

2001

## An Introduction to Service-Learning for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions

Howard Muscott  
*River College*

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

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Muscott, Howard, "An Introduction to Service-Learning for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions" (2001). *Disabilities*. 13.  
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcedisabilities/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Topics in Service Learning at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Disabilities by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).



# An Introduction to Service-Learning for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions

**S**ervice-Learning (SL) is on the rise again in schools and communities. Never in the history of our nation have more students been involved in activities designed to integrate service in the community with academic learning in order to meet the needs of both the students themselves and the communities they serve. According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics (Skinner & Chapman, 1999), 32% of all public schools and nearly 1/2 of all high schools organized SL as part of the academic curriculum, with 53% reporting mandatory participation. This reciprocal engagement between schools and their communities has occurred in both K-12 and higher education over the past 20 years. The resurgence of SL as a tool for educational reform began anew in the 1980s with colleges and universities leading the way. Soon thereafter, the movement moved to high schools. The 1990s have seen the emphasis shift to younger and younger students in both elementary and middle schools.

Students with disabilities have frequently been the recipients of other people's generosity. Many SL programs involve students without disabilities and students in higher education as tutors and mentors to students with special needs (Skinner & Chapman, 1999). These programs frequently have three sets of goals: (1) meeting the academic and social needs of the students with disabilities; (2) enhancing the service provider's attitudes and skills in relating to, and working with, people who have special needs; and (3) meeting the service provider's own needs in the areas of academic, interpersonal, career, and/or civic development.

Rarely have students with disabilities in general, or those with emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD) in particular, been seen as providers of service to others. There are four possible reasons why providing service for others is a relatively new and frequently controversial practice for students with disabilities, any one of which may have limited student involvement. First, the field has historically focused programming on the disability itself, with the remediation of students' weaknesses rather than the enhancement of each student's strengths being emphasized. A related concern involves the pessimistic view that these children and adolescents have little, if anything positive to offer others. The pragmatic concern that students with disabilities lack the requisite skills needed provides a third reason. The fourth reason cited is that students with disabilities frequently lack the motivation and desire to perform acts of generosity for others.

Despite these limitations, SL began to take hold as a promising practice for students with EBD towards the end of the 1990s. A recent review of the extant literature in the field revealed 11 different programs in which students with EBD were engaged in SL (Muscott, 2000). The major thrust for this interest resulted from the growing dissatisfaction with programming for students with EBD. This dissatisfaction culminated with advocates calling out for reform (Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Van Bockern, 1990; Knitzer, Steinberg, & Fleisch, 1990). The call for reform involved a philosophical shift in emphasis from a "curriculum of control" focused on obedience and compliance (Knitzer et al., 1990) to that of a "reclaiming environment" (Brendtro et al., 1990). According to Brendtro et al. (1990), a reclaiming environment promotes attachment, achievement, autonomy, and altruism by meeting children's basic needs for belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity. The authors argue that restoring value and competence to alienated and discouraged children will require an educational environment that includes four essential elements. One element is the use of SL.

The purpose of this article is to acquaint practitioners with the practice of SL as a method for enhancing the curriculum and meeting the academic, social, and emotional needs of students with challenging behavior. Specifically, teachers, administrators, and mental health

professionals will be presented with both a rationale for incorporating SL into their programs and enough introductory information to begin the process with their students. Keeping this in mind, one should consider several questions. What is SL? How does it differ from other traditional forms of experiential learning and community service? Why is SL important for students with EBD? How does one develop a high quality SL program? What are some examples of high quality SL programs? What challenges do we face in implementing high quality SL programs with students with EBD? What evidence do we have that SL is effective for students with EBD?

### **What is Service-Learning?**

America has a long tradition of voluntary public service dating back to the inception of the Republic. While this practice has been critical to the building of American society and present in our political, philosophical, and religious traditions, community service was conspicuously absent from the formal curriculum in our nation's schools until the second half of the 20th century. One of the first formal attempts at defining the engagement between schools and community occurred when the Southern Regional Education Board (1969) defined SL as the integration of the accomplishment of tasks that meet human needs with conscious educational growth. Since that initial definition was put forth, alternative terms and definitions have flourished. In fact, in the seminal review on the topic commissioned by the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education entitled, *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book For Community and Public Service* (1990), Kendall notes that 147 different phrases have been coined to describe the engagement between schools and community. Over the years, SL has been seen as both a form of instructional pedagogy that reflects certain core values and a type of program.

