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ABSTRACT

Teaching the "Heart and Soul" of Citizenship: Service-Learning as Citizenship Education

By

Bernadette Sun Chi

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

University of California, Berkeley

Professor David Stern, Chair

Troubling trends in political disengagement among young people include decreasing knowledge of and interest in political issues as well as lower rates of voting compared to previous generations. To potentially address this concern, service-learning has often been promoted in public schools as a means of educating active citizens, among other outcomes.

Despite the expansion of service-learning programs, the relationship between service-learning and citizenship outcomes deserves further study. This dissertation examines the following questions: Do teachers consider "citizenship" an explicit goal for service-learning experiences in K-12 schools? How do teachers and students define what it means to be a "good citizen"? What models of citizenship are taught in schools, and through service-learning in particular? Does service-learning make a difference in students' attitudes and understanding of citizenship?
I analyzed service-learning and non-service-learning (comparison) student pre-post surveys (n=704), student interviews (n=107) and teacher interviews (n=28) from schools throughout California. I drew on political theories and extended a framework of citizenship models to illuminate the ways in which service-learning may foster good citizenship.

Four central conclusions emerged from the data. First, the language of citizenship was missing from most classrooms, indicating that teachers were not framing service-learning as a strategy for teaching citizenship explicitly. Second, multiple models of citizenship existed in schools, including citizenship as legal status and as good behavior, which form a context for service-learning. Third, service-learning projects promoted active models of citizenship that fostered the "heart and soul" aspects of citizenship, including caring for and taking action to benefit other individuals or the community. Fourth, if citizenship is broadly defined as membership in a political community, most service-learning experiences did not connect direct service projects to broader civic and political processes, thus limiting many students' exposure to participation in a political community. Finally, I suggest implications for research, practice and policy to increase the impact of service-learning on students' understanding of what it means to be a good citizen.
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Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments... It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities... It is the very foundation of good citizenship. (Chief Justice Earl Warren, Brown v. Board of Education, 1954).

Reviews of evidence of youth civic and political engagement have been primarily viewed as troubling (Battistoni, 2002; Galston, 2001b; Gibson, 2001; Sax, 2000). For example, youth interest in discussing political issues has declined to their lowest levels since historic highs in the 1960's (Sax, 2000). Voting rates among young adults have declined since 1972 (the first election when 18 year-olds were given the right to vote in a Presidential election) when 50% of 18 to 24 year olds voted compared to just 28% voting in 2000 election (Gibson, 2001). Overall, the 18-24 year old cohort has shown the steepest decline in voting of any age group (Gibson, 2001; Sax, 2000). The focus of much of the attention to address concerns of youth civic disengagement rests on public education as the primary state institution responsible for preparing citizens for democratic participation.

The Role of Public Education in Developing Citizens

Citizenship education has been within the traditional purview of public schools, and much has been written about its theoretical and curriculum
implications (e.g. Conover and Searing, 2000; Dewey, 1916; Goodlad, 1997; Gutmann, 1987; Reich, 2002). As indicated by the opening quote, the responsibility to provide public education has rested with the states. A recent review of state constitutions and statutes reaffirmed that one of the primary goals of states’ education efforts is “to promote good citizenship, democracy, and the preservation of rights and liberties” (Tolo, 1999, p. 13).

Within this context of citizenship education, service-learning — the integration of community service activities into the academic curriculum — has been widely promoted as a means of developing “active citizens” (Kielsmeier, 2000; Smith, 1994). Eyler and Giles (1999) make the connection more explicitly: “participation in service-learning leads to the values, knowledge, skills, efficacy, and commitment that underlie effective citizenship” (p. 164). Similarly, the National Service-learning Cooperative (1998) explicitly connects service-learning and citizenship in the introduction to its document, Essential Elements of Service-Learning:

The special vision of service-learning is that children and youth are a resource now, that young people are not just preparing to be productive citizens but are capable of productive citizenship now. They can simultaneously utilize their talents and energy to contribute today and develop skills and attitudes that will foster a more committed and participatory citizenry tomorrow. Active citizenship is not a mere textbook abstraction, but it is a way of being, a practice, a commitment, even a habit, that can be, ought and must be entered into and made a part of one’s life as early as possible. (p. 3).
Commentators and researchers outside of the service-learning field also cite it as a strategy worthy of attention. For example, Putnam (2000) specifically mentions service-learning activities as means to “strengthen the civic muscles of participants” and to foster social capital (p. 405). Reich (2002) suggests service-learning as a promising strategy to support multicultural, liberal civic education. Etzioni (2001) suggests that voluntarism is important for “community building, civic spirit and democratic government” and is “best conducted as service learning” where individuals “benefit educationally and socially from their service experience” (p. 10). Barber (1992) has consistently recommended community service and service-learning activities as critical experiences to teach students about the duties of citizenship.

Expansion of Service-Learning

Service-learning is big, it’s growing, and it’s taking root in schools...at every grade level and in every type of school. And best of all, service-learning is here to stay, because educators understand its power to create the next generation of active-duty citizens that our country needs. (Harris Wofford, June 20, 2000).

Service-learning enjoys the attention of many policy makers and practitioners, in part, because it promises to foster many types of personal, institutional and social outcomes such as improved self-esteem and self-efficacy among students, more relevant and engaging educational experiences and stronger communities (Alt and Medrich, 1994; Billig, 2000; Conrad and Hedin, 1991; Furco, 1994, 2002; Kraft and Krug, 1994; Luce, 1998; Root, 1997). In the
midst of these diverse outcomes, however, "(f)ostering active citizenship among young people is by far the most commonly mentioned rationale for service-learning" (Kielsmeier, 2000, p. 653).

The growth of service-learning programs and requirements in schools and districts provides additional impetus to examine whether service-learning delivers on its promises to promote citizenship development. For example, in 1984, 9% of all US high schools offered service-learning while 27% of high schools offered some type of community service program. Only five years later, almost one-third of all schools offered service-learning while 83% of all high schools offered community service programs (Skinner and Chapman, 1999).

Key educational groups have also begun promoting service-learning as an educational strategy worthy of attention. For example, the Education Commission of the States (ECS) published several newsletters and a national report encouraging service-learning to promote "every student a citizen" (ECS, 2000). The National Council of the Social Studies (NCSS) issued a recent statement rearticulating the mission of social studies to prepare students to be active citizens and supporting service-learning as a strategy to promote citizenship (NCSS, 2001).

Significance of This Study

Even as the practice of service-learning has expanded, significant issues and theoretical and empirical questions remain when considering service-
learning as a means of citizenship education that deserve further research: How is citizenship being taught in schools? What models of "citizenship" are students learning through service-learning? How does examination of such issues provide insights into theoretical, policy, and pedagogical debates about what and how citizenship should be taught in schools? Addressing these questions would help teachers and administrators better understand the potential power and limits of service-learning rather than assuming a direct relationship between youth participation in direct service activities and adult participation as an active citizen involved in civic, political and non-political activities.

Given the rhetoric about the power of service-learning to foster citizenship, I wanted to study service-learning as a strategy for citizenship education to see if "citizenship" was taught through service-learning experiences and to examine how it was defined as a goal and outcome. My hypothesis was that the relationship between service and citizenship was much more complicated than was reported in the research and practitioner literature. Such a study would address key issues and contribute to the citizenship education and service-learning fields in the areas of research, policy and practice.

One important issue is that, theoretically and in practice, conceptions of citizenship and "good citizenship" remain contested (Beiner, 1995; Kahne and Westheimer, 2000; Schudson, 1998; Turner, 1993; Van Gunsteren, 1994; Westheimer and Kahne, 2002). In short, citizenship means many things to many people – from a set of rights reserved for members of a particular nation state
(and a means of denying others from certain privileges), to a set of practices implemented to shape politics and policies, to good behavior and civility in how we treat one another.

A second issue is that despite the diverse meanings of citizenship, few recent empirical studies have explored how “citizenship” is defined by teachers in schools and how it is taught within classrooms (Conover and Searing, 2000; Ferguson, 1991; Fickel, 2001; Kahne and Westheimer, 2000; Westheimer and Kahne, 2002). In particular, studies of service-learning have not extensively examined students’ and teachers’ understanding of citizenship which would assist in conceptualizing civic goals and outcomes of service-learning as a strategy for citizenship education (Kahne, Westheimer and Rogers, 2000; Perry and Katula, 2001).

The proposed study addresses these issues, thus contributing to greater understanding of the relationship between service-learning experiences and citizenship outcomes. Implications for policy makers include clarification of citizenship outcomes of service-learning in the midst of many other outcomes promoted by service-learning advocates. Implications for practitioners include examining the practice of service-learning as a strategy for citizenship education, including teachers’ goals and understanding of citizenship and how different models of citizenship could be fostered.
The Setting: California as a Useful State to Study

Given its demographic profile and political climate, California is a particularly interesting state to examine in the context of citizenship education and service-learning. In 1994, the passage of state Proposition 187 limited access to education and public health resources to "legal immigrants" which automatically cast attention on the legal status of individuals or families as citizens or non-citizens. In particular, public school teachers were expected to report students or their families to the Immigration and Naturalization Service if they were identified as illegal immigrants. As a result, attention to the definition of citizenship as legal status was heightened. Thus California public schools offer an interesting opportunity to explore other meanings of citizenship, especially models of active citizenship promoted by service-learning that are very different from the technical definition of citizenship as status.

California provides rich opportunities to identify and share lessons regarding the policy and practice of service-learning for other reasons. The number of school districts implementing community service and service-learning requirements has grown in the last five years, indicating a growing interest in community-service-based experiences for students as well as a growing need for better information about how and why service-learning works for students of all ages. For example, the number of school districts with service-learning policies "such that all students will participate in service-learning" has grown 241% since the data was first collected, from 39 districts in 1997 to 94 districts in 2001 (M.
Brugh, personal communication, October 2000; California Basic Educational Data System, 2002). Similarly, the number of school districts with policies “such that all students will participate in community service” has grown to 169 districts (out of 1043 districts, or 16%) as reported in 2001 (California Basic Educational Data System, 2002).

In addition to interest at the local level, interest at the state level has also grown. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction released a report in 1999 from a state service-learning task force outlining recommendations for implementation of service-learning in California (California Department of Education, 1999). The state was also one of five states chosen to participate in the “Learning in Deed” initiative by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to identify and to develop policies that support service-learning. Given this rich environment of policy and practices that promotes service-learning, a study of citizenship education in a diverse collection of California public schools would provide useful insights to service-learning practitioners and policymakers interested in citizenship education.

Structure of the Dissertation

This study draws on a subset of qualitative and quantitative data from students and teachers collected from 1997-2000 by the Service-Learning Research and Development Center at the University of California, Berkeley for the California Department of Education CalServe Office during a three-year state
evaluation study of K-12 service-learning partnerships. This study explores the state of citizenship education in public schools by examining service-learning as an instructional strategy intended to teach active citizenship.

In Chapter Two, I review citizenship theories and research from citizenship education and service-learning literatures. I present a conceptual framework that delineates various models of citizenship that may be taught in public schools. I use this framework throughout this study to explore the potential power and limits for service-learning as a strategy for citizenship education. In Chapter Three, I outline the research design, setting and methods of the study.

In Chapter Four, given the many potential outcomes of service-learning, I examine the language used by teachers to frame service-learning experiences for their students. I was curious to see whether service-learning was perceived of and used as a strategy for citizenship education. I found that while service-learning was rhetorically touted as promoting "citizenship" development, the language of citizenship and what it means to be a good citizen were conspicuously missing from most service-learning experiences in this study. Instead, teachers used rhetoric to encourage students to act as "responsible" people, "good community members" or "human beings"—important terms and roles relevant to civic identity and social participation, but they did not connote the political dimensions of citizenship.
Chapter Five describes the school context for service-learning and suggests potentially conflicting models of good citizenship taught in schools that have not been explored in previous studies of service-learning as citizenship education. Although interviews suggest that most students involved in service-learning articulated a clear desire for active citizenship to “make their schools or neighborhood better”, some students still defined good citizenship as good behavior or as legal status - two models of citizenship traditionally taught in public school. This was in spite of their participation in service-learning experiences that promoted an active model of citizenship as participation in service.

In Chapter Six, I examine students’ and teachers’ reasoning about the importance of active citizenship. Service-learning appeared to nurture attitudes of active participation to help other individuals or a larger community. This finding suggests the promise of service-learning experiences as citizenship education. I draw on political theory to illuminate Westheimer and Kahne’s framework of models of citizenship and to examine the different models of what it means to be a “good citizen” that may be taught through service-learning. Data in this study clarifies their framework and suggests a new subcategory within it, suggesting that teachers have a critical role in framing and shaping service-learning experiences and outcomes.

Chapter Seven presents a summary of findings and implications of this study. In sum, service-learning appeared to teach students important “heart and
soul” dimensions of citizenship that promoted an active model of good citizenship that emphasized caring for and helping other individuals and as well as contributing to the welfare of their communities. This model was in contrast to traditional models of citizenship taught in schools such as legal status or good behavior. While students heard about the virtues of action, responsibility and kindness to others, however, most teachers did not bridge the direct service activities with strategies relevant to citizen participation such as voting, advocacy and other activities in the political processes. In short, if citizenship is defined as membership in a political community (Walzer, 1989), then it appeared that most service-learning experiences were limited in fully preparing students for their roles as citizens in a political community.
Chapter Two
LITERATURE REVIEW OF CITIZENSHIP THEORIES, CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND SERVICE-LEARNING

To frame this study of service-learning as citizenship education, this chapter reviews three bodies of literature: (1) citizenship theories to offer insight into what models of citizenship may be taught in public schools and through service-learning; (2) citizenship education research to review existing models of citizenship taught through schools, including the various strategies used by teachers and schools to teach students about what it means to be a citizen; and (3) the civic outcomes of service-learning literature to clarify how citizenship outcomes have been defined for this particular instructional strategy.

THEORIES OF CITIZENSHIP

An examination of theoretical frameworks of citizenship provides insight into different concepts or models of citizenship that exist in practice (Van Gunsteren, 1994; Kymlicka and Norman, 1995). Clarification of such models of citizenship helps to illuminate what we expect students to know and be able to do as citizens. This normative aspect of schooling is not often addressed, but it should be because "the way we define citizenship is intimately linked to the kind of society and political community we want" (Mouffe, 1992, p. 225). Because I focus on citizenship education in the United States, the theoretical frameworks in this study draw on democratic theories.
This dissertation study focuses on the essential meaning of citizenship, drawing from Aristotle and elaborated by others, most specifically Walzer (1989), to define a citizen as "most simply, a member of a political community" (p. 211). Because citizenship theories provide divergent expectations of members and types of political community, those interested in citizenship education should expect different models of citizenship to emerge in practice.

Different models of citizenship drawn from relevant political and social theories are elaborated in this section. I first outline certain democratic theories that suggest distinctively different roles for "citizen" as well as different expectations for membership and types of desirable political communities articulated within each model. Taken together, these theoretical frameworks suggest that assumptions in the practice of citizenship education must be examined as expectations of what it means to be a good citizen will vary depending upon the theory that is presumed or enacted.

Political Theories

Theoretical discussions of citizenship and democracy are rich and complex and address many topics across disciplinary boundaries (e.g., Beiner, 1995; Janoski, 1998; Kymlicka, 1995; Mouffe, 1992; Sunstein, 1990; Turner, 1993). For the purposes of this study, I focus in this chapter on briefly reviewing theoretical frameworks that illustrate distinctive models of citizenship (Held,
1996; Dahl, 1998). I begin with a review of political theories that articulate different versions of democracy with accordingly different expectations of its citizens.

Although the direct democracy of Athens represents the widely accepted founding model of democracy, the relevance of this model of citizenship to present-day America is limited because of the immense size of our nation, its large and diverse population with competing interests and the lack of opportunity or resources for individuals to serve as full-time, deliberative citizens. Thus while inspirational as a founding model, its application is limited.

Relevant to contemporary discussions of democracy and citizenship, a distinctive model of citizenship that evolved from the direct democracy of Athens and initiated in ancient Rome was civic republicanism. Overall, the civic republican conception of citizenship favored patriotism, public spirit and willingness to set the common good above one’s interests (Held, 1996). The ancient Roman city-republic, in particular, connected political participation and liberty with civic glory and military power, thus defeating claims that stability of society, law and security could only be achieved through monarch rule and replacing the dutiful subject of previous monarchies who had derived their authority to rule as God-given (Held, 1996).

The full expression of civic republicanism emerged in the Italian Renaissance. Within such Italian city-republics as Venice, Florence and Siena, citizens were male and propertied as in Greece. The role of citizens was to
participate in self-government, electing officials to serve on councils that oversaw executive and judicial matters. Elements of civic republicanism were articulated by Machiavelli and Rousseau, and in American political thought, through the writings of Dagger and Pettit. Elements of civic republicanism such as participation and emphasis community welfare have been moderated, however, by liberalism, the prevailing democratic theory and model of citizenship in present-day America (Axtmann, 1996; Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, and Tipton, 1985; Reich, 2002; Sandel, 1996; Smith, 1997).

Fundamental to liberalism are concepts of a private sphere separate from the state with an emphasis on individual autonomy and on the values of toleration and freedom of choice. Elaborated by Hobbes and Locke in the seventeenth century and continued through the writings of Mill, Madison and Nozick, citizens in a liberal democracy essentially have protection from the state to pursue their interests within the private sphere. It is assumed that the state operates to create an orderly society based on the protecting the interests of the citizens. Citizens, however, are only expected to participate in the public sphere to protect their individual rights and interests when they view their rights as being infringed upon by the state (Axtmann, 1996; Battistoni, 2002; Held, 1996).

A particular strand of liberalism, communitarianism, has emerged that stresses participation in political life as necessary not only to protect individual interests but to create an informed, committed citizenry concerned with the common good. Communitarian ideals of commitment to others in a community
have been used throughout history, from the writings of the ancient Greeks, the Bible, Catholic social thought and early sociologists such as Tonnies, Durkheim and Parsons among others (Etzioni, 1998). “New” communitarians such as Bellah, Galston, and Taylor are concerned “with the balance between social forces and the person, between community and autonomy, between the common good and liberty, between individual rights and social responsibilities” (Etzioni, 1998, p. x).

American political thought has been marked by an effort to balance the competing claims of liberal and civic republican theory (Lister, 1997; Smith, 1997; Sandel, 1998), especially given the unlikelihood of individuals who are purely liberal or civic republican in their beliefs. The emergence of the communitarian perspective articulates a balance of emphasis on individual rights (liberalism) and on responsibilities to community or society (communitarianism and civic republicanism) broadly. It is important to note, however, that communitarian theory is not clearly distinctive. For example, critiques of liberalism or invocations of civic republicanism ideals may be viewed as communitarian, even if those theorists do not place their arguments within this category (e.g. Sandel, 1998). The communitarian perspective, while not theoretically deep, is still useful as a distinction between the boundaries of liberalism and republicanism.

These democratic theories offer different models of citizens as members of political communities as both expectations of membership as well as desired political communities vary. For example, civic republican theories of democracy
emphasize the participation of all its citizens in community affairs and promote community welfare over self-interest. Liberal theories stress a citizen's freedom to pursue one's interests (without harm to others) in the private sphere with individual choice driving participation in the public sphere to protect one's interests. A communitarian model of citizenship proposes a balance of individual rights and interests with concern for community welfare through encouraged participation in civic and political affairs.

All of these political theories, however, reflect an assumption about citizenship that is inherent in most political theories: that citizens have, by definition, status in a political community. The roles and expectations of non-citizens, however, are not clearly addressed. Critics of this conception of "citizenship-as-status" focus primarily on the concept of "citizenship-as-desirable activity" by encouraging greater participation by all individuals in the community and in civil society (Kymlicka and Norman, 1995).

Other Social Theories

While political scientists tend to view citizenship in terms of status of membership – focusing on the criteria of membership and its accompanying entitlements and responsibilities – sociologists have focused on the practices of citizens and not on the political or legal status of individuals, thus defining citizenship as practice. As Turner argues, "citizenship may be defined as that set of practices (juridical, political, economic and cultural) which define a person
as a competent member of society, and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups" (Turner 1993, 2).

These practices represent the interaction of individual actions and the practices of social institutions. For example, the practice of citizenship was illustrated by the actions of immigrant communities against Proposition 187 in California as they lobbied for education and health services for all children, regardless of political status. Thus, one need not be a legal citizen to act as a citizen. Other writers such as Boyte and Kari (1996) also emphasize the "public work" of engaged individuals as the basis of defining citizenship and building a common civic purpose.

Feminist Critiques of Citizenship

Aspects of citizenship have also been the subject of feminist critiques including the perception of universality and neutrality of citizenship in mainstream political theory that treats individuals as abstract citizens regardless of sex, race or class. This inattention to multiple differences also ignores the unequal opportunities of individuals based on their social or economic relationships to engage in their rights, roles and duties of citizenship. This is especially true for groups that have been silenced or marginalized or oppressed (Phillips, 1995; Okin, 1989; Young, 1989). Other feminist critiques focus on the overemphasis on the egoistic, rationalistic individualism; the ignorance of problems in the gender structure in families or workplaces; distinction between
reason and passion; the invocation of community that does not acknowledge the potential oppression of women (Friedman, 1989; Okin, 1989; Sunstein, 1990; Young, 1989).

While these discussions raise deeper questions about the meaning of citizenship, particularly relevant to this study is the feminist critique of political theory that articulates an ethic of care. Drawing from Gilligan's challenge to Kohlberg's theory of moral development, feminists such as Noddings (1984, 1995) articulate an ethic of care that may be distinct from and supplement an ethic of justice. While the justice orientation highlights issues of fairness, right and obligation with autonomy, and abstract reasoning as desirable goals, the care orientation is "grounded in responsiveness to others that dictates providing care, preventing harm and maintaining relationships" (Larrabee, 1993, p. 5; Flanagan and Jackson, 1987). Since many of the rationales for service-learning seem to draw, even implicitly, on an ethic of care rather than an ethic of justice, this dimension of citizenship is important to consider (Battistoni, 2002).

Based on this review of citizenship theories, it is clear that different models of citizenship taught through schools should be examined because the diversity of theories should lead to expectations of many models of citizenship in practice. The next section outlines the types of civic involvement that may be considered as acts of citizens.


Types of Civic Involvement

Other political theories provide insight into roles and expectations for citizens. Levels of participation expected of individuals in a democracy vary greatly. For example, Pateman (1970) suggests a model of participatory citizenship that stresses the significance of participation in both the public and private spheres (e.g. in the workplace and the family) because participation in these spheres is an educational process that fosters skills, interest and efficacy in political participation. Similarly, Barber's normative model of "strong" democracy also expects active participation of citizens while a "weak" democracy requires very little participation (Barber, 1984).

In an extensive review of civic voluntarism in America, Verba, Schlozman and Brady (1995) describe political and nonpolitical activities relevant for citizenship. Political activities are divided into two categories: electoral and non-electoral. Electoral political participation consists of activities associated with voting, campaigning, and running for office while non-electoral political participation includes taking part in community associations, organizing political action groups, initiating contacts with government officials and taking part in social protests to pursue changes in laws and policies.

Non-political participation includes work with community organizations, charitable and church-related activities and volunteer work with agencies. To call these activities non-political, however, may not be an accurate description as individuals may view their participation in these activities as political statements.
(i.e. participating in these activities in place of typical political activity) thus expanding the notion of what it means to be political. Others have described these types of activities as distinctly civic in nature (Keeter, Zukin, Andolina and Jenkins, 2002). What is important to note is that there are many types of activities that citizens may be engaged in and the types of involvement expected of citizens thus must be examined in any study of citizenship education.

This brief review of theories suggest that examination of students' and teachers' understanding of citizenship with corresponding expectations for involvement would be useful. Just as there are diverse models of citizenship in theory, a diversity of models of citizenship is taught in the practice of public schools that have, as their mission, the education of citizens (Dewey, 1916; Katznelson and Weir, 1985; Kliebard, 1995; Tyack, 1974).

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: MODELS AND STRATEGIES

Although many factors such as family, media, peers and community organizations influence youth political development, public education is the only state institution that bears the primary responsibility “to give all children an education adequate to take advantage of their political status as citizens” (Gutmann 1987, p. 288). Citizenship education focuses on the influence of schools in shaping students' understanding of citizenship as well as the skills, attitudes and dispositions that are expected of citizens.
While significant attention was paid to the political development of youth in the 1960's and 70's, the child and school had "disappeared" from the political socialization literature as relatively few recent studies have examined influences that shape youth attitudes, skills and behaviors (Dudley and Gitelson, 2002; Torney-Purta, 2002). Interest in youth civic engagement, however, has recently reemerged as a priority of political scientists, foundation officers and policy makers (Galston, 2001b; Gibson, 2001).

