/administrative-offices/office-students>
- VanSlette, S. H., Schaefer, Z. A., & Hagedorn, K. (2014). Strategies for easing faculty management tensions at institutions of higher education. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 14*, 2–14.
- VanSlette, S. H., Schaefer, Z. A., & Hagedorn, K. (2014). Strategies for easing faculty-management tensions at institutions of higher education. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 33*(1), 2–14. [affairs/temple-emergency-action-corp/service-learning-trips/alabama-2011](https://www.jacadmin.org/affairs/temple-emergency-action-corp/service-learning-trips/alabama-2011)
- Ward, K. (1996). Service-learning and student volunteerism: Reflections on institutional commitment. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning, 3*, 55–65.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wengel, L. (2000). Community-centered service learning. *American Behavioral Scientist, 43*, 756–766.
- Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (1996). Community service and political—moral identity in adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 6*, 271–284.