### **Service-Learning as Instructional Pedagogy**

One common practice has been to define SL as pedagogy. In this context, SL is seen as an extension of Kolb's (1984) four part experiential learning process of observing or experiencing events, reflecting on the experience, developing concepts that explain the experience, and testing those concepts in alternative situations. Alt (1997) concluded that SL differs from experiential learning in its requirements that participants engage in activities that: (1) serve unmet community needs; and (2) use thematic links between classroom and off-site experiences to integrate service with intellectual challenge and academic content.

Proponents of SL as an approach to pedagogy include Zlotkowski (1990), Trainor, Muscott, and Smith (1996), and the National Service Act (1993). Zlotkowski (1993) identified the characteristics of SL as: (1) direct experiences working with communities in need and/or organizations that promote the public good; (2) reflection on the experience, and; (3) planned reciprocity of learning and benefits. Trainor et al. (1996) defined it broadly as a method of instruction in which students learn the content of the curriculum while actively participating in and reflecting on experiences that benefit both the community and themselves. In its essence, Trainor et al. (1996) argued that SL requires three basic and interconnected components — an identified community need, a delineated set of learning outcomes to be

mastered, and on-going, planned opportunities for reflection. The National and Community Service Act of 1990 (PL 101-610) defined SL as a method:

- under which students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully designed service experiences that meet actual community needs and that are coordinated in collaboration with the school and community;
- that is integrated into the students' academic curriculum and provides structured time for a student to think, talk, or write about what the student did and saw during the actual service activity;
- that provides students with opportunities to use newly acquired skills and knowledge in real-life situations in their own communities; and
- that enhances what is taught in school by extending student learning beyond the classroom and into the community and helps to foster the development of a sense of caring for others. (42 U.S.C. 12572 (a) (101))

### **Service-Learning as a Type of Program**

Service-Learning can also be defined as a type of program in which students engage the community in order to meet an unmet local, regional, national, or international need. Service-Learning programs enlist students as partners with individual members of the community, public or private community agencies, schools, businesses, governmental agencies, and even national or international organizations. These programs can occur as "one-shot" experiences that last a few hours or a day (e.g., a yearly spring park clean-up), on-going experiences that take place daily, weekly, or monthly (e.g., tutoring, visiting the elderly), or as outcome related experiences that last until a project is complete (e.g., lobbying for a community space for teens). On-going programs have the greatest potential for meeting both community and learning needs (Conrad & Hedin, 1982).

When SL is seen as a type of program, three broad types of experiences are possible. These are usually referred to as direct service, indirect service, or advocacy (Dunlap, Drew, & Gibson, 1994) or direct setting, indirect setting, or nondirect setting (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990). In direct approaches, students engage in

face-to-face interactions with the people being served at either the service site or elsewhere in the community. Common examples include tutoring, mentoring, or connecting with people who are institutionalized (e.g., senior citizen housing, group homes for people with disabilities, children in hospitals). Indirect approaches involve experiences that address a community need, but the service providers and the recipients of service are physically distant from one another. Examples of indirect experiences include writing letters to individuals who are incarcerated, providing recreational materials for people who are hospitalized, or raising money for a family in need, either in the local community or in another country. Advocacy approaches are aimed at increasing public awareness of a problem or issue affecting individuals, the community, the nation, or the world as a whole. They are sometimes considered a sub-category of indirect approaches in that they frequently don't involve direct contact between the participants. However, this is not always the case. Examples of advocacy include speaking, performing, or lobbying for equal rights for minorities, people with disabilities, or women, getting adequate school funding for the arts, getting out the vote among 18-21 year old young adults, participating as a surrogate for a student with a disability, or lobbying for the cessation of deforestation of the rainforest. Lastly, students can engage in non-direct SL experiences that take place at a service site, but do not involve direct contact with the ultimate recipients of the service. Many of these projects benefit whole communities rather than specific individuals. Examples include recycling programs, beautification projects, and building houses.