Political socialization research typically measured the influence of education simply by years of schooling - a "convenient measure of social status or as a coarse indicator of the level of intellectual achievement of the population under investigation" (Ferguson, 1991, p. 389). The content of what occurs in schools that may actually influence political attitudes, however, needed further examination (Ferguson, 1991).

Since the core mission of social studies is "to help students develop the knowledge, skills, and values that will enable them to become effective citizens" (NCSS, 2001, p. 319), social studies research provides insight into how schools have explicitly taught citizenship. However, I also address other forms of citizenship education beyond the classroom-based curriculum, including the implicit or "hidden" curriculum that includes citizenship grades and pedagogy. In particular, in the final section of this literature review, I summarize literature within the service-learning field as a proposed instructional strategy to teach
citizenship education to suggest limitations in the literature to be addressed through this study.

*Models of Citizenship in the Practice of Schooling*

In this review, I examine various models of citizenship that have been taught in schools through the explicit (enacted) curriculum, the implicit (or "hidden") curriculum and the null curriculum (or that which is not taught).

*The explicit curriculum.*

The curriculum that is intentionally taught in schools about citizenship appears mainly in social studies (Cuban, 1991; NCSS, 2001; Saxe, 1997). For the purposes of this study, I focus on the models of citizenship taught through social studies education and through textbooks in particular.

When examining models of citizenship taught through the explicit curriculum, social studies textbooks are remarkably similar in how they define what it means to be a citizen. For example, most textbooks define citizenship as *political status with rights* by describing ways individuals become citizens (by birth or naturalization) and by focusing on the Constitution as the source of citizen rights (Niemi and Junn, 1998). The National Standards for Civics and Government – what come closest to a consensus statement from the citizenship education field (Bahmueller, 1995) – also offers a "more precise" definition of citizenship:
• means that a person is recognized as a legal member of the nation
• gives each person certain rights and privileges, e.g. the right to vote and to hold public office
• means each person has certain responsibilities, e.g. respecting the law, voting, paying taxes, serving on juries” (Center for Civic Education, 1997, p. 35).

While this definition of citizenship appears to balance attention to rights and obligations of citizenship, Gonzales, Riedel, Avery and Sullivan (2001) conclude in their content analysis of the Civics Standards that “the overall picture of citizenship...depicts the good citizen as one who is an individual rights-bearer, and one who is a relatively passive citizen whose rights are not accompanied by corresponding obligations, including the obligation to participate in civic life” (p. 122-123). They suggest that the Civics Standards, “with their emphasis on knowledge, attitudes, and values to the near exclusion of active, informed participation—do relatively little to ensure that civic knowledge will be translated into effective citizenship that embodies active engagement in civic life” (Gonzales et al., 2001, p. 123). Other reviews of civics textbooks support these observations (Hahn, 2002).

Within the explicit curriculum, another model of citizenship that has been taught to students is citizenship as national identity. Teaching citizenship as national identity, or more specifically what it means to be American, was illustrated most clearly in the late 19th and early 20th century with “Americanization” or assimilation efforts that took place during the waves of
immigration as well as during World Wars I and II (Fass, 1989; Reich, 2002; Tyack, 1974).

More currently, the Civics Standards includes a notion of allegiance in its definition of citizenship. "Citizens owe allegiance or loyalty to the United States" because "in turn, they receive protection and other services from the government" (Center for Civic Education, 1997, p. 35). While aspects of patriotism or allegiance connote an unreflective, almost "primordial" bond with one's nation state, some have argued for the need to reframe patriotism as development of "civic consciousness" (Janowitz, 1983) or "love of country" as a positive attachment to a particular society (including its historical legacy and cultural traditions) as well as the capacity for constructive criticism (Damon, 2001).

The implicit curriculum.

Also referred to as the tacit or "hidden" curriculum, the implicit curriculum teaches students lessons about citizenship through rules of conduct in school, citizenship grades and other awards for student behavior (Battistoni, 1985; Dreeban, 1968; Tanner and Tanner, 1990). For example, citizenship as good behavior rewards students with high citizenship grades for compliant behavior including following classroom and school rules, obeying teachers, being punctual and attending class. In this case, a good citizen is one who follows rules or does not cause trouble.
Students are also encouraged through the implicit curriculum to help others or to contribute to the school or classroom community by "good citizen" or "good student" awards. In other words, while good citizenship grades reward students for obeying classroom and school rules and not causing trouble, good citizenship awards also reward a model of citizenship that emphasizes citizenship as helping others or going beyond what is normally expected (such as following rules).

Drawing roots from Dewey and the Progressive Era and finding fertile soil in current day community service or service-learning initiatives, the model of citizenship as active community member focuses on fostering knowledge about the issues in the community and on encouraging active participation to benefit communities. For example, Reuben (1997) writes that the "community civics" curriculum endorsed by the National Education Association in 1915 defined "the good citizen as a person who habitually conducts himself with proper regard for the welfare of the communities of which he is a member, and who is active and intelligent in his operation with his fellow members to that end". This definition of citizenship was a clear departure from nineteenth century conceptions of citizenship in that "it completely ignored formal politics and government in favor of themes of cooperation and community" (Reuben, 1997, p. 399).

Another model of citizenship articulated perhaps most clearly during the Progressive Era is citizenship as social reformation. As illustrated by the writings of Rugg (1921/1996) and Counts (1932), these citizens explicitly attempt
to improve society. That is, students are not only be expected to participate in their communities as citizens, but "ideally, students learn how to identify social problems, the causes of problems, and strategies for reform" (Kahne, Rodriguez, Smith, & Thiede, 2000, p. 319). As citizens, they "act collectively to foster progress and gain deeper understandings" of societal improvement (Kahne et al., 2000, p. 319).

The null curriculum.

While previous examples have illustrated models of citizenship taught through the explicit and implicit curriculum, the null curriculum is also relevant to consider because it is an examination of what is not taught in schools. Or put another way, what are students not learning in schools about what it means to be a citizen?

One way to answer this question is to acknowledge the fact that schools seek to avoid controversial subjects (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Hahn, 1991; Hess, 2002; Kahne et al., 2000; Niemi and Junn, 1998). I suggest this as a model of citizenship as avoidance of controversy and conflict because students are taught by omission that participating as a citizen does not involve controversy and conflict when it, in fact, does. As a result, it appears that students would rather avoid conflict or controversy than accept it as part of the democratic process. For example, Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996) suggest that civics be
taught differently to prepare students about the "conflictual" nature of political participation:

Civics should be taught in a realistic matter, introducing students to the conflictual, often unsettling nature of politics... Students need an introduction that is realistic without being alienating, encouraging without being propagandizing, and that promotes participation as well as simply learning. (p. 279).

These many models of citizenship found in theory and in practice illustrate the variety of models of citizenship taught in public schools. Yet extensive attention to these many models of citizenship in both theory and practice is not evident in recent studies of social studies education (Dudley and Gitelson, 2002; Kahne et al., 2000; Kahne, Westheimer and Rogers, 2000).

I now shift my focus to examine other aspects of the citizenship education literature relevant to this study: (1) the role of teachers in fostering citizenship and (2) the effectiveness of various instructional strategies used to teach about citizenship.

Teacher Beliefs

"Teachers’ thinking and the underlying personal beliefs and theories that form the framework for their classroom decision-making have wide-ranging implications" (Fickel, 2000, p. 360) and so should be examined. Teachers serve as "gatekeepers" because they decide "what learning experiences the students in their classroom will have, what issues, content, and topics students will engage with, and the instructional materials and methods that will be used" (Fickel,
2000, p. 360). Although this study did not acknowledge teachers' unconscious beliefs that reflect ideology, it is still important to explore the process and outcomes of intentional teaching activities in classrooms; understanding teachers' thinking and underlying beliefs is critical because individual teachers make a difference in how citizenship is defined and taught in their classrooms (Westheimer and Kahne, 2002).

In particular, teachers' beliefs about what it means to be a good citizen are important to examine because there is evidence to suggest that the teacher's role is pivotal in promoting political participation (Ferguson, 1991; Fickel, 2001). Past research suggests that most teachers define good citizen in terms of obedience, loyalty, conformity, avoidance of controversy, and restraint from criticism of government officials and that their students were not inclined to conceive of citizenship in broad participatory terms (Levenson, 1972). While some recent research suggests that teachers' understanding of citizenship includes an emphasis on social concerns and being an informed, questioning citizen (Anderson, Avery, Pederson, Smith, and Sullivan, 1997), obedience to the law was one of the most important qualities of good citizenship that teachers hoped their students would learn in an international study of civic education (Torney-Purta, Lehman, Oswald, and Schulz, 2001).

Focusing on students' beliefs about citizenship, Conover and Searing (2000) suggest similar conclusions in their study of 100 students and adults in four United States communities as they report "most students have thin
understandings of what it means to be a citizen, understandings dominated by a focus on rights and deficient in a sense of obligation. For most, being a good citizen requires only that one obey the law, vote, and act patriotically” (Conover and Searing, 2000, p. 117).

In addition, despite statements by the NCSS about the primacy of citizenship education in the social studies, most social studies teachers hold teaching citizenship to be a low priority (Kahne et al., 2000). This finding supports an earlier study by Rutter (1986) in which social studies teachers rated four goals (basic literacy skills, good work habits and discipline, academic excellence and personal growth) above citizenship. The low priority of teaching citizenship in social studies as the discipline rhetorically intended to teach citizenship suggests that it is worth exploring to see if citizenship is taught through service-learning.

Types of Instructional Strategies

In addition to teacher beliefs, instructional strategies are critical to examine because they vary widely and they have an impact on outcomes. Based on the recent International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) study, the predominant modes of teaching social studies continue to focus on instructional strategies including textbooks, worksheets, watching videos and writing reports which supports prior studies of social studies classrooms (Baldi, Perie, Skidmore, Greenberg, and Hahn, 2001). In
short, "larger-scale research data indicates that traditional, textbook-bound practices of knowledge transmission, rather than reflective inquiry, continue to pervade classrooms" (Fickel, 2001, p. 360; Cuban, 1991).

Others argue that the method of teaching should also be democratic to best prepare students to participate in a democracy (Dewey, 1916; Battistoni, 1985; Engle and Ochoa, 1988; Newmann, 1977). For example, active participation in classroom discussions, participation in the community, use of simulations and inclusion of community speakers have been correlated positively with measures of increased civic knowledge, more participatory attitudes and greater support of democratic values by students (Kahne, Chi and Middaugh 2002; Niemi and Junn, 1998; Torney et al., 2001). Given the increase in service-learning activities in K-12 schools and its rhetorical purpose to foster active citizenship, I turn to the service-learning literature.

SERVICE-LEARNING

Definition of Service-Learning

The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 provides a federal definition of "service-learning":

- is a method whereby students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service that is conducted in and meets the needs of a community;
- is coordinated with an elementary school, secondary school, institutions of higher education, or community service programs, and with the community;
- helps foster civic responsibility;
• is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students;
• and provides structured time for the students to reflect on the service.

In spite of this definition, there has been significant difficulty in defining what service-learning is. For example, Zeldin and Tarlow (1997) explain:

What is school-based service-learning? There is little consensus. For some, it is a reform initiative aimed at making schools more responsive and relevant to young people. For others, service-learning is an instructional strategy, a means for improving the academic achievement, citizenship, and community membership of young people. For others, it is a program that integrates meaningful work in the community with rigorous coursework and structured reflection. For still others, it is all of the above. (p. 173).

Interestingly, although it has been difficult to define service-learning, there appears to be consensus around components to be included in service-learning experiences, including "active participation, thoughtfully organized experiences, focus on community needs and school/community coordination, academic curriculum integration, structured time for reflection, opportunities for application of skills and knowledge, extended learning opportunities, and development of a sense of caring for others" (Billig, 2000, p. 659). These components are similar to the eleven Essential Elements distilled and promoted by the National Youth Leadership Council, a leading organization in the service-learning field (National Service-Learning Cooperative, 1998).
Although there may be consensus on the practices to be included in high quality service-learning experiences, the sheer number of these practices and the variability with which they are implemented to various degrees of quality make it challenging to research the effects of it as an independent variable. That is, across studies, often what is described as “service-learning” may vary tremendously in goals, length, structure, focus and type of involvement (Battistoni, 2002).

Recent articles by Warter and Grossman (2002) and Yarbrough and Wade (2002) have suggested theoretical frameworks to address the complexity and challenges of researching (and implementing) service-learning. For example, Warter and Grossman (2002) describe the usefulness of the developmental-contextual framework (with its concepts of contexts, multiple domains, lifespan, and risk and resiliency) to understand the complexity of service-learning experiences in nurturing students’ development. Yarbrough and Wade suggest that logic models from researchers, practitioners and even participants must be developed to research each program because the experiences are relatively unique and the investigation complex.

Both of these articles have begun to articulate theoretically-based explanations for the complexity of service-learning programs. This study draws on the variability of service-learning to explore the potential for producing multiple types of civic and citizenship outcomes.
Civic Outcomes of Service-Learning

Just as there are different definitions of service-learning, there is a wide variety of goals that service-learning is expected to achieve. For example, literature reviews of service-learning outline goals reflecting the personal, social, civic and academic development of youth, ranging widely from the development of personal responsibility, social competence, self-esteem, pregnancy prevention, violence prevention, empathy, civic responsibility, basic skills, homework completion and higher attendance. (For more discussion about the other outcomes of service-learning, see Billig, 2000; Alt and Medrich, 1994; Eyler, Giles and Gray, 1999; Gray, 1996; Root, 1997).

In examining service-learning as a potential strategy for citizenship education, I draw primarily on studies of service-learning in K-12 education conducted or published in the last ten years. I also include higher education studies if they provide insights not included in the K-12 studies. Essentially, I have grouped the outcomes into three categories: (1) civic responsibility\(^1\) (e.g. responsibility to others, altruism or commitment to service); (2) political attitudes or dispositions (e.g. participation in governmental or political processes including advocating changes in policy or voting); and (3) citizenship (e.g. students' awareness and understanding of the meaning of citizenship).

Before delving into the service-learning literature, it is important to lay out

---

\(^1\) Although the concept of civic responsibility is one of the five main components of the federal definition of service-learning, the concept has been difficult to define and may include many elements. For more discussion, see Ammon, Furco, Chi and Middaugh, 2002).
a few caveats. While the evidence to support service-learning may be promising, "(t)he field is clearly a messy one, and far more and better research is needed" (Billig, 2000, p. 660; Battistoni, 2002). Many service-learning studies are program evaluations and not theory-based studies. Most studies lack experimental or quasi-experimental designs with control groups to address self-selection bias. In short, many service-learning studies are suggestive but not conclusive about the impact of service-learning on particular outcomes.

_Fostering civic responsibility._

Although I have grouped the following findings within a category of civic responsibility, it is important to acknowledge that these writers were not necessarily attempting to define civic responsibility as a construct or to place their findings on specific civic outcomes within that concept. I discuss their studies here as a means of grouping these studies within a larger framework to organize and make meaning of the many types of civic outcomes that may be explored through service-learning research.

Research on service-learning in K-12 and higher education suggest that these experiences foster positive aspects of students' civic development at the K-12 level. For example, high quality service-learning experiences appeared to increase students' awareness of community needs (Center for Human Resources, 1999); their sense of responsibility for others (Marks, 1994); their commitment to make a positive contribution to the community or to make a difference or act on
their concerns (Center for Human Resources, 1999); acceptance of cultural
diversity (Center for Human Resources, 1999); aspects of caring (Kuest, 1997) and
their interest or commitment to service now and later in life (Center for Human
Resources, 1999; Davidson, 1995).

A qualitative study suggested that service experiences in a local homeless
shelter encouraged students' moral development in the dimensions of giving,
tolerance and respect for others, agency and responsibility, and justice with
compassion (Youniss and Yates, 1997). While these studies suggested positive
outcomes, it is also important to note that there were also studies that showed
mixed or no results on these types of dimensions (Marks, 1994; Ridgell, 1995),
suggesting that not all service-learning experiences were the same. Thus further
examination of service-learning was necessary to determine conditions under
which desired outcomes occurred.

One of the most rigorous studies of service-learning in higher education\(^2\)
suggest that when integrated into coursework, service-learning experiences
encouraged students to work for equal opportunity and find careers to help
others when compared to students who took the same course without
participating in service-learning (Markus, Howard, and King 1993). College
student volunteers serving in social agencies placed higher priority on
community improvement and aspired to leadership positions more than their

\(^2\) These studies are intended to be illustrative as this is not a thorough review of service-learning research in
higher education. See Eyler, Giles and Gray (1999) for a more comprehensive examination of studies
about the effects of service-learning on students, faculty, institutions and communities.
counterparts not involved in service (Eyler and Giles 1999).

Two other higher education studies used quasi-experimental and experimental designs to examine the impact of mandated service programs on college students' future intent to volunteer. Stukas, Snyder and Clary (1999) found that service mandates appeared to undermine future volunteer intentions of those who would not otherwise volunteer or who feel that it would take external control to get them to volunteer when compared to control group students. Thus, service requirements appeared to negatively affect those student who would not volunteer on their own.

To examine tolerance, an important aspect of citizenship (Gutmann, 1985), another study of college students in a quasi-experimental nonequivalent control group design suggested that students involved in service-learning showed larger increases in their international understanding as well as larger decreases in racial prejudice when compared to students not involved in service (Myers-Lipton 1996).

*Improved political attitudes or disposition.*

Some outcomes of service-learning relate more explicitly to students' political development in increasing their capacity or motivation to participate in the political system. This category of service-learning civic outcomes has probably received the least amount of attention. Within this category of civic outcomes, high school students who did service-learning appeared to develop a
more sophisticated understandings of sociohistorical contexts and were more likely to think about politics and morality in society and to consider how to effect social change (Youniss and Yates, 1997; Morgan and Streb, 1999). In addition, they were more likely to report a desire to be engaged in community organizations and to vote 15 years after their participation than those who did not participate (Youniss, McLellan and Yates, 1997; Yates and Youniss, 1996). A five-state evaluation of service-learning programs reported that engagement in service-learning increased students' political attentiveness, political knowledge and desire to become more politically active (Morgan and Streb 1999).

**Citizenship.**

All of the results discussed thus far have reflected a broad range of civic outcomes that are relevant to citizenship. Citizenship as an explicit outcome of service-learning, however, has not received extensive attention despite “generalized beliefs about service and specific service programs are predicated on the assumption that service has a favorable influence on citizenship” (Perry and Katula, 2001, p. 331). Since citizenship is the focus of the proposed study, the remainder of this section will explore in more detail the literature that explicitly connect service and citizenship.

From a conceptual standpoint, few writers have addressed the topic of citizenship as an explicit outcome of service-learning experiences. For example,
Barber (1992) has consistently advocated for service-learning as a “potent civic
educator” under certain conditions:

Where students use experience in the community as a basis for
critical reflection in the classroom, and turn classroom reflection into
a tool to examine the nature of democratic communities and the role
of the citizen in them, there is an opportunity to teach liberty, to
uncover the interdependence of self and other, to expose the intimate
linkage between rights and responsibilities. (p. 252).

Mendel-Reyes (1998) similarly suggests that “almost every service
learning model that...intentionally integrates academic learning and relevant
community service...offers at least a minimal education in citizenship by
exposing students to community life and to one facet of the citizen’s role, service
to the less fortunate” (pp. 34-35). According to these writers, service-learning
when including certain components inherently offer a “minimal” education in
citizenship.

A few studies have begun to collect data that is explicitly framed as
components or elements of citizenship. These studies fall into two categories: (1)
studies that defined citizenship as a compilation of various attitudes, behaviors
and skills that citizens should exhibit and (2) studies that have collected data
attempting to construct teachers’ and students’ understanding of what it means
to be a “citizen”.

In particular, two studies reflect the concept of aggregating civic outcomes
as important dimensions for citizenship. For example, Eyler and Giles (1999)
organized their findings in a framework of Values (“I ought to do”), Knowledge
"I know what I ought to do and why"), Skills ("I know how to do"), Efficacy ("I can do, and it makes a difference") and Commitment ("I must and will do"). They suggest that service-learning provides an "ideal environment for connecting these disparate elements of student development into effective citizenship development" (p. 157).

In a review of 37 empirical studies, Perry and Katula (2001) also defined citizenship as a "global construct that represents an array of discrete values, attitudes, and behaviors" (p. 331). They examined six categories of outcomes related to citizenship, including citizenship-related cognitive understanding, citizenship attitudes, citizenship skills, institutional change, philanthropic and civic behaviors and political behavior.

Rather than imposing a framework of citizenship upon subsets of student outcomes to interpret them as important for citizenship, a few researchers have begun to explicitly ask students and teachers directly what it means to be a good citizen to capture students' normative understanding of desirable citizenship attitudes, skills and behaviors and to explore if service-learning or community service experiences may affect students' understanding of citizenship. These questions are particularly important to research because "the question of what constitutes 'good citizenship'...is highly controversial and contested" (Battistoni 2002, 10; Westheimer and Kahne, 2000, 2002).
Westheimer and Kahne’s Framework: “What Kind of Citizen?”

Westheimer and Kahne (2002) in particular have recently made strong claims about the need to clarify the various models of citizenship that may be taught through service-learning experiences because “it highlights the importance of examining the underlying goals and assumptions that drive different programs in design and practice” (p. 4). Their research has found that underlying goals and assumptions about what it means to be a “good citizen” created structures and outcomes that varied significantly across classrooms. After reviewing qualitative and quantitative data from 10 programs intended to promote “democratic values”, they describe at least three models of “good citizens” that these programs, many of them service-learning in nature, attempted to develop. The three models have different implications for what students are expected to know and what role individuals are expected to play in society as citizens:

(1) **Personally Responsible Citizen**: In this “individualistic vision of good citizenship”, the Personally Responsible Citizen acts responsibly by taking care of their own obligations and by not being a burden on society by staying financially solvent, paying taxes and obeying laws. In addition to taking responsibility for their own matters, personally responsible citizens seek to help those in need and to volunteer time to charitable causes. By strengthening the character of individuals through such virtues as honesty, hard work, responsibility and compassion, this model of citizenship draws from character
education reforms that seek the development of socially desirable and democratic virtues.

(2) Participatory Citizen: Participatory citizens are those “who actively participate in the civic affairs and the social life of the community at local, state and national levels” (p. 5). This model draws from a tradition that emphasized the importance of civic participation, from the American Founders to Tocqueville to Dewey and the Progressives. Participatory Citizens prepare for civic participation through programs that focus on teaching students about how government and other community organizations work as well as on skills such as running meetings, analyzing needs and organizing initiatives to address needs in the community.

(3) Justice Oriented Citizen: The conception of citizenship that is the “least commonly pursued”, Justice Oriented Citizens “critically assess social, political and economic structures and explore collective strategies for change that challenge injustice and, when possible, address root causes of problems” (p. 6). Teachers and programs that promote this form of citizenship are “less likely to emphasize the need for charity and volunteerism as ends in themselves and more likely to teach about social movements” (p. 7). This conception of citizenship draws from the social reconstructionists such as Rugg (1921) and Counts (1932) who argued that education should prepare students to address enduring social problems and promote a “new social order”.
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This framework is a helpful contribution to service-learning research because it problematizes the assumption that service-learning experiences promote a mostly undefined notion of citizenship. It suggests why some service-learning experiences may promote certain civic outcomes and not others.

Westheimer and Kahne's framework draws on teachers' and students' interpretations of what it means to be a "good citizen" and not on preconstructed concepts defined by researchers. Thus the framework is useful to practitioners to examine their assumptions and to acknowledge the complexity of citizenship as a construct. In addition, the framework is useful to researchers because provides more nuanced insights into how citizenship may be defined to clarify and categorize programs or projects and outcomes that may be expected.

There are a few limitations to this framework that will be addressed in the proposed study. First, the models are drawn only from service-learning teachers and do not take into account other models of citizenship described earlier that may be taught through schools, such as citizenship as legal status and citizenship as good behavior. Attention to these models of citizenship already taught in public schools may seem obvious to recommend but they have rarely been addressed in service-learning studies (R. Battistoni, personal communication, October 24, 2002). Second, while the framework draw various educational philosophies such Dewey, Ruggs and Counts, political theories of democracy and citizenship are useful to illuminate distinctions within and between the different models of citizenship.
For example, the Personally Responsible Citizen reflects a mostly liberal model of citizenship with dimensions of being responsible for one's behavior as well as communitarian or republican aspects of volunteering to help others or the larger community. The Participatory Citizen reflects an important dimension of civic republicanism with its emphasis on participation. The Justice Oriented Citizen also reflects civic republicanism with its emphasis on participation as well as a concern for justice and the welfare of all individuals in society (e.g. Rawls, 1971).

This dissertation study will begin to address these limitations by incorporating models of citizenship found in practice and in theory and will draw on the framework as useful launching point to examine service-learning as citizenship education.

Potential Limits for Service-learning as Citizenship Education

Also important to examine are the potential limits of service-learning as a strategy for citizenship education. Boyte and Kari (1996) have presented perhaps the most trenchant critique of community service and service-learning initiatives in preparing individuals to participate as citizens. Their view of citizens as performing "public work" suggests that many youth service activities are problematic for several reasons. First, volunteer service activities typically do not include opportunities to think "broadly about the larger policy dimensions of the problems they confront" through service activities (Boyte and Kari, 1996, p.
8). Second, the “personal language” of many service programs do not indicate the extent to which individuals act effectively as citizens. They suggest that “when citizenship is equated with voluntarism, it loses its seriousness and power. It becomes what one does after hours and on the side” (Boyte and Kari 1996, p. 6) rather than a serious endeavor that may require sacrifice and sustained commitment to change.

Markus, Howard, and King (1993) caution that “well-intentioned community service programs often invoke hortatory references to enhancing students’ understanding of their ‘civic obligations’ and the ‘responsibilities of citizenship,’ but it is not uncommon for such programs to be apolitical or even antipolitical in practice” (p. 417). In these cases, students are not encouraged to consider the “broader social and political dimensions” of their work. If this is true, then the apolitical or antipolitical nature of many service-learning programs requires careful attention to understand how service experiences may foster citizenship values and behaviors.

Davidson (1995) reported similar findings from a qualitative study. While state-mandated service-learning requirements may “strengthen voluntarism and a commitment to the community”, her interviews with 24 students in four high schools suggested that “most students saw no relationship between service and citizenship in the larger community” (p. 126). “Citizenship was viewed in terms of government and its institutions (and) service to the community was not a part
of that concept...in most students' minds the perception of service to the community is distinct from involvement in political life” (p. 99).

Another recent study indicated the challenge of studying citizenship as a construct given the many meanings of citizenship. Kollross (1997) designed a study to examine the effect of a short-term service-learning experience on students' progress through three developmental phases based on “responsible citizenship”. Results indicated that there was no significant developmental gain on any of the three phases. In explaining her findings, Kollross observed that participants may have been confused about the definition of citizenship because a large number of students at this community college were foreign born. Her explanation indicates the confusion that exists in practice regarding the language and concept of “citizenship”, suggesting the need to clarify students’ understanding of citizenship before attempting to measure it.

Significance of This Study

Given the growth of service-learning in K-12 schools and higher education institutions, clearly more research is needed especially if service-learning is to be viewed as a viable strategy for citizenship education. In particular, “research about citizenship skills and behaviors, particularly political behavior, has largely been neglected in studies of service” which is noteworthy given the “centrality of active citizenship in most theories of and proposals for service” (Perry and Katula, 2001, p. 360).
The proposed study will address limitations and contribute to the citizenship education and service-learning literatures in three ways:

(1) First, while the focus of this study is on the potential citizenship outcomes of service-learning as the strategy, I will first examine if service-learning experiences are used as a strategy for fostering citizenship, rather than assuming that service-learning experiences are intended to teach citizenship. Given the multiple outcomes of service-learning articulated in the literature, this appears to be important to examine.

(2) Second, if service-learning is perceived to be a strategy for citizenship education, it should be examined in the context of public schools that have taught other models of citizenship through the explicit and implicit curriculum.

(3) Third, since many models of citizenship exist in theory and in practice, a fruitful exploration would be to examine what kinds of citizens are fostered through service-learning by drawing on the voices of students and teachers and on political theories to illuminate their views. Findings from this study would better define citizenship as a dependent variable by clarifying dimensions of citizenship a goal and outcome for service-learning activities.

Research Questions

Thus key questions to be addressed in this study of service-learning as citizenship education include the following:
• Is "citizenship" an explicit goal for service-learning experiences in K-12 schools?
• How do teachers and students define what it means to be a "good citizen"?
• What models of citizenship are taught in schools and through service-learning, in particular?
• Does service-learning make a difference in students' attitudes and understanding of citizenship?

Based on the review of models of citizenship in theory and in practice, I propose the following conceptual framework to examine the models of citizenship taught through service-learning as a basis for this dissertation study. These three definitions of citizenship capture the models of citizenship taught in practice (Options #1 and #2), Westheimer and Kahne's framework of active models of citizenship (Option #3) with political theories summarized earlier in this literature review:

(1) Citizenship as Legal, Political Status: This model of citizenship is the technical definition of citizenship, having legal, political status in a nation state.

(2) Citizenship as Expected Rule-Abiding Behavior: This model of citizenship includes elements of obedience, voting as a basic duty of citizenship and avoiding conflict and controversy.

(3) Citizenship as Community Participant: This model of citizenship includes Westheimer and Kahne’s framework as distinctive models of active citizenship, including the Personally Responsible Citizen, Participatory Citizen, and Justice-Oriented
Citizen. I also draw on the political theories of liberalism, communitarianism and republicanism to illuminate distinctions within and between these models of citizenship.

This conceptual framework is useful because it represents clearly distinct aspects of citizenship; with a manageable number of options; and a means of combining many models of citizenship reviewed in the literature. This framework places Westheimer and Kahne’s models of active citizenship in the context of other models of citizenship that exist in schools and within political theories of democracy and citizenship. The next chapter outlines the research design and methods of data collection and analysis.
Chapter Three  
DESIGN, METHODS, DATA AND ANALYSIS

Design and Methods of the Study

This study examines the potential impact of service-learning on students' understanding of what it means to be a good citizen. To determine whether a particular instructional strategy such as service-learning influences student civic development, a quasi-experimental research design can be used to examine differences between students who are involved in service-learning and those who are not. Student responses from service-learning classrooms can be compared to student responses from non-service-learning classrooms to see if there are differences between the two sets that may be attributed to the service-learning experiences.

A quasi-experimental research design provides the best level of confidence in reporting differences in outcomes, given that complete random assignment of students was not possible with the schools in this study (Weiss, 1998). Public education is a complex enterprise, full of variables that are beyond the control of teachers and administrators. So the notion of controlling for “all variables” to test one intervention is challenging at best. For example, attempting to control for teacher effects with the use of matched, control classrooms can be thwarted by school scheduling that does not allow for random assignment of student subjects. Teachers report that every class “has a personality of its own” that is often inexplicable to them and thus could affect
any differences in outcomes. Students bring in their many life experiences into classrooms that affect their ability and attitudes to learn. Despite these limits, however, the quasi-experimental design still provided the most useful way to consider what service-learning may uniquely contribute to students' development.

**Settings and Sample**

This study draws on a subset of data collected as part of a three-year state study of K-12 service-learning in California conducted by the Service-Learning Research and Development Center (SLRDC) at the University of California, Berkeley from 1997-2000. In 1999-2000, seven service-learning partnerships volunteered to participate as part of an "intensive" study and data from this sample represents the basis of this study. The partnerships had received grants from the California Department of Education CalServe Office to implement service-learning programs in their schools and they represented a wide range of rural, suburban, and urban communities in the northern, central and southern regions of California. Such diversity among communities is desirable to capture the range of experiences and conceptions of citizenship that are influenced by community history and context (Conover and Searing, 2000).

At least three service-learning teachers and at least one matched comparison classroom participated from each partnership. Information packets were mailed to coordinators, teachers, and evaluators during the summer to
prepare for the study during the 1999-2000 school year. The teachers and evaluators attended a training in August 1999 to discuss the various instruments involved in data collection. The bulk of the interview and observation data was collected during the second semester of the 1999-2000 school year.

The primary source of data was drawn from a representative sample of service-learning students (n=95) comprised of four to six students randomly selected from each service-learning classroom. The students represented a range of grades from three to twelve, and came from a variety of cultural, ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. They participated in service-learning projects in various classes including Social Studies, Language Arts, Foreign Language, and Math. 25 service-learning teachers were also individually interviewed to describe their service-learning projects and their understanding of what it meant to be a good citizen.

In addition, individual interviews were conducted with 12 students from three comparison (non-service-learning) classrooms and with three comparison teachers who taught similar student populations and who did not implement service-learning projects in their classrooms. To collect information from a representative sample of students, a random sample of four to six students from the comparison classrooms were selected to be interviewed. Due to time constraints during site visits, interviews with students and teachers from all comparison classrooms were not included in the data collection; priority was given to collect information from the service-learning classrooms. While this is a
weakness in the overall data collection, enough data was collected to provide suggestive findings.

I am cautious in making generalizations about the entire service-learning field since the sample of participating teachers was intentionally not a representative one. However, the evidence collected through this sample of experienced, well-respected and conscientious service-learning teachers can contribute to a deeper and more theoretically based understanding of the implementation and expected outcomes of service-learning as a potential strategy for citizenship education.

Data Collection and Analyses

One of the most important challenges of this study was to figure out how to measure "citizenship", a term that is often used in rhetoric but rarely defined in practice. Since citizenship is a very abstract concept for adults, it was challenging to devise ways to ask students, from grades three to twelve, about their understanding of what it meant to be a good citizen.

Although paper and pencil measures offered some benefits such as economy and consistency in administration, I did not consider surveys to be a desirable method to capture students' attitudes about an abstract concept such as citizenship. Surveys depend on children's reading abilities; create problems in data if some students have difficulty in following instructions; and provide information about students' judgments, but not their reasoning. Also, while
other measures of citizenship (as in the National Assessment of Educational Progress) often focus primarily on students' understanding of content, I wanted to examine students' understanding of what it meant to be a good citizen, a concept that relates to values, attitudes, skills or behaviors. These dimensions are not typically assessed because they are difficult or expensive to assess in large-scale way.

Interviews offered benefits and challenges that I carefully weighed. Benefits included the fact that interviews allowed for follow-up questions to clarify terms or ideas. Interviews did not depend on students' reading abilities, and they were suitable for probing students' and teachers' reasoning about their responses. Challenges included the fact that they were more time-consuming to administer as they required individual administration. As a result, only a random sample of four to six students was interviewed in each classroom (both service-learning and comparison).

Despite these challenges, the most useful method to collect the primary source of data for this study was semi-structured interviews with students and teachers to query and to probe them on their experiences with service-learning as well as their understanding of "citizenship" as a term and concept taught in school. Scenarios were developed for students and teachers to choose one of several models of citizenship, and then to explain their reasoning for their choices. As another data source, pre-post surveys were also developed and administered to students in third-grade and above.
To address the research questions, it is important to note that students were not asked for a direct definition of the term, "citizen", through the data collection. This was done for two reasons: (1) because I was not interested in whether students could convey the strict technical definition of citizenship and (2) because teachers during our pilot phase had expressed concern that the term would confuse or intimidate children. I was interested in their normative understanding of citizenship, and so students were asked what they thought a "good citizen" was or did. This was also perceived by teachers to be less threatening to students.

An interview protocol for service-learning students explored details about the service projects, classroom activities (such as preparation and reflection), and student learning in various areas (including personal, civic and academic) (see Appendix A). An interview protocol was also developed for comparison students that asked about their activities inside and outside of school (see Appendix B).

To explore students' understanding of good citizenship, individual student interviews included a scenario with three types of good citizens (see Figure 3.1 and Appendix C) that reflected three distinctly different models of what it meant to be a good citizen, based on review of the citizenship education literature. These options included: (1) citizenship as good behavior (Option #1):
Good citizens are “grown-ups who vote and don’t break laws” that is similar to the dutiful adult role of citizens as reflected in textbooks and promoted by the use of citizenship grades in schools; (2) citizenship as legal status (Option #2): A good citizen is “someone who was born in this country, or has passed a test for citizenship” to reflect the definition of the technical status membership in a political community and is a conception that is also taught in textbooks; and (3) citizenship as community contributor (Option #3): A good citizen is “anyone (even a young person) who tries to make the school or neighborhood better” to illustrate the dimension of citizenship that emphasizes positive action to address a need in the community.

Figure 3-1 Interview Scenario for Models of Good Citizenship

| #1 | Jim said that grown-ups who vote and who don’t break laws are good citizens. |
| #2 | Chris said that a good citizen is someone who was born in this country or has passed a test for citizenship. |
| #3 | Martha said that a good citizen is anyone (even a young person) who tries to make the school or neighborhood better. |

The scenario was introduced with the following statement: “Lots of times, adults want students to do service because it will help them become good citizens but it turns out that people mean different things when they say, ‘good
citizen' so we want to know what you think it means to be a good citizen.” Students were asked to read through the choices and to pick the idea that they agreed with most and to explain why they agreed with that statement. They were also asked to explain why they did not pick the other conceptions. Students were also encouraged to come up with their own idea of what it means to be a “good citizen”. These probing questions provided a rich understanding of students’ reasoning for why they did or did not select each option.

All interviews were taped. Interviews were coded based on categories that were drawn from the data. The categories were then analyzed based on the conceptual framework described in the literature review and reviewed for evidence of themes, patterns and disconfirming cases (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Student quotes are attributed numbers (e.g. Student #1) to protect the confidentiality of students.

**Student survey data.**

Survey data for this study was collected as part of a larger survey to measure “civic responsibility” (see Appendix D). The survey was developed by staff at the Service-learning Research and Development Center at the University of California, Berkeley and was generated from reviews of existing measures and discussion with service-learning teachers and researchers. Because many of the items on the survey did not relate to students' attitudes about citizenship, eight items were selected that reflected aspects of citizenship that may be affected by
students' service experiences. They were analyzed as individual items because they did not represent a reliable cluster or construct.\(^1\)

**Table 3-2**  
**Text of Eight Student Pre-Post Survey Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Text of Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #1</td>
<td>All students should learn about problems in the neighborhood or city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #4</td>
<td>Cities should take care of people who can't take care of themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #6 (Reverse)</td>
<td>It's hard for people my age to do anything about problems in my neighborhood or city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #9 (Reverse)</td>
<td>It's not important for all students to help out their school or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #10</td>
<td>I am interested in doing something about problems in my school or city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #11 (Reverse)</td>
<td>Only people who like volunteering should get involved in my school or city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #27</td>
<td>I work hard because it is good to help others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #31</td>
<td>I work hard because I think about how I would feel if I needed help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to clarify the way survey data for this study were analyzed. In previous large scale multi-site evaluations, data across classrooms was aggregated to present findings from pre-post surveys. It was assumed that student civic responsibility impacts would be fairly consistent across classrooms because the service-learning experiences were assumed to be of high quality (as indicated by higher than average numbers of hours of service, consistent reflection opportunities, and integration with the academic curriculum) and thus considered a relatively uniform and consistent educational intervention.

---

\(^1\) For more information about the full Civic Responsibility instrument, refer to Ammon et al., 2002.
The original CalServe study also proposed to aggregate data across classrooms and I report those results in Chapter 6. Qualitative information about individual classroom service-learning projects, however, suggested that service-learning experiences across classrooms varied widely, such as type of service project (e.g. environmental, educational, etc), levels of personal contact with individuals in the community, connection to subject matter, and types of goals articulated by teachers. Such variance in implementation created relatively unique learning environments for students, teachers and communities (Hecht, 2002). As a result, data from the pre-post surveys are also reported by classroom.

Data from pre-test and post-test surveys into an Excel file and then transferred to SPSS. Analysis of mean scores compared pre-test and post-test data, using a paired-sample two-tailed t-test of significance. An independent sample was used to compare mean scores of service-learning and comparison classrooms.

Teacher interview data.

The teachers were individually interviewed, using a semi-structured format with interview protocol (see Appendix E). Teachers were queried about their motivations for including service-learning in their classrooms, how projects were designed, and the goals and intended learning outcomes of the projects. An interview protocol was also developed for comparison teachers that focused on the learning goals they had for their students, and on how they chose their
instructional strategies (see Appendix F).

As with the student interviews, all formal interviews were taped. Teacher interviews were coded based on categories that were drawn from the data, and the information was then analyzed for evidence of themes, patterns, and disconfirming cases. I use pseudonyms (e.g. Ms. Y) to protect the confidentiality of teachers in the study.

Findings from this study are reported in the next three chapters. Given the many potential outcomes of service-learning, the next chapter explores the use of language in the practice of service-learning across classrooms to examine whether and why students were (or were not) explicitly engaged in discussions about citizenship.
Chapter Four
IS CITIZENSHIP A BAD WORD?
THE LIMITED LANGUAGE OF CITIZENSHIP IN
SERVICE-LEARNING

Teachers and students in this study were engaged in a wide diversity of
service-learning projects. Third grade students tutored first grade students in
their reading to improve their own reading skills and learn the value of helping
other people. Sixth grade students studied the ancient civilization of
Mesopotamia and created and painted a mural with a local artist to beautify their
school. Seventh graders germinated native plants and cleared whole areas in
their community of non-native species to engage their interest in botany and to
increase their caring for other living organisms (including people as well as other
life forms in the environment). Students in elementary, middle and high schools
engaged in oral history projects in partnership with seniors in their community
and as part of their English or Social Studies curriculum to promote greater
intergenerational understanding and to improve their interviewing and writing
skills.

Given this diversity of service-learning practices and potential outcomes,
to more fully understand whether, how and why service-learning may promote
citizenship in youth, it is important to examine the language used in the practice
of service-learning because "language is part of practice and it is in practice that
people learn" (Lave and Wenger, 1991, p. 85). I focus in this chapter on
examining the language used by teachers in their classrooms to frame the
service-learning experiences for their students, to examine if service-learning
experiences were intentionally aimed at fostering students' understanding of
citizenship.

Data suggests that in most cases the practice of service-learning did not
support the rhetoric of service-learning as explicit “citizenship” education as
there was virtual silence on the language and subject of “citizenship” in most
classrooms. This chapter also presents reasons for teachers' non-use and use of
the language of “citizenship”.

Citizenship Rhetoric of Service-Learning

As discussed in the opening chapter, the rhetoric used by service-learning
proponents at the local, state and national levels as well as in documents
produced by leading organizations promote citizenship development as a
rationale for service-learning activities. For example, the State Superintendent of
Public Instruction in California, Delaine Eastin, believes in the power of service-
learning to foster citizenship:

One of the goals of public education is to ensure that our students
obtain the academic skills and knowledge necessary to prepare
them for the twenty-first century. Another goal is to encourage our
student to become good citizens in our democracy...service-
learning combines both goals...effectively. (California Department
If service-learning is intended as a strategy for citizenship education, statements like this raise questions that must be examined to understand what kind of citizen is desired. Are teachers explicitly attempting to teach students about citizenship through service-learning? Or do they have other goals in mind? How do teachers frame service-learning experiences for their students through the use (and omission) of language? And in the words of Westheimer and Kahne (2002), “what kind of citizen” is desired?

To attempt to understand these questions and to explore how service-learning experiences may teach citizenship (implicitly or explicitly), the remainder of this chapter illustrates the lack of discourse in citizenship in service-learning experiences, explores teachers' reasons for not using the terminology of “citizenship” and offers a few examples of teachers who did attempt to teach their students explicitly about citizenship.

Lack of Discourse about Citizenship

Despite the purported primary purpose of service-learning as a strategy to promote active or engaged citizenship, the language of “citizenship” was missing from most service-learning experiences. The lack of discourse about citizenship is perhaps not surprising as educational reforms engendered by the landmark 1983 educational report, A Nation At Risk, and its successors have paid limited attention to conceptions of citizenship and democracy. Most educational reforms have focused instead on improving economic competitiveness by returning to
the "basics" and focusing on standards and accountability (Butts, 1989; Darling-Hammond, 1996; Fenstermacher, 1995; Goodlad, 1997; Tyack and Cuban, 1997).

Although recent reforms have not reflected lofty civic goals, some commentators have proposed the need for an alternative view of education that emphasizes teaching for democratic life (Darling-Hammond, 1996; Meier, 1995; Oakes, Quartz, Ryan, & Lipton, 2000). For many teachers, the civic mission of education may be achieved through strategies such as service-learning which promote personal, social and civic development. Teachers may wish to help students build their "civic muscles" to participate in democratic life, including fostering self-efficacy, interpersonal understanding, civic responsibility, stewardship and awareness of social issues (Battistoni, 2002; Eyler and Giles, 1999; Westheimer and Kahne, 2002; Putnam, 2000; Reich, 2002).

However, if teaching about citizenship was considered one of the primary rationales for service-learning by its proponents, this study suggests that teaching about citizenship was not an explicit goal for many teachers implementing service-learning experiences. When asked if they used "citizenship" language in their classes, 14 out of 25 service-learning teachers (or 56%) reported that they did not use the term at all in their classrooms. Of the 11 service-learning teachers that did report using "citizen" or "citizenship", only four teachers (16%) connected their discussion of citizenship extensively with their service-learning projects. The others (28%) occasionally discussed
citizenship with their students but not consistently or not in relation to the service-learning projects.

When students engaged in service-learning projects were asked if they heard the word, “citizen” or “citizenship” in their class, 63% (53 of 84 students)\(^1\) reported that they do not recall their teachers using the terms in class. This finding suggests that teaching explicitly about “citizenship” was not a high priority for most teachers and that service-learning experiences occurred in schools that placed a low value on citizenship development (Darling-Hammond, 1996; McDonnell and Conover, 2000; ECS, 2001).

*Is Citizenship A Bad Word?*

“Citizen and citizenship are powerful words. They speak of respect, of rights, of dignity...It’s a weighty, monumental, humanist word.” (Fraser and Gordon, 1998, p. 113)

Because most teachers did not explicitly frame the service-learning experiences in their classes as a means of teaching students about “citizenship”, students did not necessarily connect their service-learning experiences in their schools and communities with their pre-existing understanding or connotations of that word. The following excerpt from a high school student interview was typical:

**Interviewer:** Did your idea of what it meant to be a “good citizen” change because of your experience in the (service-learning) project?

---

\(^1\) Although 107 student interviews were conducted, 11 students did not complete this part of the interview. Of the 96 remaining students, 84 participated in service-learning activities and 12 did not as comparison or non-service-learning students.
Student: Well, I've never really thought about that subject or never really thought it would make me a good citizen to help... So I guess it's made me a better citizen, if I think about it.

Interviewer: So you hadn't really thought about your project in terms of being a good citizen?

Student: Yeah.

The lack of "citizenship" language suggested that it would be useful to examine why teachers would knowingly or unknowingly avoid using the terminology. Their reasons ranged from conscious avoidance of the terminology of citizenship, to lack of awareness of service-learning as a means of teaching students about citizenship, to the belief that the desired outcomes for service-learning were other than civic or political, as illustrated in the following section.

Fear of state proposition 187.

A few teachers avoided using the term, "citizen", because they believed it would create an environment of fear for their students. For example, a service-learning coordinator in a rural northern California area commented that the concept of citizenship reminded her of "green cards" when she described her community's awareness of the consequences of Proposition 187:

I think people are aware of it. The Hispanic community is certainly aware of it and it's a scary thing in their lives because a lot of mothers are not legal. A lot of dads have come here, gotten work, and have become legal, and then they bring their wives back and the wives aren't legal, so it's real...And a lot of the kids aren't legal either. It becomes real hard for them to go out and seek medical
care and take care of themselves because they're afraid all the time. And I don’t think the other kids are aware of how scary that really is. (Ms. K).

Similarly, a middle school teacher in southern California who taught students who were recent immigrants and learning English as a Second Language (ESL) noted that she avoided the language of citizenship because “some of my students are not here legally and I could care less. And I don’t want to get into that because it can kind of scare them” (Ms. D).

Avoidance of divisive issues.

Teachers also avoided the terminology of “citizenship” because it raised other controversial issues. The same middle school teacher noted above from southern California explained that the notion of citizenship evoked feelings of “ethnocentrism” as she explained an incident that occurred in her class:

I had a kid stand up in my seventh period class and say, “I’m right because I’m white” and “white power.” ... I don’t want to incite that in my classroom. Not that I have anything against [the use of citizenship] in certain classrooms. In that ESL classroom, I wouldn’t use it. I think I’m just kind of being cautious. (Ms. D).

This teacher’s comment illustrated that some teachers avoided the use of “citizenship” because of difficult conversations that the term would evoke, including controversial issues such as nationality, race and power. Instead of addressing this child’s opinions as part of a broader conversation, the student was assigned to a different classroom. This avoidance of conflict is not
surprising to social studies researchers who have observed that the culture of schools tend to avoid conflict and controversy (Hahn, 1991; Hess, 2002; Kahne et al., 2000; Niemi and Junn, 1998).

Another high school teacher recognized this aspect of schools and explained it in this way:

I think we try to do our best to minimize any conflict in schools. And I think we like to convince ourselves that the reason we want to minimize the conflict is because...some things are too difficult to talk about and if they're difficult to talk about, it's best that we don't talk about it...we don't want to bring them up to kids and we don't have solutions and if we don't have solutions, we shouldn't talk about the problems. (Ms. D).

This teacher goes on, however, to explain the value of discussing difficult problems:

I think there is always something to be gained by talking about the issues, even if you have two sides of the story, even if you have two completely different ways of looking at the world.

She clearly welcomed discussing issues such as “racism, sexism and classism”, even if they engendered disagreement from individuals who have “completely different ways of looking at the world” (Ms. J). However, this viewpoint was not typical of most teachers in the sample (service-learning or comparison).

_Lack of priority in the school curriculum._

Several teachers reported that they did not teach explicitly about citizenship because civic goals were not important priorities in their schools. For
example, when asked if she talked about citizenship in her class, an elementary school teacher observed that teaching about citizenship "doesn't seem to be a priority to teach at my school" (Ms. O). Her observation reflected the overall lack of attention to civic goals in her school (and perhaps in public schools in general) rather than a fear of the terminology. The lack of priority was illustrated in at least two ways: first, that teaching about citizenship was not a goal for many teachers in creating service-learning experiences in their classroom and second, that teaching students about citizenship was not a priority for their grade level or subject matter curriculum.

Not the primary goal for service-learning

Several teachers did not consider service-learning as a strategy to explicitly teach citizenship. Instead, they focused more on the personal and social development of students. In some cases, teachers clearly wanted to teach civic outcomes through the service-learning experiences. However, they did not connect these outcomes to explicit teaching about what it meant to be a citizen.

Even when citizenship was an important goal, teachers often did not connect teaching of citizenship to their service-learning projects as illustrated by a middle school teacher who reported that teaching about citizenship was an important goal:

I don't know if I would directly link [citizenship] to the projects we've done. I definitely think that their understanding of citizenship has improved more this year because I've discussed it
more with them and really emphasized it more, and made it clear this year in particular that the grade wouldn't be purely based just on behavior. That you really have to be participating and be prepared. And I don't know if I would link it, their understanding of that, to the service project. I definitely mentioned it in regards to the project, but I wouldn't say the project helps to improve that understanding. (Mr. J).

This teacher's observation suggests that merely engaging students in service-learning experiences may not necessarily contribute to their understanding of citizenship.

**Not a part of the grade level or subject matter curriculum**

For other teachers, the lack of priority to teach citizenship was based on grade level or subject matter expectations, reflecting what was deemed appropriate to teach at a particular grade level. For example, an elementary school teacher noted that she did not discuss citizenship with her students because she felt that they would “get that in the eighth or twelfth grades” (Ms. O).

When asked how citizenship was taught to students, another elementary school teacher explained:

There is a story for one thing about the Statue of Liberty and people coming to this country. So they do get some of the adult part of it. I'm trying to think of a story we read where they actually said, good citizens. But I can't recall. I don't know that it's part of the curriculum. (Ms. L).

A high school teacher who taught peer education at her high school made a distinction among the subject matter disciplines in explaining why she would
not use the terminology of citizenship: "I think a word like 'citizenship' for me belongs in a civics class or a history class" (Ms. S). Another high school teacher who taught social studies then made grade level distinctions within the subject matter:

The world studies text discusses a lot of democracy - and that's about it. I think that when the kids get to the 11th grade and they are doing U.S. History and studying the Constitution. Then when they get to Civics in their senior year, [there is] much more of a definition of citizen and of voting but...not a lot in the tenth grade. (Ms. Y).

These teachers' reasons illustrated that teaching explicitly about "citizenship" was not a priority for many teachers even if they valued other personal and civic outcomes of service-learning. For some reason, the language of citizenship did not capture these other civic outcomes.

Negative connotations or personal feelings about the word.

Still other teachers seemed to view "citizenship" as involving a different set of concepts than those they wanted to foster. These teachers decided not to use the terms "citizenship" or "citizen" because of the negative connotations that the words carried. For example, an elementary school teacher explained:

I think it is because when I grew up, I connect citizenship with maybe these kind of dry definitions of it—and kind of a 50's...mom with homework and dad at the office..you know, "You must be a good citizen", kind of flat definition. So I suppose that's what would be my own prejudice. (Ms. S).
Another middle school teacher felt that the definition of citizenship was too limiting and narrow:

I wonder if it's because so many of us who are middle-aged have a somewhat negative image of it because [citizenship] was used so strictly and to mean only a very limited number of things. I've often...tried to broaden the idea of citizen because it is so often narrowed down into voting and saying the pledge and that's just never set right with me. (Ms. R).

Another high school teacher agreed, distinguishing the legal status of citizenship with other meanings of the term: “To me the word has a legal connotation to it, not so much a communal connotation. I'd search for a different word” (Ms. W). Still other teachers considered the terminology of “citizenship” as “old fashioned” and “archaic”.

Alternatives to “Citizenship”

For many reasons, most teachers who implemented service-learning in their classrooms did not view it as a means of explicitly teaching students about citizenship. When asked what phrases they used with students to explain why service was important to do, teachers described a range of alternatives to denote individual and community development. These phrases may be relevant to students' understanding of citizenship but the teachers did not engage the word (or, arguably, the concept) directly.

The following section lays out the different categories of alternative phrases used by service-learning teachers. The largest number of teachers (n=6)
used phrases such as “community member, community involvement, community participant” in place of citizenship.

Community member.

As one teacher in an urban elementary school declared, “usually citizen and community member are used interchangeably” (Ms. A). Another teacher in a suburban middle school used similar language with her students: “This is what you should be doing for your community” (Ms. P). This emphasis on community and the role of individuals as members of a community clearly reflects priorities of communitarian theory to foster individuals’ connections to a larger community.

For these teachers, the notion of community was important for different reasons and raised other dimensions of communitarianism and republicanism. For example, some teachers emphasized the notion that individuals should be actively involved as participants in a community. For others, fostering an association to the well-being of others was an important aspect of community. For example, a high school teacher in a rural area of northern California explained that “I would talk about membership, I would talk about belonging” because she focused on how service-learning experiences created opportunities for students to be “community members” (Ms. W).
Another middle school teacher explained the need for service-learning as a means of strengthening connections between youth and their communities primarily because he saw few opportunities to do so:

I think the lives that children lead today, they need service-learning because they become disconnected with the lifestyles they have today with the TV’s and the videos and the electronic games, the technology. They get disconnected. I think service-learning helps students get more connected to the communities, getting them out of the classroom and into being aware of what a community is. (Mr. M).

The prevalence of this type of reasoning regarding connection to and concern for community suggests a new subcategory of a Personally Responsible Citizen for Westheimer and Kahne’s framework as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6 based on students’ views of good citizenship.

**Responsible student.**

While some teachers clearly emphasized using service-learning as a means of fostering a sense of community membership and connection, other teachers focused more on encouraging “good” or “responsible” students within their schools. For example, an elementary school teacher explained that rather than using the language of “citizenship” in her school, her colleagues used “responsibility a lot. Responsible student...Helpful student” (Ms. S). These teachers suggest that “responsibility” means obedience to school rules but also helpfulness to others.
A middle school teacher in a border town of California and Mexico did not consciously use the terms, "citizen" or "citizenship" because of the large population of Mexican-born students who attended the school. Instead, she focused on the behaviors and attitudes of being a "good student". She explained:

What would a student do? What should you do as a student? What is your responsibility as a student rather than a citizen? Maybe student is the word. I just haven't thought of the word 'citizen' as using it any time...I'm trying to think of if I've ever used the word 'citizen' and if I did, I didn't mean citizenship. I meant being a person and doing what you know you should be doing to help yourself and to help others. (Ms. N).

Another middle school teacher used phrases that emphasized students' responsibilities to model good behavior for younger students: "I don't use the word citizen... I talk about being responsible or being a role model or a mentor because that's what we do with the kindergartners" (Ms. D).

Good person.

Rather than focusing on the role of youth as "students" in school, several teachers used phrases such as "good person" or "good people" to describe their goals for student development more broadly. In this way of thinking that is reflective of American themes of individual morality, Protestantism and liberalism, by focusing on creating good people, one automatically created good citizens (Kaestle, 1983). Typical of this reasoning was this teacher in an inner city middle school:
We talk about characteristics of a good person, a good moral person. If you’re into drugs, chances are you’re not a good citizen. You're not a good person, so in turn, you're not a good citizen. If you're a husband, or boyfriend, and you abuse your wife or girlfriend, you're not a good person, and you can't be a good citizen. They go hand in hand. We talk about, what are things that make a good person. If you respect people, that makes you a good person, and chances are, you're a good citizen as well. (Mr. M).

Steward.

Going beyond the notion of treating other people well, two teachers in suburban schools chose phrases that indicated the responsibility of humans to preserve the environment for future generations. A middle school teacher noted, “I don’t use the word citizen. I use environmental steward” (Ms. D). An elementary school teacher expanded the focus on the physical environment to include human institutions: “This would have been stewardship...about better neighborhoods and school—that’s stewardship so I’ve probably used a different vocabulary” (Ms. E).

Human being.

At the very broadest level, two teachers emphasized service to the community as actions that individuals should take because of the responsibility they share in common humanity. A middle school science teacher in small town in northern California couched her concern for “human beings” as the reason for involving her students in service-learning experiences. In particular, she wanted her students to understand human beings in the context of all living organisms:
I think, being a caring person, a caring human being on this planet because this planet needs a lot of caring too... what I try and do in science is say that everything we do in here has to do with every organism on the planet, not just humans. So that's part of why when I talk about things like this I'm just broader and looking at us as humans and the responsibility we have as human beings, rather than a fungus-being or a beetle-being. Or a flower being. Part of that is because it's science. (Ms. R).

While this teacher used the language of caring as a universal human responsibility to other living organisms, another teacher did not use the language of citizenship but clearly framed her concern for human beings in the language of justice:

Interviewer: Do you talk about citizenship as part of your class?

Teacher: I talk about it roundabout.

Interviewer: Are there other ways you talk about it?

Teacher: I talk about being somebody who fights for justice. I talk about being somebody who tries to stop racism, who tries to stop violence. I mean, I talk about the action, not the name of it.

Interviewer: And when you say, "someone", is it that, this is what means to be a "good person", this is what it means to be a "good community member"? Or it is just...

Teacher: Human. We're humans. We all have to do this thing because we're human. (Ms. J).

These teachers suggested two important themes, an ethic of care and an ethic of justice, that were not raised explicitly by other teachers. Feminist critiques of citizenship, in fact, offer these themes as important to citizenship, especially valuing relationships and caring for others (ethic of care) as well as concern for equality and human rights (ethic of justice). These teachers appeared
to promote these themes of care and of justice as important sources of motivation upon which individuals should act to help other people or the larger environment. These themes will be explored more fully in subsequent chapters.

The alternative phrases used by teachers are important civic outcomes, even if teachers did not relate them explicitly to citizenship. The point is that the service-learning experiences did not directly engage students' understanding of citizenship. What students did learn about citizenship from their service-learning experiences will be explored in more detail in Chapter Six.

Although most teachers in this sample did not feel the need to teach students explicitly about citizenship, four teachers intentionally and consistently chose to do so. The following section offers brief descriptions of how they defined citizenship, how it related to their service-learning projects and why such teaching was important to them.

A Few Teachers Teach about "Citizenship"

Of the 25 service-learning teachers who completed interviews, four teachers (16%) made a conscious choice to use the terminology of “citizenship” in their classrooms and to work with their students to better understand the concept through their service-learning projects. Seven other teachers (28%) said that they used the terminology, but as indicated in their interviews and in classroom observations, the language was not used extensively or intentionally with their service-learning projects so their classrooms are not described here.
One teacher, Ms. C, working in a continuation high school in a small town connected her discussion of "productive citizenship" explicitly to the service-learning experiences offered to all students in their small school. She explained that the school provided many opportunities for students to be involved in the community because "our number one goal is to help our students develop into being productive citizens." This was particularly important to many of her students who had previously exhibited anti-social behaviors such as truancies, infractions of community laws, or alcohol and drug abuse.

Group service-learning projects providing companionship to elders or students with disabilities provided opportunities for students to feel positive about helping the community and receive affirmation for pro-social and responsible behaviors. Students were also encouraged to take leadership in organizing these activities, or to initiate other projects.

For this teacher, the idea of productive citizenship was intimately tied to the notion of individual and collective responsibility that came from her personal experience and from her conviction about what was missing from her students' lives. She explained:

I grew up in a small rural California community and lived on a ranch...One of the principles that my parents instilled in me was kind of a collective responsibility...And I really think that's just all part of my life - so therefore it became a part of this because one of
the things that I perceived when I first got to the school was the lack of that dimension, the idea that you're responsible.

Ms. C believed that service opportunities provided to students taught them the importance of being responsible for others and were opportunities to “connect” her students with society that was a real “passion” for her. Ultimately, her hope was that through these experiences, the students were “going to be better spouses or partners. They’re going to be better parents. They’re going to be better workers that respect people’s rights, and listen to people and share and all of that. And they’re going to be better people. They’re going to be better citizens.” Thus, citizenship was important to teach explicitly as a way to connect her students to society. Overall, this teacher exemplified what it meant to teach a model of Personally Responsible Citizenship, combining individual responsibility to take care of self and to help other individuals.

Teaching more than the basics.

Another teacher in an inner city middle school, Ms. M, explicitly taught citizenship to her students because of her own beliefs that citizenship development was an important goal of education. She defined citizenship as “thinking beyond yourself and feeling a part of a community and a responsibility to that community in some capacity.”

She also explained why teaching citizenship should be central to education and why she chose to use service-learning in her classroom:
Teaching is not just teaching about basics...So much of education is being exposed to all different things, and preparing your kids to be responsible citizens. So, I think service-learning is a way to do that.

In teaching citizenship, this teacher combined explicit attention to citizenship grades to promote personally responsible behaviors ("a general awareness of being responsible for yourself and not making a mess behind yourself, picking up and taking responsibility for things when you need to take responsibility") with several service-learning projects that drew on what students had learned. In particular, Ms. M facilitated conversations that connected student learning to larger questions: "Can we see any impact or any difference that we've made?...What can you do as a sixth grader?"

For example, students drew from their study of Mesopotamian and Sumerian inventions to create a website to educate other students and teachers. Cave art studied in literature was the inspiration of a school mural that was designed and painted by students in an effort to beautify their school. Reflections about their first year of middle school became the basis of a guide and visits to local elementary schools to orient incoming sixth graders and help them in their transition to middle school.

This teacher's goals for teaching citizenship also exemplified what it meant to be a Personally Responsible Citizen with her emphasis on personally responsible behavior that also encouraged helping other individuals.
Community membership in the classroom and school.

A third-grade teacher in an urban elementary school, Ms. A., used the language of citizenship in her classroom to foster her students' understanding of what it meant to participate in a community. She explained that “our class motto is leadership, scholarship and citizenship and we talk about those three things in our classroom.” This teacher defined citizenship in the following way: “I say you’re not being a good citizen, you’re not helping to make this community better.”

In her classroom, she explicitly described the role of citizen as part of a collective, a community in a manner which she considered “socialist based”:

We talk about how if we’re living in a community and one person in the community says something to hurt, even if it is just hurting themselves, it’s hurting the whole community...We talk about issues of trust and issues of kindness.

She goes on to define citizenship as interchangeable with community membership. For example, she defined her classroom as a community and asked her students:

What’s our job as a community? It’s to learn...If you’re standing in the way of learning, then you’re not being a good citizen, a good member of the community. And your job as a community member is to help everyone here to learn. If you don’t learn, then we haven’t done our job.

The service-learning projects selected by the teacher supported the idea that the purpose of the classroom community was to promote learning as she created a “book buddy” project with a kindergarten class in their school. Ms. A
extended the collective responsibility of students to focus on learning within their own classroom to the larger school as her students read to the younger students and helped them craft the text and pictures of a story for a "Young Authors" Project.

This aspect of community membership was not clearly addressed in Westheimer and Kahne's framework and this dimension of Personally Responsible Citizen as Community Contributor is discussed in more detail in Chapter Six.

*All aspects of citizenship.*

A sixth-grade elementary school teacher who worked in a community on the border of California and Mexico worked with other sixth grade teachers in his school to discuss with their students what it meant to be a good citizen. He explained:

We talked with them not only about what a good citizen is at school but in the community and in general, in life. There are a lot of things that we do [in] the community that make us good citizens. Whether my kids understood the concept is something else. But we made the point that a good citizen involves many different areas in life...at home, at play or at work. (Mr. A).

When queried about his understanding of citizenship and what he taught to his students, Mr. A strongly stated that he taught citizenship as legal status, as law-abiding voter and as community contributor through social studies and the student council elections. He discussed how the election system worked but “we
also talk about what a good citizen is as far as not only behavior but also what they do with the skills that they learn. We try to teach them not only what's good in school inside the [class]room but also what's good outside school and outside the community" (Mr. A).

The emphasis on teaching students decision-making skills as well as encouraging civic behaviors was illustrated by how Mr. A introduced service-learning to his students, emphasizing the goal of service-learning to learn "hands-on experiences" and "life long skills" and how students "were going to make the decisions." He explained, "I didn't say we're going to do this, this and that. I asked for suggestions. The student voice is very important to us because they have to buy into it. If they don't buy into it, it's not going to be successful."

The desire to foster student buy-in did not stop Mr. A from making suggestions about what his students could do. For example, he took his students around the school grounds and asked them, "Is there something that we can do to improve it?" Students came up with many suggestions, including recycling containers, more shade trees, trimming bushes, better watering systems and fertilizer. This list of student-generated ideas has driven the service and fundraising activities for his class as Mr. A also found ways to connect the study of literature, science and mathematics to the service-learning project of school beautification.
The Importance of Using the Language of Citizenship

Although these four teachers provided evidence of why some teachers intentionally used the language of citizenship in their classrooms, it was clear that most teachers did not find it important to use. So why should it matter if students are not connecting these outcomes to their understanding of citizenship? There are several responses to this question:

First, if educators are expected to teach about citizenship, the terminology should be used, especially if the words or phrases are unclear or contested. Theoretically and in practice, citizenship is a particularly contested concept (Beiner, 1995; Kahne and Westheimer, 2000; Turner, 1993; Van Gunsteren, 1994). Language is critical to examine, especially if individuals are to achieve a common understanding about the meaning of words or concepts. Indeed, without dialogue and clarifying meaning behind words, understanding remains limited.

Second, although teachers may view the language of citizenship as "narrow" or "archaic", the terminology and concept are important to teach students because the concept of citizenship and legal status still hold power while many definitions of citizenship exist. For example, policies restrict funding based on legal citizenship status for educational loans, fellowships and health care. While service-learning is not necessary to teach the legal definition of citizenship and the legal status of children will not change after a child does a service-learning project, their understanding of what it means to be a good citizen could broaden.
Finally, when contested terms such as citizenship are avoided, students are not given the opportunity to learn or unlearn connotations that they have when they think of citizen or citizenship. That is, what students learn at home or in their personal contacts remain unchallenged. Since citizenship is a significant dimension of individuals' public identity, such conversations should take place in public schools to assist the learning process.

**Implications**

The most significant finding in this chapter is that most teachers who used service-learning did not talk about "citizenship." This is at odds with the purpose of service-learning as expressed by many proponents. The alternative terms and phrases that teachers use in place of "citizenship" (e.g. being a "good person" or "human being") connote individual behaviors that are moralistic and, for the most part, take place outside of the political and institutional spheres.

While these phrases tend to reflect a liberal conception of citizenship that emphasize individual behaviors, the most used alternative phrases, "community member" or "community contributor", reflect a more republican model of citizenship and represents an important contribution of service-learning as a strategy for citizenship education (as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Six). The choice to use more non-political phrases in place of citizenship, however, conveyed models of citizenship that emphasized helping actions but deemphasized political behaviors of citizens.
Before moving onto the next two findings chapters, it is important to note that even as the language of "citizenship" was missing from many service-learning experiences, the diversity of teachers' language indicating goals for service-learning suggest that teachers play a critical role in shaping service-learning experiences for students. That is, not all service-learning experiences are the same. While this point seems obvious to state, literature in service-learning has only begun to appreciate that the "nature of the particular goals selected seem to have a profound effect on implementation strategies" (Ammon et al., 2002, p. 2).

Review of teachers' goals for their service-learning projects in this study, however, suggested that many teachers had difficulty articulating clear goals for service-learning as well as designing appropriate service-learning activities to support their stated goals (Ammon et al., 2001). As a result, I focus most of the discussion in the next two chapters on the overall student and teacher samples without examining the correspondence of responses between teachers and their students. When teachers were consistent and intentional in connecting goals and practices, I highlight these classrooms throughout in Chapter 6.

The examination of language only begins to illuminate how teachers and students engaged in the service-learning projects that may foster students' civic development. To further explore service-learning as a strategy for citizenship education, I begin in the next chapter to examine students' understanding of what it means to be a good citizen.
Chapter Five
SETTING THE CONTEXT FOR SERVICE-LEARNING:
CITIZENSHIP AS LEGAL STATUS AND GOOD BEHAVIOR
(OPTIONS #1 AND #2)

The previous chapter examined the language used in the practice of service-learning to explore how those experiences were framed by teachers explicitly or implicitly for their students. It appeared that the discourse of "citizenship" was limited in most service-learning experiences, indicating that most teachers did not use service-learning as a strategy for teaching citizenship explicitly. Given that the language of citizenship was absent in many service-learning experiences, it was important to ask the students directly, "what does it mean to be a good citizen?" to examine what students may learn about citizenship (directly or indirectly) through service-learning experiences.

Before examining the impact of service-learning on student's understanding of citizenship, the purpose of this chapter is to explore the range of student thinking about what it means to be a good citizen, drawing from student interviews across all of the classrooms (service-learning and non-service-learning). This chapter summarizes evidence of models of good citizenship - as good behavior and as legal status - taught in public schools in this study. This evidence sets the context for examining the impact of service-learning as a strategy for citizenship in the next chapter.

I developed an interview scenario articulating three types of citizenship that drew from the conceptual framework detailed in the Literature Review. The
scenario included the following options: (1) citizenship as rule-abiding individual that is similar to the traditional duties of adult citizenship to follow laws and to vote as reflected in textbooks and citizenship grades; (2) citizenship as legal status to reflect the technical definition of citizenship as membership with rights in a political community often taught in textbooks; and (3) citizenship as active contributor to illustrate the dimension of citizenship that emphasizes positive action to address needs of other people or of the community.

As noted in the Chapter Three, the purpose of this study was not to explore if students understood the technical definition of citizenship but to examine their understanding of what it meant to be a good citizen. Table 5-1 illustrates the number of students' first choices among these three options.

Table 5-1 Student Choices of Different Models of “Good Citizenship”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students First Choices (of the three options)</th>
<th>First choice of Service-learning students (n=92)</th>
<th>First choice of Non-service-learning students (n=12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students believed that...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship is about voting and following laws or rules (Option #1)</td>
<td>16% (14.5/92)</td>
<td>50% (6/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship is about status (by birth or naturalization by taking test) (Option #2)</td>
<td>4% (4/92)</td>
<td>0% (0/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship is about making their school or neighborhood better (Option #3)</td>
<td>79% (72.5/92)</td>
<td>50% (6/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Described Own Definition of Citizenship</td>
<td>1% (1/92)</td>
<td>0% (0/12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 I use the phrase “legal status” to denote the status of individuals as citizens or non-citizens in a political community or nation-state.

2 Students were asked to select their first choice among the three options. Three service-learning students selected two “top choices,” so each of their choices has been counted as 0.5 within their respective categories. One service-learning student created her own definition of what it meant to be a good citizen.
Most students involved in service-learning (79%) chose the model of good citizenship as helping other individuals or helping their community (Option #3) as compared to 50% of the comparison (non-service-learning) students who selected Option #3. This difference between service-learning and comparison students' choices was significant at the p<.05 level, suggesting that service-learning had a significant impact on students' desire to contribute to their school, neighborhood or community and to "make things better." This finding will be examined in further detail in the next chapter by examining students' reasons for selecting Option #3.

To describe the context for that discussion, this chapter examines the reasoning provided by 22% of the service-learning students who selected good behavior (Option #1) or legal status (Option #2) as their definition of good citizenship. This finding suggests that other models of good citizenship were taught in public schools, creating an environment of potentially conflicting models that still hold currency for students and teachers in public schools.

In the following section, I first discuss the model of "citizenship as legal status" evidenced in Option #2 because it is typically taught in the explicit school curriculum (Niemi and Junn, 1998) and represents the technical, legal definition of citizenship. I also discuss the reasons why students did not choose Option #2 to illustrate the contested nature of citizenship.

---

3 I used a Chi-square test to compare the number of students (service-learning and non-service-learning) who chose Option #1 or Option #2 to the number of students who chose Option #3.
Based on initial data analysis, I separate discussion of the two behaviors in Option #1—following rules and voting—because of the distinct differences in student reasoning about their choices. I first review students' responses defining good citizenship as following rules, model that was taught primarily through the implicit curriculum through citizenship grades and awards. I then discuss the limited responses from students about the role of voting and politics in their definition of citizenship that suggest apolitical models of good citizenship taught in schools in this study. I also lay out students' reasons for not selecting Option #1.

Viewing Citizenship as Legal Status (Selecting Option #2)

At least four service-learning students (4%) selected this option because it focused on the technical definition of citizenship as legal status in a political community such as a nation-state. For these students, citizenship as legal status was necessary to "good citizenship".

For example, a middle school student in a border community explained, "it's like you can help the neighborhood or the schools, but that doesn't make you a citizen" (Student #6). In short, helping behaviors did not give an individual legal citizenship status. A high school student in an urban community in northern California agreed that the issue of legal status was significant to him: "If you're born here, then you're a citizen. That's the bottom line that I get" (Student #96).
Four service-learning teachers acknowledged that legal status was important to acknowledge when discussing citizenship. An elementary school teacher in a border community declared that all three models of citizenship in the interview scenario (including legal status) defined what it meant to be a good citizen. A middle school teacher explained that having the legal status of citizenship conveyed an individual’s “permanent commitment to...a community or society” (Mr. J). During the interviews, students described how they learned this model of citizenship from textbooks, their family members (who, in some cases, students were helping with the citizenship exam), media and past teachers.

Rejecting Citizenship as Legal Status (Rejecting Option #2)

While the legal status of citizenship was important to some students’ and teachers’ understanding of good citizenship, many more students believed that the legal status of an individual was not important to their understanding of “good citizenship”. These students and teachers understood the technical definition of citizenship as legal status; they just believed that legal status “doesn’t have anything to do with being a good citizen” (Student #64). For these students, there was a true disconnect between the distinction of “citizenship as status” and “citizenship as desirable behavior” (Kymlicka and Norman, 1995). Students offered different reasons, however, for disregarding legal status as an important dimension of “good citizenship”.
Citizenship is an accident of birth.

Several students suggested that focusing on the legal status of citizenship was not fair to include in defining good citizenship because technical citizenship was simply an accident of birth. As one student observed, “if you're born in this country, you were just born... it's not something you just did” (Student #41). Another student noted that for non-citizens, “it's not their fault they weren't born here” (Student #12). A high school teacher supported this reasoning when she explained that individuals could not take “credit” for their citizenship status because “where you’re born is a decision that your parents made, not you. And if you’re not part of the decision making process...I don’t think should get claim to it” (Ms. T).

Citizenship has more to do with contributions.

Other students explained that a person’s contributions to a community or society were most important in determining who is a good citizen. One student living in a small town near the California/Oregon border explained: “[legal status] is just a piece of paper that will tell you you’re a citizen. It doesn't mean anything about being a good citizen, a citizen that helps others” (Student #10). Yet another student explained, "It's not whether you're born here, it's you want to help the community. If you want to make it a better place then you're a good person, you're a good citizen. You want to help this place” (Student #82).

Teachers also held these sentiments. For example, a high school teacher in
a rural area in northern California explained "just because we're born here, we've passed a test... that has nothing to do with how you're contributing to society or the community as a whole...[legal status] to me has nothing to do with being a good citizen" (Mr. D). The other high school teacher who believed the individuals could not "take credit" for the citizenship status added, "I think changing things, making things better is what makes you good citizen. I mean it's the only thing that makes you a good citizen" (Ms. J).

*Citizenship test does not measure what is important.*

On the technical process of naturalization, students disagreed about the usefulness of the paper-pencil citizenship test to determine if one is a "good citizen". One student believed in the test because it helped to ensure that citizens know some aspects of a country's history, laws and culture "because you got to know something about this country" to be a good citizen (Student #75).

On the other hand, many more students objected to the use of a test to assess good citizenship. For example, citizenship was about caring about where you lived and that was not measured by a test: "just because you can pass a test doesn't mean you're going to be a good citizen and just because you were born here doesn't mean you really give a damn about this country or the people in it" (Student #83).

Teachers also believed that a citizenship test was an inadequate measure. As stated by a middle school teacher, "the test is simply a matter of knowing
some facts about the country and the government of where ever you’re living” (Ms. R). Another middle school teacher questioned the validity of the paper-pencil test: “from a teacher’s standpoint, a test isn’t going to tell you anything anyway. I wouldn’t pass the test for citizenship” (Ms. D).

Citizenship as legal status includes people who are “bad.”

For other students, the legal status of citizenship does not guarantee that one acts as a good or responsible citizen. A middle school student pointed out that just because one holds official citizenship, many official citizens do not follow laws: “some people who are born in this country...are just disobedient, they don’t obey the law. Some people in different countries probably come here and are better than people over here” (Student #60).

Citizenship as status is exclusionary.

Teachers and students also disliked the concept of legal status as “exclusive”, “racist” or “prejudiced” as illustrated by this high school student’s statement: “it's racism to just say that someone who was born in this country was a good citizen” (Student #9).

In an astute comment that distinguished between the priorities of a nation-state and the people who live within it, a middle school student from Mexico and living in a homogenous community in northern California explained that the concern for citizenship as legal status was “what the country’s trying to
do' (Student #74). That is, citizenship as legal status is a concept important to nation-states attempting to determine who receives benefits of citizenship but it does not define how individuals choose to help others or their communities as "good citizens" would be expected to do.

In sum, teaching about citizenship should consider this model of citizenship as legal status not only because it is the technical definition but because this model conflicts with other models of citizenship that may be taught. Attention to this model of citizenship may seem obvious to recommend but has rarely been addressed in service-learning studies (R. Battistoni, personal communication, October 24, 2002). In addition to legal status, some students found another model of citizenship taught in schools - citizenship as good behavior - compelling to their understanding of good citizenship.

Citizenship as Good Behavior and Voting as a Duty (Selecting Option #1)

This model of citizenship was intended to focus on the minimal expectations of good citizens to follow rules or laws and to vote as a basic civic duty. In addition, it was intended to emphasize the notion of citizenship as an adult role and set of behaviors. While some students reported the importance of both voting and following rules and laws in selecting this option, more students reported distinct reasons why each were (or were not) important to their understanding of good citizenship and so these two aspects of Option #1 are discussed separately. I focus first on the aspect of following rules and laws...
because more students cited this aspect of choosing this scenario. I then address the issue of voting at the end of this chapter.

Good citizenship as following rules.

Students felt that rules and laws should be followed for different reasons. For example, some elementary and middle school students felt it was important to follow rules simply because they exist: “It's not really good to break the law” (Student #23). Other young students expressed the need to follow rules and laws to avoid negative consequences. For example, elementary school students believed that people who break laws “make people mad” (Student #71) and people who do not follow laws “go in jail” (Student #57). Another middle school student in the same school suggested:

“it's not just making your neighborhood better, it’s everything you do. It includes listening to the teacher, not talking back. I think it's better to follow rules and not break laws” (Student #91).

A student enrolled in a continuation high school said that a good citizen was one who followed rules and took personal responsibility: “being a good citizen, you don't steal, you don't vandalize, you don't litter. [A good citizen is] someone who's able to take care of himself” (Student #12). For this student, taking care of oneself, following rules and not causing trouble to others were acts of good citizenship.

Other students recognized the importance of following laws because they helped create safe, orderly communities. Several students from an urban middle
school observed, “people break laws a lot” in their community. They believed that laws should be followed “because laws are made for a reason and when you first make them, they’re not supposed to be broken” and “you shouldn’t break laws [because] it’s kind of like a community thing” (Student #67). A teacher in a small town middle school agreed that good citizens should follow rules and laws because “you understand the reason for laws and you obey them. You’re a person that takes being allowed to live in a society seriously” (Mr. R).

This model of citizenship as good behavior was clearly illustrated through the use of citizenship grades administered in many elementary and middle schools and in a few high schools in the study. Students received good grades in citizenship for behaving well as exemplified by this middle school teacher’s description of his school’s criteria for assigning citizenship grades:

I think that it’s just how your actions affect the learning environment. Like, if you’re talking all the time or throwing things or up and out of your seat and making it hard to teach, or if you bring in other people with you. Just being counterproductive, that’s going to affect how you’re viewed as a citizen in school. (Mr. R).

Students were expected to be orderly in their class and larger school environments as described by an elementary school teacher:

After a recess or lunch hour, they have to stop and freeze and then walk to their lines and to behave in that line waiting for the teachers to come and get them. That kind of thing is also part of citizenship. (Ms. L).

Students clearly understood the criteria for good citizenship grades. For example, many students reported the importance of “being quiet”, “following
rules”, “listening to the teacher” and “not causing trouble”. Citizenship awards also rewarded students for another form of good behavior, that of being a helpful, kind person. Students received such awards when they helped or showed kindness toward another student.

*Citizenship as is Not Just about Good Behavior (Rejecting Option #1)*

Although the model of citizenship as good behavior was compelling for some students, other students did not value the importance of following rules. They provided two types of reasons: first, the exhortation to follow laws is weak because everyone breaks a rule or law at some point. Second, some laws and rules should not be followed because they are unfair or wrong and need to be changed.

Students of all ages, elementary through high school, believed that exhorting people to follow laws as desirable for good citizenship was not compelling to youth because “usually most of the grownups break laws sometimes” (Student #21). Middle school students reported that “everybody breaks laws” (Student #36) and “ain’t nobody perfect” (Student #63). Other high school students agreed that “it’s not just about breaking laws...’cause I’m pretty sure we’ve all broken one” (Student #30) and “I don’t know nobody yet that has respected all laws” (Student #31). Another high school student focused on the actions of politicians in particular when he suggested that “laws are always broken anyway, politicians always break laws” (Student #29).
For other students, blind obedience to rules and laws was not a desirable trait for good citizens because some laws may be wrong or unfair and should be challenged or changed. That is, while laws were necessary to sustain an orderly society, not all laws were equal. High school students observed, “you have to break some rules to make things better” (Student #15) and “some laws need to be changed” (Student #47). A middle school student explained that “maybe the laws aren't right, so maybe you should do something about the laws” (Student #41) and another student in this class noted, “I think a lot of our laws are not good” (Student #42). One teacher provided a clear rationale for this reasoning:

I think that you can be a great citizen and still breaks laws...because a lot of these laws are impossible to avoid breaking. They're designed to trap people, and young people are going to break them all the time. It doesn't mean that they're a bad person, it just means that the laws are bad. (Mr. M).

This is not to say that these students and teachers did not believe in a body of laws to protect individuals and communities. Rather, they suggest that good citizens should be able to evaluate the justness or effectiveness of laws and work to change them if they feel it is necessary. Thus, blind obedience to all laws was not a desirable trait of good citizens for these students and teachers.

In a unique twist, several students attending a continuation high school observed that individuals sometimes broke laws and could learn from their mistakes to become better citizens. This orientation appeared to draw from the personal experiences of these students who had made mistakes (such as drug use, erratic school attendance, or other infractions of school rules or community
laws) and who were now actively involved in helping their communities through school-based community service activities.

One student indicated a sense of forgiveness of past mistakes that should be possible when evaluating who can be a good citizen:

That kind of bothers me because there are convicts... and I think that they're convicts because maybe they had problems and don't know how to deal with them or maybe they're involved in that life and that's the only way that they know. But they can still be a good citizen. (Student #32).

In sum, the model of citizenship as following rules and good behavior was taught in schools in part through citizenship grades. The extension of following rules in schools to respecting laws in the community, however, was balanced by skepticism of adult behaviors and the assumption that all laws are good or fair. Extending beyond simply following rules, citizenship awards and honor rolls also recognized students for helping others. This notion of being “awarded” for good citizenship in this manner also acknowledged the seemingly exceptional nature of the acts of helping others.

Overall, it appeared that models of citizenship taught explicitly or implicitly in schools in this study included citizenship as legal status taught through textbooks, citizenship as following rules encouraged through citizenship grades, and, in intermittent cases, citizenship as helping others recognized by citizenship awards or honor rolls.

I now turn my discussion to the act of voting as an act of good citizenship.

Option #1 included the act of voting as a component of “good citizenship”
because that option was intended to reflect what was expected of citizens as rule-abiding, duty-bound adults. But as the interviews progressed and as I analyzed the data, it became apparent that the only political act in the interview scenario was the act of voting. So I separate discussion of this aspect of citizenship because it became clear that students did not engage the political dimensions of citizenship in their discussions.

**Good Citizenship as Voting Adults (Selecting Option #1)**

Several students pointed out that direct service “to make things better” (as illustrated by Option #3) was insufficient to good citizenship because “good citizens” also needed to vote. A third grader in an urban area put it simply by saying, “just because they do [service] doesn’t mean they’re a good citizen” (Student #97). As one middle school student elaborated, “it’s not just making your school or neighborhood better...you should vote and you shouldn’t break laws” (Student #67).

The remainder of this chapter focuses on the limited discussion of voting by students as an act of citizenship in a political community. Voting is perhaps the least controversial element of political participation and one of the most widely used measures of citizenship activity and civic engagement (Eyler and Giles, 1999; Putnam 2000). Arguably, it is one of the most significant acts of citizenship as self-governance in a democracy as voting represents one’s preferences to be addressed in the public sphere.
More specific to service-learning, the connection between current service
as youth and future political participation as adult voters is one that is assumed.
For example, Kielsmeier (2000) observed, "(f)ostering active citizenship among
young people is by far the most commonly mentioned rationale for service-
learning. Support for this view has been strengthened by the decline among
young people in some indices of citizenship, particularly voting rates" (emphasis
added, p. 653).

It is important to place this discussion in the context of political theory to
provide insight into what may be considered desirable elements of citizen
participation. Liberalism as the most prevalent political theory has its critics for
not articulating norms of desired behavior. Its essential rule is to do no harm to
others. Political participation is assumed to be the choice of the individual.

However, advocates of communitarianism and civic republicanism desire
higher levels of social capital and increased participation in civil society. Thus
they suggest that voting should not be the only measure of responsible
citizenship. Other activities such as direct service or volunteer activities also
represent an important indicator of civic engagement and citizen participation
(Niemi and Junn, 1998). While these points are valid, attention to the political
obligations of citizens cannot be ignored because they most directly relate to our
role of citizens in self-governance.

Most civics textbooks emphasize the right and responsibility to vote as
“central to the sustenance of democracy” and “it is voting that constitutes the
primary means of participation” for citizens (Avery and Miller, 1998, p. 16). Despite the centrality of voting as civic participation in textbooks, however, very few students (four out of 104 students, or 4%) mentioned the importance of voting in connection with their understanding of citizenship or service even though it is easy to articulate and this particular citizen duty is often part of the explicit curriculum.

In short, most students primarily viewed good citizens as helping others or improving their communities, not as voting adults. While the forced choice between service and voting may have influenced the number of students’ first choices in selecting the option including voting (Option #1) versus direct service (Option #3), it is notable that when given a second choice, only two other students (2%) mentioned voting as important to being a good citizen. Eight other students rejected this option because they did not consider voting an important component of good citizenship.

Given that few of the students interviewed were of voting age, it may not be surprising that so many students did not cite voting as important to good citizenship. However, only four students (4% of the total sample) mentioned the grown-up status as the reason for not selecting Option #1, suggesting that this aspect was not a significant reason for students selecting or not selecting this model of good citizenship. The following section outlines the reasons why students do or do not value the political act of voting as an important aspect of being a good citizen.
Voting matters (Selecting option #1).

The few students who noted the importance of voting in their definition of a good citizen expressed the need to vote because helping was not enough. As explained by a sixth grader: "You should vote and you shouldn't break laws, it's kind of like a community thing...it's not just making your school or neighborhood better" (Student #67). Another middle school student cited the importance of voting "because a long time ago we couldn't vote so you should take advantage of that" (Student #100). Another middle school student (Student #71) indicated the importance of voting by referring to a state proposition that would have allowed juveniles to be treated as adults in criminal trials.

However, even students who expressed the duty to vote also indicated the limitations of the vote and the need to engage in other civic actions such as direct service. This point was illustrated by this high school student: "It is good to vote so because you have a choice for President and stuff, but they can't, like Presidents or Senators, they can't do all the work. You have to help them" (Student #8).

A few teachers supported the importance of voting. For example, a high school teacher who used service-learning in her classroom defined citizenship for her students as expressing one's voice: "Having a voice to influence government. Influence...who you have as an elected official. And voting is one way of influencing that" (Ms. Y).

A high school teacher who did not use service-learning in his classroom
represented the view of most government teachers:

My focus is that they have... some idea of how the government works. But really, that's secondary to have them at least become participants in the government through voting and understanding what citizenship is. I think that's very important. (Mr. O).

Another teacher, however, explained her mixed feelings about voting: “I think the voting is important because then you're participating directly in democracy (but) I think people get discouraged because we vote for these propositions and then they go to court” (Ms. U).

*Voting does not matter (Rejecting option #1).*

When voting was mentioned by students, more of them cited the perceived irrelevance of voting as opposed to speaking about the importance of the act. Students believed that “you don't have to vote to be a good citizen” (Student #96) for several reasons. First, students believed that voting would not necessarily create visible change: “It doesn't really matter about the voting. Even if you did vote it's not like you're going to make the place look better or anything” (Student #20). An elementary student in a border town observed, “some people don't vote, but they still help a lot in the community.”

Second, students recognized that “not all grownups vote” (Student #21) suggesting that exhortations to youth about the importance of voting ring hollow in the ears of youth. That is, if youth do not observe adults voting, why should youth believe that it is important to citizenship?
Third, other students explained that they did not vote because they may not feel knowledgeable about the candidates or issues or because they did not like the candidates. For example, “you might not know who you want to vote for” (Student #75) or “you may not like the person who’s running or something, so you’re not going to vote” (Student #79).

Fourth, other students felt that voting was an act that they could not do now, so they would focus on what they were able to do now such as direct service work through volunteering. By doing so, youth acknowledged that while they cannot vote, they still felt that they should be considered good citizens:

To me a citizen, that means you’re not only looking out for yourself, you’re looking out for the well-being of everybody...just because I’m not a grown up or just because I can’t vote, or just because I don’t break laws doesn’t mean I’m not a good citizen. (Student #83).

For many students, the issue of inclusion of young people as good citizens was significant as illustrated by a middle school student who stated that "you don't have to be a grownup to be a good citizen” (Student #50). This is not surprising because many of the students were not of voting age. So even if they could not vote, students believed that they could be good citizens:

It's what you think and what you do to make a difference. We're minors and we can't vote.... I could be a good citizen by trying my best to work in my school to help my school and help my community and that would make me a good citizen even though I'm a minor. (Student #31).

A middle school student also pointed out the general disrespect of youth by adults that was perhaps the reason why youth were not generally considered
"good citizens":

Some people don't respect you. People under 18, they just pass them off like they don't hardly even exist and most of us do have a reasonable opinion about stuff. I think if we try and make the neighborhood better, then we should be considered as...good citizens. (Student #73).

These students' opinions about the unimportance of voting were echoed in some teachers' opinions that voting was not an important expectation for citizenship. For example, a middle school teacher stated, "I don't think citizenship happens when you vote" (Ms. D).

Another high school teacher valued strategies other than direct service and encouraged political participation and challenges to the power structure to promote justice. However, she did not exhort the importance of voting without critical analysis of who was running for office:

My mother used to always say, 'every four years, we get to pick who's going to oppress for us for the next four years.' So to say, well, it's your responsibility to vote so vote between Al Gore and George Bush. And if you don't vote, that's a bad thing...I think that's crap. I think that idea of responsibility beginning and ending with that kind of false choice is criminal. (Ms. T).

For this teacher, if based on careful analysis, students did not the candidates running for office, they had the right to express their displeasure, even to refrain from voting. Thus, voting alone was insufficient to being a good citizen.
Implications

Other models of citizenship currently taught in public schools focus on legal status and good behavior. Even students engaged in an inherently active model of citizenship through service-learning found these models to be compelling to their understanding of what it meant to be a good citizen. And although voting is the most discussed citizen right duty in civics textbooks as an explicitly political act (Avery and Simmons, 1998), most students did not address it as an important component of their understanding of good citizenship. The fact that more students commented on the negative aspects of voting than on the positive aspects of it suggests that most students have an apolitical view of citizenship.

Most students involved in service-learning, however, were significantly more likely to believe good citizenship emphasized direct actions to help other or their larger communities (Option #3). In a culture that celebrates individualism and self-interest, this is an important contribution of service-learning to develop the civic character of youth (Barber, 1992; Bellah et al., 1985). The following chapter describes their reasoning for choosing Option #3.
The previous chapter examined models of citizenship – citizenship as legal status, as good behavior, as voter – taught in public schools. Because these models still hold power for teachers and students, they form a context for service-learning as a strategy for citizenship education in public schools. Thus service-learning advocates should assume that service-learning experiences influence students' understanding about good citizenship in school environments that teach competing and potentially conflicting models of citizenship.

To examine the potential impact of service-learning on students understanding of good citizenship, service-learning and comparison students were asked responded to an interview scenario. 79% of service-learning students (versus 50% of non-service-learning students) selected Option #3 and defined good citizenship as “making their school or neighborhood better.” This difference was significant, suggesting that service-learning experiences influenced what students thought it meant to be a good citizen. Although recent survey research suggests that students value active participation in their communities (Baldi et al., 2001; National Association of State Secretaries, 1999), this chapter contributes to that discourse by illuminating why students value participation by examining their reasons for selecting Option #3.
I begin with discussion of student survey data because it conveys a mixed story of the impact of service-learning. I then focus most of the discussion in this chapter on student interview data. I use Westheimer and Kahne's framework of citizenship models to organize student responses because their framework was developed as a result of examining service-learning programs. The evidence here potentially adds to their framework.

QUANTITATIVE DATA

Most large-scale studies examining the effects of service-learning have assessed the impact of a specific outcome through the use of a pre-post student attitudinal survey (Battistoni, 2002; Eyler and Giles, 1999; Melchior et al., 1997; Weiler et al. 1998). Similarly, this study collected pre-post student survey data to assess students' attitudes about "civic responsibility" (see Ammon et al., 2002, for more details about this survey). Eight items from the larger SLRDC civic responsibility instrument were selected for this study because they represented aspects of students' desire to help people or to get involved in their community. Student responses ranged from "1" (Disagree a Lot) to "4" (Agree a Lot) on Items #1, #4, #5, #9, #10 and #11. Student responses on Items #27 and #31 ranged from "1" (Not a Reason) to "3" (A Big Reason). Table 6-1 below reports the full text of the items.
Table 6-1  Text of Eight Pre-Post Student Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Text of Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #1</td>
<td>All students should learn about problems in the neighborhood or city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #4</td>
<td>Cities should take care of people who can't take care of themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #6 (Reverse)</td>
<td>It's hard for people my age to do anything about problems in my neighborhood or city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #9 (Reverse)</td>
<td>It's not important for all students to help out their school or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #10</td>
<td>I am interested in doing something about problems in my school or city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #11 (Reverse)</td>
<td>Only people who like volunteering should get involved in my school or city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #27</td>
<td>I work hard because it is good to help others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #31</td>
<td>I work hard because I think about how I would feel if I needed help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, as illustrated in Table 6-2, when pre-post test change scores are compared for the aggregate samples at the elementary, middle and high school levels, there were no significant changes at the high school level. Changes at the elementary level moved in a negative direction for Item #11 as they did at the middle school level for Items #10 and #27. (For greater ease in reviewing the data in Tables 6-2, 6-3 and 6-5, the signs for mean score changes on reverse items were reversed to reflect a consistent direction of change, i.e. negative signs illustrate a negative direction of change). Two tailed t-tests were used to test the significance of pre-post changes in students' scores at the p<0.05 level.
Table 6-2 Changes on Pre-Post Survey Items Aggregated by Grade Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CHG1</th>
<th>CHG4</th>
<th>CHG6 Rev</th>
<th>CHG9 Rev</th>
<th>CHG10</th>
<th>CHG11 Rev</th>
<th>CHG27</th>
<th>CHG31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ES=Elementary School, MS=Middle School, HS=High School; N=number of students

While these findings suggest that service-learning can have potentially negative impacts, qualitative data suggested that service-learning implementation varied significantly across classrooms, as discussed in Chapter Three. As a result, data is also reported at the classroom level. As illustrated in Tables 6-3 and 6-4, there was relatively little change as only 6 of 31 (19%) service-learning classrooms had two or more items change in positive or negative directions. Changes appeared to be more likely to occur at the lower grades than at the upper grades.

Table 6-3 Number of Classrooms with Changes on Pre-Post Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of School</th>
<th>N (w/ No Change)</th>
<th>N (w/Change on at Least One Item)</th>
<th>N (w/Significant Change on Two or More Items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pos (+)</td>
<td>Neg (-)</td>
<td>Pos (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>9 (3)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>13 (3)</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>9 (3)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=number of classrooms; numbers in parentheses represent comparison classrooms

p < .05 level
Analysis at the classroom level also suggested that service-learning experiences did not affect students in a consistent or uniform manner as illustrated in Tables 6-4 and 6-5. Significant changes in students' attitudes occurred in both positive and negative directions on seven of the eight items.

Table 6-4  Classrooms Showing Significant Changes on Individual Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #1</th>
<th>Item #4</th>
<th>Item #6</th>
<th>Item #9</th>
<th>Item #10</th>
<th>Item #11</th>
<th>Item #27</th>
<th>Item #31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Classrooms showing Change in Positive Direction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Classrooms showing Change in Negative Direction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Classrooms showing No Change</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Items in parentheses represent comparison classrooms. Total number of classrooms = 40

This finding suggests that teachers emphasized different aspects of service and citizenship, the quality of the service-learning projects may have been uneven, or that assumptions about consistent civic outcomes for service-learning should be challenged.
### Table 6-5 Changes in Pre-Post Student Survey Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CHG1</th>
<th>CHG4</th>
<th>CHG6</th>
<th>CHG9</th>
<th>CHG10</th>
<th>CHG11</th>
<th>CHG27</th>
<th>CHG31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary School Classrooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.92*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.76*</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-1.50*</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.75*</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-1.00*</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.77*</td>
<td>-0.65*</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.90*</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.68*</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES10c</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES11c</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES12c</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School Classrooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>1.09*</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS14c</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS15c</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS16c</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Classrooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.46*</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS10c</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS11c</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS12c</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. "c" = comparison classrooms

* = p<.05 level
As observed by Kahne and Westheimer (2002) and supported by this review of survey data, service-learning was not implemented uniformly across classrooms and different outcomes across classrooms required examination of the goals and practices within each classroom.

QUALITATIVE DATA

Because the survey items were not tied directly to models of citizenship and did not address key dimensions of service-learning implementation, I examined student interview data to explore their understanding of good citizenship as a potential outcome of service-learning experiences. I now turn to the option selected by the most number of students during their interviews (Option #3). Similar to the discussion of Options #1 and #2 in the previous chapter, students chose Option #3 for many different reasons that will be examined in this chapter.

Overall, the traditional models of citizenship taught in school – following rules, voting or holding the legal status of citizen – was insufficient for many students' understanding of good citizenship. Having received a citizenship award, a high school student pointed out the weakness of the citizenship grades or awards in teaching about citizenship:

What a lot of people consider being a good citizen is things like that [pointing to definition of citizenship as following laws and voting] and that's bull... what I've especially learned from this class is that most of the people that they consider citizens are people that don't do anything. (Student # 83).
In sum, most students selected Option #3 because of its emphasis on action to help others, help the community or work to make things better for self and for others as suggested by this high school student: “I’ve learned about citizenship in the past and ... all you have to do is pass a test. That's not really citizenship. Citizenship is like doing something good for your country...” (Student # 76). I now turn to Westheimer and Kahne’s framework as a way to organize these students’ views of active citizenship.

A Framework for Teaching Citizenship

As described in the literature review, Westheimer and Kahne (2002) propose three models of “good citizens” developed from students and teachers engaged in service-learning experiences: the Personally Responsible Citizen, the Participatory Citizen and the Justice-Oriented Citizen. All of the models are active in nature and each are very different in their outcomes of what students were expected to know and what role individuals were expected to play in society as citizens.

To illustrate the distinctions among these models, Westheimer and Kahne suggest that the Personally Responsible Citizen contributes food to a food drive, while the Participatory Citizen organizes the food drive and the Justice-Oriented Citizen seeks to understand and act on the economic and political infrastructures that allow people to be poor and hungry in the first place (see Table 6-6 for a
summary of their framework). These models were not considered mutually exclusive but reflected the distinctions among the primary emphases of the teachers in the way that they explained citizenship.

Table 6-6 Westheimer and Kahne’s Framework: Kinds of Citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Personally Responsible Citizen</th>
<th>Participatory Citizen</th>
<th>Justice Oriented Citizen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts responsibly in his/her community</td>
<td>Active member of community organizations and/or improvement efforts</td>
<td>Critically assesses social, political, and economic structures to see beyond surface causes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works and pays taxes</td>
<td>Organizes community efforts to care for those in need, promote economic development, or clean up environment</td>
<td>Seeks out and addresses areas of injustice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obeys laws</td>
<td>Knows how government agencies work</td>
<td>Knows about social movements and how to effect systemic change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycles, gives blood</td>
<td>Knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Action</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributes food to a food drive</td>
<td>Helps to organize a food drive</td>
<td>Explores why people are hungry and acts to solve root causes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Core Assumptions | To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must have good character; they must be honest, responsible, and law-abiding members of the community | To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must actively participate and take leadership positions within established systems and community structures | To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must question and change established systems and structures when they reproduce patterns of injustice over time |

This framework is significant because it represents an important contribution to clarify the complex and relatively unexamined relationship.
between service-learning and citizenship outcomes (Chi, 2000; Perry and Katula, 2001; Westheimer and Kahne, 2002). All service-learning experiences do not seek to foster the same type of "citizen" and a consistent set of civic or citizenship outcomes of service-learning should not be assumed. Thus, it is important to explore what citizenship means to students and teachers and to clarify different models of citizenship that are taught in classrooms.

I use Westheimer and Kahne's framework as a basis to explore the citizenship goals, structures and outcomes of service-learning. Based on review of the teacher and student data, however, there were several limitations to their framework and I draw on political theories to address these limitations. First, the model of the Personally Responsible Citizen appeared to combine distinctive dimensions of liberalism and republicanism that needed to be clarified and possibly be separated (e.g. taking care of self and helping others). Second, the notion of helping others also contained distinctive types of motivation and desired benefits (helping as an altruistic individual and helping as a community contributor) based on theories of liberalism and republicanism that suggest a new subcategory or model of citizenship to their framework, that of Personally Responsible Citizen as Community Contributor.

To gain a better understanding of differences in classroom practice, teachers responded to the same interview scenario administered to students to explore their understanding of good citizenship. Of the teachers who selected
Option #3, I coded teachers' definitions of citizenship according to Westheimer and Kahne's framework. Results are displayed in Table 6-7.

Table 6-7 Frequency of Teachers Promoting Models of Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models of Citizenship</th>
<th># of Service-learning Teachers who Promoted this Model of Citizenship&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th># of Comparison Teachers who Promoted this Model of Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personally Responsible Citizen</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice-Oriented Citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/All Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the large number of teachers who articulated aspects of the Personally Responsible Citizen and drawing on political theory, I examined the data within those classrooms to review the themes and components reflected in teacher's definitions (see Table 6-8 for results). The Personally Responsible Citizen represented the most comprehensive of Kahne and Westheimer's models, incorporating distinctive aspects of good citizenship including (1) taking personal responsibility for one's own affairs, a distinctively liberal notion, and (2) volunteering to help others in need, which could represent aspects of liberalism or republicanism, depending on the motivation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although 25 service-learning teachers were interviewed, one teacher's interview was not taped because of a malfunction of the recorder. As a result, details about this teacher's classroom and service-learning project are limited. As a result, for the purposes of this discussion, the sample size for service-learning teachers is 24.
### Table 6-8 Frequency of Teachers Promoting Revised Models of Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis in Political Theory</th>
<th>Revised Models of Citizenship</th>
<th># of Service-learning Teachers</th>
<th># of Comparison Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism (Self-Sufficiency)</td>
<td>Personally Responsible Citizen (PRC): Taking Care of Self</td>
<td>1 (1 ES)</td>
<td>2 (1 ES; 1 HS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism (Self-Sufficiency); Ethic of Care (Concern for Others)</td>
<td>Combined PRC: Taking Care of Self and Volunteering to Help Other Individuals</td>
<td>7 (1 ES; 4 MS; 2 HS)</td>
<td>1 (1 ES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Care (Concern for Others)</td>
<td>PRC: Volunteering to Help Other Individuals</td>
<td>2 (1 ES; 1 MS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communitarianism (Concern for Community Welfare)</td>
<td>PRC: Volunteering to Contribute to Community</td>
<td>6 (3 ES; 2 MS; 1 HS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Care (Concern for Others); Community Welfare</td>
<td>PRC: Volunteering to Help Other Individuals and to Contribute to Community</td>
<td>5 (3 MS; 2 HS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicanism (Importance of Participation)</td>
<td>Participatory Citizen</td>
<td>1 (1 HS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Justice (Concern for Justice); Community Welfare</td>
<td>Justice-Oriented Citizen</td>
<td>1 (1 HS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/All Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ES=Elementary School, MS=Middle School, HS=High School

As observed by Westheimer and Kahne (2002), these categories are intended to illustrate distinctive elements and primary foci of different teachers; they are not intended to be mutually exclusive but meant to suggest different models of good citizenship that may be taught through service-learning or other strategies.
Of the 21 service-learning teachers originally categorized as teaching Personally Responsible Citizen model, one teacher emphasized good citizenship as being responsible for one's own behavior and not causing harm to others. Another seven teachers included that aspect of citizenship but also emphasized a sense of altruism, of helping other individuals.

The remaining 13 teachers tended to emphasize one of two types of motivations to be active citizens beyond "taking care of self". For example, two teachers mostly emphasized good citizenship as helping individuals such as friends, family, classmates or neighbors through acts as altruistic individuals. Six other teachers, however, emphasized the actions of individuals as members of a community, of those who act because they feel responsible for the welfare of their community thus motivating them to act as community contributors for collective benefit, drawing on elements of communitarianism.

While there were five teachers who emphasized both of these motivations, there was a distinction in reasoning and motivation that deserved closer examination. As a result, drawing on communitarian and republican theories of democracy and citizenship, I propose the model of Community Contributor as a subset and distinct category within the Personally Responsible Citizen model.

Before presenting the data, as described earlier, most of the teachers in this study did not clearly or consistently articulate their goals for service-learning. As a result, most of the discussion in this chapter focuses on distinctions in reasoning within the overall student and teacher samples rather than examining
if students' responses reflected their teachers' goals. I lay out reasoning from students and teachers to substantiate distinctive models of good citizenship. When available, I provide a "classroom snapshot" to illustrate how teachers defined good citizenship and used service-learning in their classrooms.

**Personally responsible citizen.**

Drawing on political theories, I found at least three distinctions in teacher and student discussions of the Personally Responsible Citizen model and they each represent a different type of motivation to act: (a) Taking Care of Self, (b) Helping Other Individuals as an Altruistic Individual (liberalism) and (c) Helping the Community Collectively as a Community Contributor (communitarianism).

**Personally responsible citizen: Taking care of self.**

Taking responsibility for one's own matters is a classically liberal notion of individual self-sufficiency and this notion is clearly articulated in Westheimer and Kahne's framework as central to the model of Personally Responsible Citizens. For at least five teachers, this was an important element of being a good citizen. I address their views in this chapter because it is an element that is not clearly addressed through service-learning activities.

For example, as described in Chapter Four, a high school teacher (Ms. C) emphasized "productive citizenship" to her students and she hoped that through
service-learning, her students would become more responsible and better individuals, spouses, parents and workers. By becoming more personally responsible individuals, in her view, they also form the foundation to become "better citizens" (Ms. C).

A middle school teacher framed personally responsible behavior important to citizenship in more concrete ways. For this teacher, being personally responsible represented an important element of liberalism, of self-sufficiency by not becoming a burden to others:

What's important to me is a child is definitely not disrespectful and misbehaving, is being a responsible student, bringing materials and what's required of you to be in class... I'm not asking a whole lot but just a general awareness of being responsible for yourself and not making a mess behind yourself, picking up and taking responsibility for things when you need to take responsibility. (Ms. M).

Similarly, a middle school student extended this notion of self-sufficiency and responsibility important to good citizenship by not doing anything harmful to others or their larger community, another important tenet of liberalism:

I don't think they have to contribute to the community as long as they don't vandalize it and make it trashy. I think they're really good citizens if they try to make it better, but if they don't do anything (bad) then it's okay. (Student #81).

A middle school student in an urban area agreed that good citizens "don't dirty up the neighborhood...and do crime in the neighborhood" (Student #60).

Ultimately, according to liberal theories of citizenship and democracy,
individuals follow laws and take care of their own business by cleaning up after themselves, they are being a good citizen by not burdening others.

Put a different way, two teachers (one elementary school and one middle school) focused on developing "good" or "moral" people who "automatically" would be considered good citizens. For these teachers, a good citizen was defined as being a good person: "We talk about characteristics of a good person, a good moral person...They go hand in hand...If you respect people, that makes you a good person and chances are, you're a good citizen as well" (Mr. M).

Because there was not a strong example of a service-learning teacher who mostly emphasized solely this aspect of the Personally Responsible Citizen, I do not provide a classroom example.

In contrast to the Personally Responsible Citizen who simply followed rules and did no harm to others, other students and teachers described the importance of taking proactive steps to "make things better". For example, one high school student in a border community explained her understanding of good citizenship in this way: "you have to do the stuff that makes this country better or the neighborhood better" (Student #8). A middle school student in northern California agreed that when one is a good citizen, "you're actually improving on everything. You're being a good citizen instead of just being a...flat citizen" (Student #42). As a result, there were at least two types of beneficiaries and

---

2 This wording was included in the interview scenario so it may have led some students to think of citizenship as improving or making things better. It is perhaps surprising that more students did not use this language in their responses.
reasoning for taking action in one's community: (1) acting as an altruistic individual to help other individuals or (2) as a community contributor to promote collective benefit.

**Personally responsible citizen as helping other individuals.**

The majority of teachers in the Personally Responsible Citizen category emphasized a model of citizenship that focused on the importance of individual acts of helping other individuals. Many students in other service-learning classrooms agreed on this definition of good citizenship as helping on a person-to-person basis. For example, a sixth grader explained, "most of the time a good citizen listens and tries to help out" (Student #60). Thinking of other people's needs was also important to a high school student in a suburban area who defined a good citizen as someone "making things better not just for yourself but other people. [You are] just not thinking about yourself but also helping other people out" (Student #51). A few students emphasized niceness – treating other people well – as important to good citizenship. A middle school student in northern California noted that a good citizen helps people and "even a young person, you can be nice" (Student #38). Another sixth grader in northern California stated: "I think it's being nice to everyone and trying to get people not to be mean and being fair to everyone" (Student #57). For these students, being nice or civil to others was what good and helpful citizens did. While these acts were primarily individual
acts, thus a liberal notion of individual choice, this reasoning emphasized helping others that may reflect a form of virtuous liberals or attention to others that evokes aspects of republicanism in their concern for others.

A few students commented on the importance of sincerity and sacrifice when considering if an individual is a “good citizen” or not. For example, a third grade student explained that:

A good citizen is someone who does something really good, someone (who when) no one wants to plant flowers in someone's yard and they can't get the seeds, a good citizen is someone, they are busy but they'd still do it to help out that person. (Student #49).

In short, a notion of sacrifice separated good citizens from other citizens. Other students spoke of the need for sincerity in the giver and the voluntary nature of the action “because it's coming from your heart and not what people would tell you to do” (Student #74). Another sixth grader explained that good citizens must be intrinsically motivated and should not expect “rewards“:

I would say a citizen is a person that's committed and not just doing it because you think that you're going get a reward. Do it from the kindness of your heart and really respecting it and liking to do it. It's okay to get rewards but you shouldn't expect it every time. (Student #90).

The following classroom snapshot illustrates how one teacher's classroom connected her understanding of citizenship with her service-learning project. Teaching in a large high school in a metropolitan area, Ms. Y taught English and Social Studies to ninth graders. Her service-learning project was an example of this model of citizenship emphasizing actions to help other individuals.
Articulating the importance of "citizenship of the heart and soul," Ms. Y selected a service-learning project that would give her students the opportunity to practice such citizenship in a buddy reading project with elementary students (called "little ones") at a nearby school.

For example, when explaining the need for service-learning project to her students, she focused on how the service-learning project was a way for her students to make an impact by developing powerful relationships helping elementary school students. Thus the project focused on building relationships between the buddies and fostering a sense of individual efficacy in the high school students. When asked to explain her goals for the service-learning project, Ms. Y responded:

I want my children to feel that they can make a difference. That when they are adults and they have their own families, they will get involved in their schools and they will get involved in their churches and their neighborhoods. They are not going to wait for it to happen. They will be the movers and the shakers. And that they each have the confidence in themselves to be able to do that...they are going out and they are volunteering individually to make a difference.

Based on classroom observations and student interviews, this buddy reading project was well-organized and students were clearly prepared to be effective tutors, with training from reading specialists and regular opportunities to discuss and problem-solve any issues that would arise from their reading sessions. Ms. Y connected the buddy reading project to her course in World Geography in the following way:
The curriculum for 10th grade is world studies. And we looked a lot at revolutions and why do revolutions happen. Maybe one of the reasons revolutions happen is because people are illiterate. They are oppressed, they haven't been allowed to have educations. And one of the ways of teaching the impacts of illiteracy is to have children witness that, and to understand the cycles of poverty. And to do buddy reading really brings that home.

Interestingly, although Ms. Y was more articulate than many teachers about the connection of the service project to the academic curriculum, none of the students reported this connection to their social studies curriculum in their interviews. Rather, what was observed in the classroom and reported by students was the importance of personal relationships between the tutors and tutees.

This focus on helping through individual actions was consistent with this teacher's hope that, in the future, her children "feel that they can make a difference... (and that) they are volunteering individually to make a difference." One student's reasoning clearly reflected this focus on individual efficacy, suggesting that it was "better to reach out to one person a lot than to a lot of people and not really make a difference" (Pilot student).

As a result, Ms. Y and the partnering teacher made a concerted effort to ensure that the experiences were personally meaningful for their students. The preparation and reflection opportunities focused on the effectiveness of the tutoring pairs to increase the benefits to each of the reading buddies. Similarly, the evaluation and reflection that took place focused on the relationships with students responding to such questions as: "How did it go? Did anything
happen? What was right? What were the victories? What were the problems? How did you handle them?"

Students participating in this well-organized buddy reading project felt the emphasis on personal relationships and the importance of helping others and the larger community. All of the students selected Option #3 because “it’s showing how deep somebody…will get into something” (Student #15), and “showing respect to the community” (Student #50), and “just not thinking about yourself but also helping other people out” (Student #51).

Some students in the larger sample recognized that by helping others, students also helped themselves. For example, a few students selected Option #3 because by making the school or neighborhood better, it would also help it be making things better for the people who are volunteering. As a high school student in southern California pointed out: “when you live in a neighborhood, you need to make that neighborhood better so you could be comfortable” and within a school, one would want to make it better so that “you can like being there and you would like to spend more time there” (Student #8).

This sentiment is reflective of Tocqueville’s (1848/1966) concept of “self-interest rightly understood” in which individuals view their self-interest as interdependent with the interests of others. Reminiscent of Tocqueville’s view of the educative function of community associations, a few students pointed out that helping make the school or neighborhood better helps to inform them about
issues or needs in their community.

This category of reasoning and motivation begins to make a transition from a Personally Responsible Citizen as Helping Other Individuals to the Personally Responsible Citizen as Helping the Community who sees his or her responsibility to the community as a motivation to act.

**Personally responsible citizen as contributing to the community.**

For other teachers within the Personally Responsible category, there were several teachers who framed their understanding of citizenship in ways that emphasized responsibility to a community, a distinctly communitarian notion that reflects an important aspect of civic republicanism. For these teachers, individuals took action not simply because it was what helpful or altruistic people did but because it was a responsibility of individuals to contribute to their community with services that promoted some kind of collective benefit.

This version of a Personally Responsible Citizen thus reflects a communitarian orientation of understanding individuals' actions within the context of responsibility to a greater community good or concern (Etzioni, 1998). In particular, the concepts of community and collective identity are important to this model as explained by this student: "Everybody helps each other and it gets everybody farther than they would be by themselves... You put in your part and that's part of your good citizenship and then everybody together just makes a good environment" (Student # 10).
Similarly, a high school teacher defined good citizenship as "anybody who's contributing to the community in a positive way... not littering or vandalizing or putting people down" (Mr. D). A middle school teacher similarly emphasized citizenship as responsibility to contribute to the welfare of the larger community: "to be a citizen means that you're actively involved in helping your community, helping your society and hoping that whatever talents or skills you bring to it is going to help to improve it for the better" (Mr. J).

Another high school teacher who defined a good citizen as a "community member" emphasized "belonging" to community as an important element of citizenship. Although she did not use the language of citizenship in her classroom, her definition of it was embedded in her larger classroom goals:

I would hope to teach the kids that we are a community, and we are...a (local) community, and then we are a California community, and then we extend to the United States and to a world community. And that it's something that keeps growing and expanding and has all kinds of consequences. (Ms. W).

She reinforced this notion of the interconnectedness of local, state, national and international communities during a discussion of the AIDS virus with her students and by framing the reduction of a communicable disease as a service with a collective benefit:

Talking about the AIDS virus really begins to bring this kind of ...awareness to their minds. You know, to see a teen understand, 'This disease does not care, it does not discriminate, it is random, it has no concern what color you are, what economic background you are, what part of the country you live in'... Get that—we are all connected with this. (Ms. W).
Reflecting aspects of communitarian theory, many students agreed with this model of citizenship as community contributor from the most global level to the most local context, mentioning some aspect of promoting the welfare of the larger community. Unlike students who articulated good citizenship as good people who help individuals, students who articulated models of citizenship as community contributor emphasized the importance of helping a community and not simply helping other individuals.

For example, several middle school students explained that “if you help the world, then that’s pretty much just like being a good citizen” (Student #102) and good citizenship is “changing the world or something, helping the world to make it a better place” (Student #69). Or in a more local context, “a good citizen is just like a good person who’s trying to help out the city and our community” (Student #80). A high school student elaborated a little further by stating, “I could be a good citizen by trying my best to work in my school to help my school and help my community and that would make me a good citizen even though I’m a minor” (Student #31).

The fact that students engaged in a relatively abstract concept of community was distinct from students' reasoning that emphasized the importance of action to help people. Articulating a critique of liberalism, a high school student in northern California understood the challenges of the free-rider problem when one contributes to a community with interest in the collective good (Samuelson, 1954):
If you vote and you don't break laws, I don't think that it makes you a good citizen. It means that you follow the rules but you don't put your time into the community and being a citizen. You're just developing your own little world and it's living off of everybody else's little environment and they're carrying the community. (Student #10).

According to these students, it was not enough solely to take care of one's own business or interests. While some students emphasized the value of helping others - whether family, friends, peers or strangers - because that is what good, altruistic individuals should do to help other human beings, these students defined good citizenship caring for others and working on behalf of the welfare of a community at large.

Reflecting an ethic of care articulated by feminist theorists such as Gilligan (1982) and Noddings (1984, 1995), a high school student explained that good citizens, in their actions to make things better, also conveyed a sense of caring of community that extended beyond care for individuals: "because if you try to make things better, that's showing that you actually care, that you think things should be different and changed to make it better" (Student #77).

This ethic of care is important to examine because it does not clearly relate to traditional political theories. Gilligan (1982) first argued that an ethic of care was as significant as an ethic of justice in moral development (e.g. Kohlberg, 1981). Noddings (1984, 1995), in particular, has been vocal about the importance of teaching an ethic of care in schools, including "caring for self, for intimate others, for strangers and global others, for the natural world and it's non-human
creatures, for the human-made world, and for ideas” (Noddings, 1995, p. 675).

As a result, service-learning experiences may foster caring for others and for the larger community that is a source of motivation for them to act as a good citizen.

As a classroom illustration, Ms. A exemplified the model of citizen as community contributor in the way she organized a book buddy service-learning project that engaged her third graders in reading with kindergartners in their school. Although her students may have been young to understood the impact of her message, her goals clearly articulated the model of “community contributor”.

As briefly described in Chapter Four, Ms. A was one of the few teachers in the larger sample to teach explicitly about citizenship. She explained,

Our class motto is leadership, scholarship and citizenship and we talk about those three things in our classroom. I say you’re not being a good citizen if you’re not helping to make this community better. So usually citizen and community contributor are used interchangeably.

Her understanding of citizenship was explicitly communicated to her students in the context of the “collective work” of community contributorship that she described as “socialist based”: “We talk about how if we’re living in a community and one person in the community says something to hurt, even if it is just hurting themselves, it’s hurting the whole community.”

That is, individuals’ actions affected not only the immediate parties involved but they also affected a larger entity of which they were all a part, in
this case, the classroom community. The purpose of the community was to support all students in their learning and all individuals held responsibility to the whole community to promote a positive learning environment as she explained to her students.

The service-learning projects selected by the teacher supported the idea that the purpose of the classroom community was to learn as she and a kindergarten teacher at the school paired students in their classrooms to be "book buddies". In this way, Ms. A extended the collective responsibility of students to focus on learning within their own classroom to the larger school as her students read to the younger students and helped them craft the text and pictures of a story for a "Young Author's" Project.

While the teachers worked together to create activities that would foster literacy development in the kindergartners and improve the third graders' reading skills, the personal relationships between and among the book buddies were also nurtured. This teacher, in fact, chose to include buddy reading in her classroom because of the integrated nature of the experiences for her students that fostered several important outcomes:

I don’t choose it because it’s service learning. I do the buddy reading program, because I think it’s the best way to teach reading, and because it has elements that I believe are really important to good pedagogy...It has a metacognitive domain where the kids are thinking about what they need to know and so it helps them to learn better and be better readers. And it has elements of community that are really important to me and to the teachers that I do buddy-reading with.
Because the students were among the youngest students interviewed, they were not as articulate as older students in their reasoning. As indicated by the interviews, however, the students absorbed aspects of the collectivist nature of their classroom as their responses indicated the importance of collective benefits. For example, when asked about their definition of a "good citizen", of the two students who mentioned the importance of making things better, one student focused on how little kids could help "their neighborhood look better" and the other cited an example of how good citizens steps in to help: "when somebody's fighting", a good citizen "tries to stop it". The third student focused her definition of good citizenship more on the importance of following rules and laws rather than helping which would make sense for younger students.

As noted earlier, the bulk of the teacher and student data was relevant to the Personally Responsible Citizen. There were, however, two teachers and a few students who articulated models of citizenship that were relevant to the Participatory and Justice-Oriented Citizens in Westheimer and Kahne's framework. The limited data suggests that these models of good citizenship are atypical but still valid so I lay it out to suggest further study. The description of each model of good citizenship represents a classroom snapshot with greater detail of how teachers defined "good citizenship" (even if it was not communicated explicitly to students) and how they implemented service-learning in their classrooms.
Participatory citizen.

An important aspect of republicanism emphasizes community participation to develop virtue among individuals and to support self-governance. Ms. H encouraged her students to learn specific ways that groups and individuals can participate in creating "political and social change" in America. This was in contrast to most teachers that fostered the Personally Responsible Citizen model to help other people or contribute to their community.

Ms. H expected her students to learn about specific strategies of how political and social change took place throughout American history. These strategies included volunteering; working for or founding organizations; voting; changing laws and participating in social movements such as women's suffrage and civil rights. She made it a point to "literally pause every time there is an example of somebody who made a difference because they just simply went out and did it."

While she had exposed her students to ways that individuals can participate in social movements to address societal needs, ultimately she encouraged her students to do "little things" to "make a difference" now:

I do emphasize for them, so you can't be Martin Luther King Jr. So you can't be someone like that but in your world, you can be. And I use the neighborhood a great deal...They think if you don't do this big thing they're not doing it. But it's the little things that really count.
The service-learning projects in her class supported her idea of doing "little things" in the local neighborhood. As a graduation requirement, students were expected to complete 20 hours of service facilitated through the United States History courses at the high school. Ms. H's students found placements in various community-based organizations and businesses through the service-learning office and then were required to get a supervisor's signature to validate the service hours. Examples of such placements included tutoring as teachers' aides in local elementary schools, translation assistance at a local health clinic and mural design and painting as part of neighborhood beautification.

It appeared that students found it difficult to connect the "little things" they were doing through service-learning to the larger strategies for political and social change that students studied. In short, it appeared that students were getting mixed messages of how to be a good citizen. As a result, students articulated a range of views of good citizenship that included the importance of following laws, voting and helping make neighborhoods better so that "you can like being there" (Student #8).

Regardless, Ms. H was one of the few service-learning teachers who extensively discussed how and why participation in larger civic and political processes was important strategies to promote political and social change. Another teacher, Ms. J, also discussed such strategies with her students but she specifically placed these discussions (and her service-learning project) in the context of a Justice-Oriented Citizen.
Justice-oriented citizen.

The Justice-Oriented Citizen emphasized critical analysis, explicit attention to social justice and greater focus on collective strategies for change. While elements of this model reflect republican elements of concern for the welfare of all individuals within a community or society, the focus on justice evidenced in Ms. J’s classroom represented a distinctive element among service-learning teachers.

As a teacher in a large urban high school, Ms. J taught students enrolled in a three-year academy and who had not previously succeeded in school. While she did not explicitly use the phrase, “citizenship,” she defined a “good citizen” as:

somebody who fights for justice. I talk about being somebody who tries to stop racism, who tries to stop violence. I mean I talk about the action, not the name of it...I think changing things, making things better is what makes you good citizen.

This teacher also framed the opportunity to change society as a right as well as a responsibility. This way of framing social or political or community action as a right contrasted with much of the service-learning literature that promotes the teaching of civic responsibility through service-learning. She explained:

I think everybody is responsible for correcting wrongs. But I also think, it’s your right to do that. And I think everybody always gets hit with, ‘it’s your responsibility’. I think we do a really good job at making people feel like they are responsible, and if things don’t change, it is clearly their fault because they didn’t do it...I think
that trying to use responsibility has been a failure because, you know, just because you're responsible doesn't mean you're empowered.

Her perspective altered the notion of social change from a responsibility or burden to an opportunity for students and their communities to express their rights to demand better conditions for themselves, their families and their communities. She explained, "I think you have a right to better, and you have a right to influence the world to give you better. You have a right to demand better." This was especially true for her students who, as students of color or from immigrant communities, were not typically taught these messages of empowerment.

Her students engaged in a service-learning project that clearly reflected this teacher's view of citizenship in engaging in hard issues such as racism, classism and sexism. For example, when discussing various issues that concerned the students, the issue of violence was a recurring one, touching the lives of many students. As a result, the students engaged in a violence prevention project that focused on the various forms of violence in students' lives and was initiated through the teacher's relationship to a community-based organization. The program originally worked with men and women in prisons to assist them in understanding the role of violence in their lives and in controlling the violence they inflict on others. The program was adapted to run in a high school for the first time.
Two facilitators from this program came into Ms. J's class every week, first to explain the "destruction cycle" that leads individuals to commit various forms of physical, verbal and emotional violence. Students were then encouraged to share their own experiences with violence and to embrace their ability to take steps in changing their behavior to reduce violence in their lives.

In addition to these sessions, students found other issues that concerned them, including the use of racial and gender slurs in their school environment as a form of verbal and emotional violence that was inflicted on students by teachers. As a result, the students initiated a student survey that asked if they had ever been the target of verbal violence by teachers. The findings were then reported to the school administration despite the misgivings of various school staff and faculty.

Ms. J noted that the administrators loved the idea of the violence prevention program because "then kids won't fight in the halls". However, beneath the changes in behavior to reduce violence in school were the growth of critical awareness among students and a sense of empowerment to change their behaviors and their environment that would not be valued by the administration:

The other thing [the administration is] going to get is somebody who is going to say, 'this is violence you are doing to me by talking this way to me, so you have to stop doing this.' So you might get fewer fist fights, but you're also going to get people speaking the truth about all kinds of stuff that you don't necessarily want to hear.
For this teacher, the model of citizenship that she evidenced in her classroom encouraged critical thinking and analysis in her students as an important way to create “social change agents” who worked individually and collectively to address justice. This model was unique among other service-learning teachers in the sample.

Her students clearly got her message. Because this teacher encouraged questioning and critical thinking in her classroom, and encouraged her students to think about the interests of class members or others beyond themselves, all of the students from this class conveyed strong interest in helping their communities in their interviews. These students were future-oriented and focused on the interests of others as suggested by the following students:

[Good citizens are] the people who try to do something about what’s wrong with this society. They’re not just caring about themselves, they’re thinking about the well-being of other people too. (Student #83).

One student called herself a “revolutionary” as a result of her involvement in this class and this student was unique because she explicitly connected citizenship to addressing things that are “wrong with this society”. While other students commented on the need to “make things better” or “improve their communities,” this student focused on analyzing what was wrong with society and developing solutions to address those needs.

Another student became an “organizer,” valuing collective strategies to promote change and mobilizing his peers to take action: “Being able to get your people organized and together is an important trait to changing anything you
want to change." This student was unique for targeting the need to organize collectively as a strategy for change as most service-learning students focused on individual actions that resulted typically in service activities to help another person or to contribute to their community. Given Ms. J's definition of good citizenship, it is not surprising that students such as the self-proclaimed "organizer" and "revolutionary" were enrolled in her class.

Implications

The diversity of student reasoning for active citizenship suggests that service-learning experiences provided opportunities to foster different types of models of good citizenship including attitudes, motivations and behaviors. The range of definitions of good citizenship provided by teachers also indicates that teachers play a critical role in shaping service-learning experiences and intended goals for students. While this observation appears obvious to state, this aspect of service-learning implementation deserves further study (Battistoni, email communication, 10/24/02; Ammon et al., 2002).

The classroom that implicitly taught a Participatory Model of good citizenship represents an example of the potential mismatch in the ways that teachers purported to teach citizenship (and other goals) through service-learning, and the ways that service-learning was actually implemented in classrooms. This was the case across many of the classrooms in the sample and suggested that further study and resources should support teachers to strengthen
their goals and deepen their practice of service-learning to achieve desired outcomes (Ammon et al., 2002).

Although limitations in the data do not allow me to examine this next point extensively, I noticed in the data analysis that Westheimer and Kahne’s models of citizenship conflate types of motivation with types of participation. For example, in the Personally Responsible Citizen model, the motivation to be responsible and take care of oneself as well as to help others is linked to individual actions such as volunteering. The Justice-Oriented Citizen presumes a motivation to work for justice through collective strategies. I propose, however, that distinguishing types of motivations to act from levels of participation would be useful in future research because there appeared to be a range of options for both dimensions.

For example, Batson, Ahmad and Tsang (2002) have examined at least four different types of motivation for why individuals should “act for the common good”: 1) egoism (to increase one’s own welfare), 2) altruism (to increase the welfare of one or more other individuals, 3) collectivism (to increase the welfare of a group or collective) and 4) principalism (to uphold some moral principle, e.g. justice) (p. 434). These categories closely matched distinctions among reasoning exhibited by students and teachers.

In addition to differences in motivations of individuals to participate, I also found evidence of different levels of participation. This second dimension ranges from no participation (not doing anything to harm or help the
community), to **individual actions** (one-to-one helping behaviors) to **group mobilization** (collective strategies) for **civic participation** or **political participation** (to work within the “system” to influence governmental or political processes).

Figure 6-5 depicts how citizenship behavior can be arranged along these two dimensions: 1) **Types of Motivation** and 2) **Degrees of Participation**.

**Figure 6-9 Interaction of Types of Motivations with Levels of Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Motivation</th>
<th>Levels of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign a petition for candidates to work for affordable housing</td>
<td>No Participation in Public/Civic Sphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help to organize a food drive</td>
<td>Individual Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute food to a food drive</td>
<td>Group Mobilization for Civic Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Care of Community (collectivism)</td>
<td>Group Mobilization for Political Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Care of Others (altruism)</td>
<td>Group Mobilization for Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize protests for affordable housing</td>
<td>Help with campaign to raise minimum wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize group to work with city official for temporary homeless shelter</td>
<td>Help family or friends if they become unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Care of Friends/Family (egoism &amp; altruism)</td>
<td>Make sure that one stays gainfully employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Care of Self (egoism)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, most service-learning teachers implicitly or explicitly taught aspects of the Personally Responsible Citizen to develop helpful individuals or
caring community contributors through direct service experiences. In short, service-learning appeared to foster a model of citizenship that encouraged active participation in local communities, a role consistent with theorists and commentators seeking a more civic republican or communitarian model of citizenship (e.g. Barber, 1992; Bellah et al., 1985; Etzioni, 1998). This emphasis on community contributor and relation to others may help to increase forms of social capital (e.g. Putnam, 2000) and may address the shortcomings of our liberal democracy that focus on individualism to an unhealthy extreme (e.g. Bellah et al., 1985).

In contrast to studies of students’ understanding of citizenship as “narrow”, “passive” and “rights-oriented” (e.g. Conover and Searing, 2000; Ferguson, 1991; Gonzales et al., 2001), service-learning experiences appear to foster greater appreciation of active citizenship. This finding is promising for those concerned with youth civic disengagement and for advocates of service-learning.

However, the observation that most service-learning teachers focused on the Personally Responsible Citizen model, especially the helping aspect of service to the virtual exclusion of more systemic civic or political strategies to address needs in the community supports the findings from the earlier chapter on teachers’ language: they tended to avoid political connotations of citizenship, using other essentially non-political phrases such as “good person”, “good
community contributor" or "human being". In short, most teachers shied away from discussions of power, which is what politics is about.

Thus, if the most basic concept of citizenship is membership in a political community, I suggest that based on the review of the models of citizenship illustrated in this chapter, it appeared that teachers did an admirable job of preparing students to be members of a community. Given critiques of liberal democracy (e.g. Bellah et al., 1985; Etzioni, 1998; Putnam, 2000; Sandel, 1998) that suggest a greater need for caring and community in our individualistic society, this is significant contribution to our understanding of democracy and an improvement of citizenship education strategies in public schools. The Personally Responsible Citizen as Community Contributor model began to address concerns for collective benefit that moved students along the pathway from primarily focused on individual interests to increased concern about a larger community.

Evidence of attention to the political dimensions of citizenship, however, was limited as students in most service-learning classrooms were not exposed to strategies other than direct service to address community needs. As discussed in the previous chapter, even the least controversial element of political participation - voting - was not addressed extensively in most service-learning classrooms. As a result, students' view of citizenship as membership in a political community was not extensively addressed. The next and final chapter suggests implications of this finding.
Chapter Seven
CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The goal of this dissertation study was to examine the promise and potential limits of service-learning as a strategy to teach citizenship in public schools. This concluding chapter summarizes the story of this dissertation, provides a range of suggested explanations for the findings and offers implications for research, policy and practice.

Summary of Findings

(1) There was a virtual silence of "citizenship" discussions in most service-learning classrooms: While service-learning is generally touted as a strategy to promote "citizenship", the language of what it meant to be a good citizen was conspicuously missing from most service-learning experiences in this study, even as students were directly engaged in acts of service that may be viewed as acts of "good citizens".

(2) Multiple models of citizenship are taught in public schools that create a context for service-learning as citizenship education: Other models of citizenship currently taught in public schools focus on legal status, good behavior and voting, creating a context for service-learning as citizenship education. Even students engaged in an inherently active model of citizenship through service-learning found these models to be compelling to their understanding of what it meant to be a good citizen. If citizenship education is a
goal of service-learning, this finding suggests the need for students and teachers to dialogue about and address the multiple models of citizenship taught in public schools.

(3) **Service-learning appeared to foster the “heart and soul” dimensions of citizenship:** Service-learning experiences appeared to teach an active model of citizenship that emphasized the virtues of action, responsibility and caring for others - the “heart and soul” of citizenship. This model contributes to citizenship education in most public schools that typically rely on models of citizenship as legal status, and the models of good citizens as rule-abiding individuals or voters.

(4) Most service-learning experiences in this study, however, were limited in exposing students to their roles as citizens in a political community: A few teachers managed to connect their service-learning projects and classroom activities to discussions about “political and social change.” Most service-learning experiences, however, did not bridge the direct service activities with strategies relevant to participation in larger civic and political processes. As a result, few students learned about the role of citizens as advocates, as organizers to address social issues or as voters who seek to influence larger state or national policies as part of collective self-governance. Thus, I challenge the assumption in the service-learning field as laid out by Kielsmeier (2002) and others that participation in service-learning activities automatically increases youth interest in future political participation.
In sum, if citizenship is essentially defined as *membership in a political community*, service-learning experiences promoted many important aspects of *membership* with concern for individual and community responsibility. Service-learning experiences appeared to have value in that they broadened students' understanding of citizenship beyond the traditional concepts of legal status or following rules, and broadened their conceptions from formal to informal roles similar to community civics taught during the Progressive Era (Reuben, 1997).

Discussion of what it meant to be part of a *political community*, however, was very limited. Very few teachers in this study explicitly discussed with their students how civic, political and social change could address the issues and needs that caused students to provide community service in the first place. Even the least controversial element of political participation - voting - was not addressed extensively in most service-learning experiences. Not surprisingly, when asked about their definition of a good citizen, most students focused on the importance of direct actions to "make things better." Thus, the implicit models of citizenship taught through service-learning tended to be apolitical in focus, moralistic in nature and individualistic (not collectivist or group-oriented) in strategy.

This phenomenon of students highly engaged as community members but mostly disengaged as members within a political community has not gone unnoticed. The disconnect occurring within K-12 service-learning classrooms
may be contributing to what Galston has described the "civic detachment" of youth who are voting in lower proportions than earlier generations and are much less interested in keeping up with politics. It appears that youth are increasingly interested in volunteering as an alternative to politics that are viewed as "corrupt, untrustworthy and unrelated to their deeper ideals" (Galston, 2001b, p. 2).

Other survey findings also suggest increasing interest in volunteerism and decreasing interest in political participation among youth (Galston, 2001b; Gibson, 2001; National Association of Secretaries of State, 1999; Sax, 2000). Although the increased interest in volunteerism may be partially explained by functional reasons such as fulfilling high school graduation service requirements or enhancing college applications, the picture of youth civic engagement is not all dim, even as the "service-politics split" may suggest that youth may be substituting volunteerism for political participation (Sax, 2000; Walker, 2000).

I do not claim that the nature of service-learning at the K-12 level described in this dissertation explains this phenomenon. Other measures of political disengagement, including low voter participation, appear to affect all age groups (Keeter, 2002; Sax, 2000). But the apolitical nature of service-learning activities in K-12 institutions may contribute to political disengagement among youth and this possibility should be studied further.

Arguably, it may not be problematic that youth are more apt to volunteer than to vote. Volunteer service could be argued as a significant form of civic
engagement because voting is not the only significant measure of a civic-minded and engaged populace (Eyler and Giles, 1999). Also, the predilection of youth to spend their time volunteering - which gives them immediate rewards - is logical especially given the minimum voting age that limits formal youth political participation. As observed by this high school student: “I could be a good citizen by trying my best to work in my school to help my school and help my community and that would make me a good citizen even though I'm a minor” (Student #31).

In addition, volunteering instead of voting is within these students’ rights in a liberal democracy that offers individuals the ultimate choice in how intensively they choose to participate in self-governance through political activity. A middle school teacher also pointed out the disaffection that youth may feel about the voting process, suggesting that the connection between service and voting was “not a particularly valid point of view”:

What I’m finding is that the more kids know more about how their government is run, the less interested they are in voting. It’s really sad. That’s what I see at this grade level. They feel an increased sense of powerlessness, especially with some of these propositions that have passed and then declared unconstitutional. So even when their vote does count, it doesn’t…I mean, they’re old enough to understand but not old enough to overcome the sense of futility that they feel. (Ms. D).

This teacher suggests the importance of fostering an appreciation of voting as part of the democratic process. To extend this point further, others have suggested the need to teach “democracy appreciation” (Hibbing and
Rosenthal, 2002). Beyond simply teaching the institutions of government or exhorting students to perform service, civic educators should teach students an appreciation of the function of a representative democracy that assumes a diversity of opinions and interests, a legislative process that involves conflict and compromise, and fundamentally, a political process that holds leaders and their accountable through voting (Hibbing and Rosenthal, 2002).

Thus, while youth participation in civic activities is promising, if connections to the minimum level of political participation through voting are lost, then arguably the act of citizenship as self-governance is lost. Without explicit attention to these concepts, the service-learning field runs a high risk of creating youth with impoverished conceptions of citizenship, as expressed by Westheimer and Kahne (2002):

Critics note that the emphasis placed on individual character and behavior obscures the need for collective and often public sector initiatives; that this emphasis distracts attention from analysis of the causes of social problems and from systemic solutions; that volunteerism and kindness are put forward as ways of avoiding politics and policy. (p. 9).

Potential Explanations That Deserve Further Study

There are many constraints within a school environment that may explain teachers' reluctance (conscious or unconscious) to expose students to other forms of civic and political participation beyond direct service, and that deserve further study. These include:
• Educators' aversion to conflict and controversy, fear of accusations of "indoctrination" and the traditional division of church and state that lead to avoidance of many forms of political education in many schools (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Niemi and Junn, 1998);

• Ideological resistance in schools to promote or develop students' civic identities as suggested by Oakes and her colleagues (2000) in their study of educational reforms:

  At every turn, educators seeking to blend moral and civic change with high achievement encounter obstacles in the form of deeply lodged ideological preferences for schooling that favors private interests, competition, and individual gain. (p. 68);

• Current educational reform strategies such as standardized testing that leave little time or energy for teachers to engage in relatively time-intensive strategies to engage student interests, to promote deep learning beyond what is tested and, ultimately, to renew the democratic purposes of education (McNeil, 2000; Noddings, 1999);

or,

• Overall lack of awareness by teachers who view service-learning as a means of teaching political participation or addressing the lack of knowledge about government policies or causes of social problems. As succinctly stated by a service-learning teacher, "it makes sense that teachers wouldn't question policies or bring in the government
through their service-learning project if they do not see the service-
learning as a form of social change” (Mr. M).

Although teachers did not mention the restrictions placed on public
funding, they represent another set of constraints on teaching political
dimensions of citizenship (Battistoni, 2002) as articulated by the legal counsel of
the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), the federal agency
responsible for the majority of funding for K-12 service-learning. A memo sent
out to CNCS-funded programs specifically discouraged them from supporting
“1) any efforts designed to influence legislation or 2) partisan activities.” More
tellingly, the memo extends beyond legal restrictions to discourage the
perception of political activity: “it is very important that [Corporation for
National and Community Service programs] avoid even a perception that
National and Community Service participants are engaging in political
activities” (Trinity, 2002).

So although this constraint was not clearly evidenced in teacher
interviews, it deserves further exploration as a potential constraint for political
dimensions of citizenship education in public schools. I now turn to other
implications of this study’s findings for research, policy and practice.

Implications for Future Research

Data and findings from this study suggest many implications for further
research. For example, the models within Westheimer and Kahne's framework (including the proposed new category of Personally Responsible Citizen as Community Contributor) and clearer distinctions among motivations and levels of participation could form the basis of a large-scale study to explore if certain citizenship models foster specific civic outcomes of service-learning (Westheimer and Kahne, 2002).

Theoretically, it would be helpful to approach citizenship education from a developmental perspective. Although this study collected data from a wide age range of students, other frameworks such as identity development (Youniss and Yates, 1997), moral development (Killen and Horn, in press) and youth development (Flanagan, in press) would help to clarify expectations and practices of service-learning in fostering youth civic development. In particular, the potential of service-learning to foster an ethic of care in relation to students' understanding of citizenship would contribute to both moral and political theoretical discourse as well as deepen the practice of service-learning in public schools.

Also, teachers and classrooms are clearly not the only civic educator of youth. A socio-cultural framework would continue to widen attention to a broader scope of factors that shape students' civic identities including attention to the age, gender, race, class and life experiences of students (Rubin, in press). In short, examination of influences beyond school would help to illuminate how students construct their understanding of citizenship and citizen participation.
There is also a very strong need for longitudinal studies that extend beyond self-reported attitudes, and that document future civic or political behaviors (e.g. voting, other electoral and non-electoral activities, volunteering, etc.) to assess the impact of service-learning experiences on adult civic and political participation.

Finally, if citizenship education is a goal of public education, it is crucial to examine how teachers in public schools can foster the political dimensions of citizenship. Careful examination of constraints and opportunities with the public school environment is necessary to enable youth to become full participants in a political community. Drawing from experienced teachers who successfully framed service-learning in the context of larger civic and political processes, it would also be useful to explore the transition between direct service experiences and political participation, to encompass the full definition of citizenship as membership in a political community.

Implications for Policy

Based on the findings and implications suggested in this study, the most significant implication for policymakers is that citizenship outcomes of service-learning policies or mandates cannot be assumed. Since service-learning experiences are expected to foster many types of outcomes (including personal, social, academic and civic development), diverse teacher goals and project practices suggest that if policymakers have certain outcomes that they wish to
evaluate and support, professional development of teachers should be a critical dimension of policy implementation.

Also, if policymakers wish to foster active participatory citizenship in students, they need to examine some of the legal or policy issues that restrict political education in schools. For example, they should allay concerns about the possibility of indoctrination - which often is perceived as favoring "liberal" causes - and argue for the need to teach students how to participate at any level of political citizenship involvement around any set of issues, liberal or conservative. The point is not to indoctrinate students into a specific political agenda but to expose students to strategies on how to participate in the civic and political systems.

**Implications for Practice**

If citizenship education is a goal of service-learning, educators should give more explicit attention to the concept and give students opportunity to dialogue and engage in multiple perspectives and models of citizenship. Opportunities for such discourse appeared in few classrooms in this study. Without such opportunities, students (and teachers) may not make the connection between service-learning and citizenship.

As suggested by the few teachers who clearly and consistently articulated their goals for service-learning to their students, the ways that teachers frame service-learning can be valuable in fostering desirable outcomes. Teacher
intentionality of goals and their selection of service and classroom learning activities "brings back the importance of the teacher's role in civic education" (R. Battistoni, email communication, October, 24, 2002). This is in contrast to current educational reforms that attempt to "teacher-proof" the classroom and suggests the need for continued professional development to assist teachers in articulating their goals for service-learning and connecting them to service-learning projects that are consistent with those goals. This is especially important given the many potential outcomes of service-learning. If civic goals are desired, then intentional goals and practices should be in place to foster those outcomes.

Similarly, there continues to be a clear need to examine "what kind of citizen" is to be fostered through service-learning experiences, as there are several models of citizenship that may be nurtured (Westheimer and Kahne, 2002). It is also important to recognize other models of citizenship taught in public schools that also influence students' understanding of citizenship. Thus students and teachers should engage in discourse about different models of what it means to be a good citizen, rather than assuming there is consensus as to the definition. In particular, if the intent is to develop the full model of citizenship as membership in a political community, educators and students should spend more attention and time bridging the direct service experiences with those in civic and political processes to address community needs and issues.
Closing

This study was intended to illuminate the potential promise and limits of service-learning as citizenship education. At this time, I wish to appreciate the work of the teachers involved in this study. These teachers should be commended for their desire to foster students’ personal, social and civic development through service-learning since such projects go beyond the norm of what is typically expected of teachers. We as a society need to nurture and support such caring, competent teachers in public schools.

In addition, according to institutional theory, schools alone should not be critiqued for the environment in which they exist because they must reflect the priorities of their environment in order to maintain their legitimacy. Thus, ultimately, the findings may be more of a critique of our state of democracy. Ultimately, apolitical pragmatism appears to be prevalent and there is little attention paid to fully preparing “citizens” who are aware, skilled and motivated to participate in various forms of civic and political action. The key question is: if this preparation does not happen in public education, where does it happen?

Putnam (2000) has faith youth participation in service bodes well for future political participation. Current attitudes of youth that may favor direct service in place of political participation, however, should be followed carefully in future years as there are serious consequences if political disengagement continues. In many ways, the disengagement of youth as voters is already being felt. Political campaigns and candidates pay less attention to issues that matter
to younger voters and target fewer resources to get out the youth vote, creating a "downward spiral" of youth political disengagement (Goldstein & Morin, 2002).

What I find hopeful about this study is that service-learning experiences provided opportunities for teachers and students to engage in dialogues and practices that can foster an ethic of care and active participation to help other individuals or the larger community, as advocated by feminists and communitarians concerned with citizenship. These aspects of service-learning should be further explored and deepened.

In particular, the work of teachers who connected their service-learning projects to larger civic and political processes provides the greatest promise that service-learning experiences teach the fullest definition of citizenship as membership in a political community. Then service-learning advocates may begin to fulfill the vision of John W. Gardner, an inspiring man, teacher and citizen-leader who passed away in March, 2002:

"Students are given very little reason to believe that they have any responsibility to the group...Almost any kind of student public service would help to right this imbalance. It might be service that emphasizes our responsibility to the less fortunate, or to the planetary environment we leave to our grandchildren, or any number of other things. But there's one area that has unmistakable salience for the accomplishment of group purpose and that is the political process. All of our other purposes will be better served if we acquaint students with their civic responsibilities, if we give them some firsthand experience with the exasperating world in which equally worthy people want mutually incompatible things, and the political process comes into play."

(John W. Gardner, Stanford University, October 18-19, 1990)
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APPENDIX A:

SERVICE-LEARNING STUDENT INTERVIEW

Hi, I'm working with the state and your school district to learn more about how students think and feel about doing projects like (insert service project name). We are interested in making service-learning work better for students, so we want your honest opinions about this project and we want to hear suggestions on how to make such projects work better. There are no right or wrong answers, since all we want to know is what you think.

History and Implementation of Class Project

a) Identifying the Activity: My guess is that students in your class did a number of different activities this year that were related to (NAME THE PROJECT).

• What kinds of things did your class do for this project?
• Did everyone do the same thing? If not, what did you do?
• Did you get to choose? If yes, why did you choose that?
• Did you work by yourself or in a group?

b) Teacher Rationale:

• When your teacher first started talking about the project, what did s/he say about why you might want to do the project? (social issue, service, application of knowledge)

c) Student Motivation:

• After the class talked about the project, did you want to do it? Why or why not?

• (Any other reasons you either wanted to do the project or weren’t so sure about doing? )
  (fun/not fun, more interesting than alternative., done before, others doing it)
d) **Student Input/Collaboration & Preparation:**

- Did students have a chance to suggest a project or choose among a number of possible projects, or help plan how to do it? *(If yes: What did you suggest to do?)*

- Did your teacher or anyone else show you what to do or how to do the project? *(If yes, ask for elaboration: What? Was this useful for you?)*

- Did you feel like you knew pretty much what you were doing when you started the project?

e) **Reflection:**

- Did you ever talk or write about how you felt about the project, or what you learned from doing the project? What did you do? How often?

- Did you talk about the project with people outside of your class? *(family, other students or friends)*

f) **Celebration:**

- Has your class had a chance to share what you’ve been doing with other people? *(made poster, presented at school assembly, newsletter, social celebration w/community)*

**Student Outcomes**

a) **Overall Evaluation:**

- What was your favorite part of this project? Why? *(helping people, needs assessment, teaching others, preparation, working in community, subject-matter learning, reflection, groups)*

- Was there something you didn’t like about doing the project? What was it? Why didn’t you like this?

- What do you think could be done to make the project work better?
b) Motivation to Learn and Subject Matter Learning

- What was the most interesting thing you learned by doing this project?  
  (*Probe for subject matter appreciation, if not mentioned*)

- Do you feel that you know more about (SUBJECT), or learned more about how to (SPECIFIC SKILL) because of this project?  
  (Decide on skill to query ahead of time)

- Did working on this project make you like SUBJECT or this class or school more or less? In what ways?

c) Personal Skills

- What did you learn about yourself doing this project?

- What did you learn about other people working on this project?  
  (peers, teacher, community, younger kids)

- Was this project different from other group projects you have done in school?  
  (If yes: How was it different?)

- Did you have any problems doing the project?  
  (If yes: What? Did you talk about this problem in class or get advice on how to handle this?)

d) Civic Responsibility

- Do you feel that you & your class made a difference to others through your project?  
  If YES: In what ways did you made a difference?  
  If NO: Why not?

- If you had a chance to do the project again, either on your own or with a class, do you think that you COULD do it pretty easily? Why or why not?

- WOULD you want to do a project like this again?

e) Present SERVICE-LEARNING SCENARIO

  Now we want to know what you think about other service-learning projects that classes might choose to do.
• Which project do you think they should do? Why? Why not the others?

• Do you think that ALL students should help their school/neighborhood/city? WHY or why not? Did doing this project make you think it was more or less important for students to contribute like this? Why?

• Where did you learn to think this way? (probe for source of their learning: from past service experiences, from parents, from church, from peers, etc.)

Learning about Citizenship

Now we’re going to talk about the meaning of "citizenship." Lots of people think students should do projects like yours so they can learn about citizenship. But people don’t always agree about what "citizenship" means. So we’re asking what students think. Remember, we’re interested in your ideas, so don’t worry about what others might say.

a) Present GOOD CITIZEN SCENARIO

• Who do you agree with most? Or do you have a different idea of what it means to be a "good citizen?"

• WHY do you think that idea is best? What about the other ones? What do you think is wrong with those?

b) Relating Citizenship to Service-learning

• Have you changed your mind about how you can be a "good citizen" because of the project you did, or have your ideas stayed the same? (If yes: How have your ideas about good citizenship changed?)

c) Other Information about Citizenship in School:

• Has your teacher talked about "citizenship" or “good citizenship” in your class? What subject were you talking about when this word came up?

• Are there any other ways or times you’ve heard the word "citizen" or "citizenship" in school? (citizenship grade, citizenship award, textbook, other kids)
d) Family Background Information

- Are you from around here? How about your parents? (probe for where the student and their parents are from, providing rationale for information if necessary)

Closing

Thank you so much for talking with me. Your ideas and feedback will help us improve service-learning experiences for students and for teachers. Do you have any questions for me?
APPENDIX B:

COMPARISON STUDENT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Hi, I'm working with your school to learn more about how students think and feel about different kinds of school activities. There are no right or wrong answers, since we just want to know what you think.

**Previous Experience with Service**

- Before we talk about school, I'd like to know about things you have done outside of school. Have you ever done a project that helps out people or groups in your neighborhood or city? (like through your church, Scouts, families, other groups)? *If yes, what do you do? How long have you been doing it? How did you get involved in it?*

- Now in you class this year, have you done any projects that help somebody outside of your classroom either in your school, your neighborhood or the city?

- Have you done any projects in school where you got to leave the classroom or gone on any field trips? If yes, what did you do?

**Thinking about Service**

Now we want to know what you think about some projects that kids like you might choose to do to help others. I'd like to read some examples of projects other students have done and ask to choose the one that you think would be the best one to do.

**Present SERVICE-LEARNING SCENARIO**

- Which project do you think they should do? Why? Why not the others?

- Do you think that ALL students should help their school/neighborhood/city? *WHY or why not?*
*IF YES:* Where did you learn to think this way? *(probe for source of their learning: from past service experiences, from parents, from church, from peers, etc.)*
Learning about Citizenship

Now we’re going to talk about the meaning of "citizenship." Lots of people think students should do projects that help others so they can learn about citizenship. But people don't always agree about what "citizenship" means. So we’re asking what students think. Remember, we’re interested in your ideas, so don’t worry about what others might say.

Present GOOD CITIZEN SCENARIO

- Who do you agree with most? Or do you have a different idea of what it means to be a "good citizen?"

- WHY do you think that idea is best? What about the other ones? What do you think is wrong with those?

b) Other Information about Citizenship in School:

- Has your teacher ever talked about "citizenship" or “good citizenship” in your class? What subject were you talking about when this word came up?

- Are there any other ways or times you’ve heard the word "citizen" or "citizenship" in school? (citizenship grade, citizenship award, textbook, other kids)

c) Family Background Information

- Are you from around here? How about your parents? (probe for where the student and their parents are from, providing rationale for information if necessary)

Closing

Thank you so much for talking with me. Your ideas and feedback will help us improve service-learning experiences for students and for teachers. Do you have any questions for me?
Some students, Bill, Chris, and Martha, were talking about what it means to be a good citizen.

Bill said that grown-ups who vote and don’t break laws are good citizens.

Chris said that a good citizen is someone who was born in this country, or has passed a test for citizenship.

Martha said that a good citizen is anyone (even a young person) who tries to make the school or neighborhood better.

Who do you agree with most? Or do you have a different idea about what it means to be a “good citizen”? Why do you think that idea is better than the other ones?
APPENDIX D:

STUDENT CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY SURVEY

DEVELOPED BY THE
SERVICE-LEARNING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (POST)

INSTRUCTIONS

You answered some questions a few months ago about students helping their families, schools, and communities. We would like to know how you feel today about these same questions. Please remember that the questions have no right or wrong answers. Some students think or feel one way, and others think or feel another way. We want to know what you think and how you feel.

Please try to answer all of the questions. If you are not completely sure about how to answer a question, mark the answer that seems to be the closest to what you think. Please mark only one answer for each question.

Date: ___________________ Your Teacher: ___________________

Your Grade: ______ Your Class (like “math” or “English”): _______________

Your Gender: □ Male □ Female

Your Ethnicity [OPTIONAL]: Please check all that apply

- □ African/African American □ Hispanic/Latino
- □ American Indian/Alaskan Native □ Pacific Islander
- □ Asian/Asian American □ White (not of Hispanic origin)
- □ Filipino/Filipino American □ Other (please specify): _______________

Experience with Service This Year:

How many hours of service did you perform as part of your service-learning in this class? __

Did you do any other service projects at your school this year? □ Yes □ No

If “yes,” what did you do? (For example, a project undertaken by the whole school like recycling, a school club project, a leadership class project, or a service project in another class)

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
Did you do any service projects outside of school this year?  □ Yes  □ No

If "yes," with whom did you work? (For example, your friends, your family, your church/synagogue, or group like the YMCA or Scouts, etc.).

---

Here is a group of statements. Please show whether you "Disagree a lot," "Disagree a little," "Agree a little," or "Agree a lot" with each of the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think all students should learn about problems in their neighborhood or city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I am in a group, I feel comfortable saying what I think.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think people should work out their problems by themselves rather than getting help from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think cities should take care of people who can't take care of themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would rather spend time on my own activities than help someone else learn something.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It's hard for people my age to do anything about problems in their neighborhood or city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am interested in what others have to say.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I don't worry too much when I can't finish a job I promised to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It's not important for all students to help out their school or community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. I am interested in doing something about problems in my school or neighborhood.

11. I think that only people who like volunteering should get involved at school and in their city.

12. I think you should help people in general, not just people you know well.

13. I usually let others in a group do most of the work.

Sometimes things you do turn out well and sometimes they don't. Mark the box that shows how sure you are that these things will work out well for you in the end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How sure are you that things will work out well in the end when—</th>
<th>Not at all sure</th>
<th>A little bit sure</th>
<th>Pretty sure</th>
<th>Very sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. you have to figure out something by yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. you agree to help someone out?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. things start out badly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. you have to do an activity for the first time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please show how *often* you do each of the following. Check the box that says how often each thing happens: not very often, some of the time, a lot of the time, or almost all the time.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very often</td>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td>A lot of the time</td>
<td>Almost all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I share things with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I help people who are picked on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I work very well with other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I recycle and do not litter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I find fair ways to solve problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I cheer up people who are feeling sad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I help others with their schoolwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I talk to other students about helping our school or neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Reasoning About Service**

These questions ask about the reasons that you do certain things. Mark the box that shows how important you think each reason is.

- If you think something is not a reason at all for you, mark the first box under “not a reason.”
- Mark the second box if you think it is a small reason.
- Mark the third box if you think it is a big reason (a very important reason).

*When you work hard on a project that your class is doing for your school or your city, why do you usually do it?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not a reason</th>
<th>A small reason</th>
<th>A big reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Because I’ll get in trouble if I don’t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Because I think it is good to help others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Because the work is interesting to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Because I want to get a good grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Because I want the teacher to think well of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Because I think about how I would feel if I needed help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Because my friends are doing it too</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Because I get to do activities that are fun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E:

SERVICE-LEARNING TEACHER INTERVIEW

Introduction and Orientation:

The purpose of this interview is to learn more details about how service-learning is implemented in California. We want to understand what motivates teachers to use service-learning, how the service projects connect with the academic curriculum, and what students gain from their involvement in the community. Some of these questions may overlap with the teacher survey that you have completed, but we are hoping that you will elaborate your responses more fully in this interview.

History and Implementation

a) Motivation for using Service-learning:

• Why did you decide to use service-learning this year in your teaching? Why did you choose this project? (teaching, service/social issue, or personal/professional motivations, etc.)

b) Student orientation for service-learning:

• How did you present the service project (or set of possibilities or ideas) to the students?

c) Description of project activities:

• To give us a better understanding of how service projects are actually organized and implemented, could you describe what happened last week (as it relates to the project)? (Probe for preparation, doing service, reflecting, connecting to classwork, etc.) Is this the beginning/middle/end of your project? Was this a typical week? If not, how was it different?

Philosophy And Definition Of Service-Learning

a) Definition of SL:

• Service-learning is characterized in different ways by different people. How would you characterize service-learning?
• What has shaped your definition or understanding about service-learning? Have you had inservices, coaching, etc. put on at the school or by the district?

b) Success in service-learning:

• In what ways does your project fulfill your definition of service-learning?

c) Challenges in service-learning:

• What were some of the challenges you faced in designing a project that would fulfill your service-learning goals?

Design of the Service-Learning Project

a) Student role in design of project:

• To what degree and in what ways were students involved in the selection and/or planning of the project?

b) Community role in design of project:

• What role did the community partner(s) play in developing the service project?

• How did that partnership evolve (teacher initiated, community initiated, previous contact, research, etc.)? Are there plans to continue this partnership?

• What feedback mechanisms and problem-solving strategies have been developed?

c) Student Preparation:

• How were students prepared to do their service? Are students doing what they were originally prepared to do? Explain your answer.
d) Extent to which students are meeting a need:
   • To what extent do you feel the services provided by the students have met or are meeting a community need?

e) Reflection strategies:
   • What strategies are you using to encourage students to reflect on their service activity? (e.g. free or guided journal writing, small group discussions, presentations, etc.)

   • How often are you using them?

f) Evaluation (KWL's, Anchor Tasks, CR Surveys)
   • To what extent and in what ways did the KWL and Anchor tasks and the new CRS capture important aspects of students' learning?

   • Have you tried to link your service-learning activities to district/state content standards?

   • Have you tried scoring the KWL and Anchor tasks? If so, how did you do this?

Support for Service-learning

a) Teacher support for service-learning:

   • Did you work with other teachers on your service-learning project?
   • Are other staff or teachers in your school working on different service-learning projects?
   • Are more teachers or fewer teachers involved in service-learning this year at your school?

b) Teacher awareness of service-learning:

   • To what extent are all teachers in your school (or district) aware of service-learning?

   • What evidence do you have that the level of awareness has changed? To what do you attribute that change?
c) **Administrator or parent support for service-learning:**

- What kind of support (if any) did you get from administrators or parents for your service-learning activities?
- What types of support from parents, and/or school and district administration would help you improve the quality of the service-learning project?

**Student Learning Outcomes: Academic, Civic, Personal, or Social**

a) **Subject Matter Knowledge/Skill**

- What particular subject matter knowledge and skills did/do you hope that students would learn through the service activity? *(Probe for specific categories.)*
- What aspect of service-learning helped teach that particular knowledge or set of skills?
- What do you think would be good evidence that they made progress in learning those concepts or skills? Have you obtained such evidence?

b) **Personal/Social Knowledge or Skills**

- What kind of personal or social knowledge or skills did you hope students would learn through the service activity?
- What aspect of service-learning helped teach that particular knowledge or set of skills?
- What do you think would be good evidence that they made progress in learning those particular knowledge areas or skills? Have you obtained such evidence?

c) **Civic Responsibility**

- Did you hope that your students' civic/social responsibility would be affected by participating in the project?
- If so: In what sense(s) did you hope or expect your students' civic/social responsibility would be affected by participating in
the project? What knowledge or skills did you hope they would develop? (probe for definition of “civic responsibility”)

• What aspect of service-learning helped teach that particular knowledge or set of skills?

• What do you think would be good evidence that they made progress in learning those particular knowledge areas or skills? Have you obtained such evidence?

Impact on Teachers

a) Effect of service-learning on teaching:

• How has being involved in service-learning affected your view or attitudes about teaching?

• Has it affected your enjoyment of teaching?

b) Service-learning compared to other teaching strategies:

• In your opinion, how does service-learning compare to other teaching strategies? (including satisfaction with service-learning as teaching strategy)

Choosing a Service-Learning Project

Educators and students both have different reasons for choosing different projects, and sometimes those ideas change on the basis of experience trying out different projects. (Give service-learning scenario)

a) Which project would you encourage your class to do? Why?

b) Do you think all students should do service projects like these? Why?

c) In what ways has this year’s project changed your thinking about the selection or design of service-learning projects?
Learning about Citizenship

Now we’re going to talk about the meaning of "citizenship." Lots of people think students should do projects like yours so they can learn about citizenship. But people don’t always agree about what "citizenship" means. So we’re asking what students and teachers think.

a) Present GOOD CITIZEN SCENARIO

• Who do you agree with most? Or do you have a different idea of what it means to be a "good citizen?"

• WHY do you think that idea is best? What about the other ones? Why didn’t you choose them?

b) Relating Citizenship to Service-learning

• Do you talk about citizenship in your class? How have you defined it for your students?

• What specific knowledge/skills of citizenship have you been trying to teach students through their service-learning project?

• Have you seen your students’ understanding of citizenship change as a result of being involved in service-learning? In what ways? How do you know?

c) Other Information about Citizenship in School:

• Are there any other ways or times the word "citizen" or "citizenship" is talked about in your school? (citizenship grade, citizenship award, textbook, other kids)

• Some educators have asserted that students hear conflicting messages about what citizenship means. Do you agree or disagree? What should be done about this?

Institutionalization and Sustainability

a) Vision for the Future:

• What are your plans for your service-learning project in the coming year? (revised, sustained, eliminated, expanded?) How likely is it that service-learning will be in existence in your classroom/school five years from now?
b) *Factors affecting Sustainability and/or Expansion*

- What factors may impact the degree to which you can maintain and expand this effort? What do you see as the supports for your effort? What factors may detract?

- How could the state, or district, or other organizations support your efforts to advance service-learning in K-12 education?

This completes the interview. Do you have anything else you’d like to share about your experience with service-learning this year? Thank you so much for your time.
APPENDIX F:

COMPARISON TEACHER INTERVIEW

Introduction and Orientation

The purpose of this study is to gather information about how an initiative called "service-learning" is being implemented in California. We also want to interview teachers who are NOT using service-learning to give us their insights about why teachers do and do not decide to use service-learning. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Teaching Methodologies

- What kinds of teaching methods do you use in your classroom? Which methods do you feel are most successful in teaching students in your school?

- Are there some teaching methodologies that you have tried and felt were not successful or were difficult to implement? (project-based learning, group work, constructivist methodologies, volunteers in the classroom, etc.)

- What factors do you consider in deciding whether or not to use a new instructional strategy?

Goals for Students

- If you had to prioritize the different goals you have for students, what would be the two or three most important goals or teaching priorities? (Probe for goals within the following areas if not mentioned: academic, social, personal, vocational, etc.)

Views on Service-Learning

- Have you heard of service-learning? Y/N

  If yes,

- What is your understanding of what service-learning involves? What are its crucial components from your perspective?
• In your opinion, how does service-learning compare to other teaching strategies, including ones that you use?

• Do you know of other teachers at this school or in this district who use service-learning? Can you tell me about the kinds of projects they have done? Have you heard about some of the benefits or challenges they have faced in doing service learning?

• Is there support or pressure at your school from administrators, parents, or other teachers to engage in service-learning?

• Have you had an opportunity to try service-learning? If yes, what are some of the reasons that led you to choose not to do service-learning this year?

  *If no,*

• Have you ever heard of other similar teaching strategies such as project based learning, community service, or discovery learning?

• Have you tried using any of these methods in teaching? If yes, please tell me more about what you did. What were your goals in using this approach? How successful were you in accomplishing those goals?

**Learning about Citizenship**

One of the reasons we’re talking to teachers and to students is that historically, schools were responsible for teaching students about citizenship, and one of the ways that some teachers are teaching about “citizenship” is through service-learning. But people don’t always agree about what "citizenship" means. So we’re asking what students and teachers think.

**a) Present GOOD CITIZEN SCENARIO**

• Who do you agree with most? Or do you have a different idea of what it means to be a "good citizen?"

• WHY do you think that idea is best? What about the other ones? Why didn’t you choose them?

**b) Relating Citizenship to Service-learning**
• Do you talk about citizenship in your class? How have you defined it for your students?

c) Other Information about Citizenship in School:

• Are there any other ways or times the word "citizen" or "citizenship" is talked about in your school? (citizenship grade, citizenship award, textbook, other kids)

• How important is it for you to teach about citizenship in your class?

That’s it. Thank you so much for your time. Do you have anything else you’d like to add?