### **How Does Service-Learning Differ from Other Traditional Forms of Volunteerism and Community Service?**

Service-Learning is different from traditional forms of volunteerism and community service in a number of ways, most notably in the balance it seeks to attain between meeting the needs of the community and the needs of the learner. While community service stresses meeting community outcomes, SL programs highlight mutuality of benefit in which both community members and learners needs are valued, identified, and addressed. In

addition, SL programs differ from volunteerism by creating a reciprocal partnership among participants that aims to move from charity to community. Students are taught to view themselves as learning partners, learning themselves as they assist others to learn, rather than service providers helping the needy. Students frequently comment that they start out thinking how much they hope to help others who are needy and ultimately remark that they have learned so much from the people they set out to help. Service-Learning is also not purely academic study. Rather, analysis, application, and evaluation are combined in an effort to integrate active service with academic reflection. Service-Learning is designed to be a form of experiential learning which tests students' higher order thinking skills while deepening their understanding of the subject matter, their community, and themselves. It is also intended to foster participants' learning about social issues that are larger than the immediate needs of the specific individuals or projects. For example, high school students with EBD who peer tutor third graders with reading disabilities, may come to examine school policy that requires full inclusion with no direct instruction in reading for these youngsters. Or, elementary students with EBD who tutor Chapter 1 students in math may explore why so many of the students in the program are African-American or Hispanic. Another example occurs when middle school students with EBD who are engaged in an environmental clean-up project begin to question why local businesses are allowed to pollute the very river they are testing for toxins and pollutants. As Kendall (1990) has argued, "Programs that combine service and learning must assist participants to see the larger context behind the needs they help address" (p. 23).

### **Why is Service-Learning Important for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders?**

According to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997 (IDEA, PL 105-17 as amended), students identified as having an emotional disturbance exhibit a wide range of behaviors that reflect at least one of the following four characteristics: (1) an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers; (2) inappropriate types of behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances; (3) a general, pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; and/or (4) a tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems. Many of these students exhibit rates of noxious behaviors such as noncompliance, negativism, physical attacks on others, or destruction of property that are higher than their typical peers (Patterson, Reid, Jones, & Conger, 1975; Quay, 1986). Their experience is often one of loneliness, rejection, and social isolation with true friendships being rare (Asher & Hymel, 1981). Moreover, teachers frequently voice concern that students with EBD are not motivated to learn or complete schoolwork, particularly in areas in which their interest level is low or they are performing below grade level. These students are frequently the recipients of other people's generosity (Ioelle & Dolan, 1993), view themselves as "damaged goods" (O'Flanagan, 1997), and rarely have structured opportunities to change either their own or other people's negative perceptions of them.

Despite these negative characteristics, students with EBD also have strengths and gifts to share with others. Service-Learning offers an opportunity for students with EBD to share their gifts while

simultaneously helping them practice social, communication, and academic skills in applied settings. Moreover, because SL programs are strength-based and designed to be experiential, practical, and connected to the real world, they have the potential to accomplish three important goals: (1) promote self-esteem and self-worth through the successful completion of projects that have social importance; (2) engage disenfranchised students in school-related activities and curriculum; and (3) reframe others people’s pessimistic views of their worth and ability to contribute to society.

Many special educators and psychologists have voiced support for using SL with students with EBD (Curwin, 1993, Fitzsimmons-Lovett, 1998; Ioele & Dolan, 1993; Rockwell, 1997, Saurman & Nash, 1980; Youniss & Yates, 1997). This support has been based on the idea that helping others might be of great value to children whose behavior frequently distances them from others. For example, Saurman and Nash (1980) prescribed service to others as an antidote to the narcissism that plagues many of our children and adolescents, while Selye (1978) remarked that the most effective curative process for young people besieged by stress was reciprocal altruism. As early as 1983, Nicolaou and Brendtro proposed SL as the primary foundation of a “curriculum of caring” for students with EBD. Ioele and Dolan (1993) have argued SL programs have the potential to develop a sense of power rather than helplessness, create worthiness rather than worthlessness, and provide opportunities for giving instead of dependency. Other professionals have touted SL as a way to enhance self-respect and responsibility in students with EBD (Fitzsimmons-Lovett, 1998; Rockwell, 1997), as a vehicle for reclaiming students who were marginalized by society (Curwin, 1993), as a tool for building character and friendships (Muscott & Talis O’Brien, 1999), and as a unique “developmental opportunity that draws upon youths preexisting strengths and their desire to be meaningfully involved in society” (Youniss & Yates, 1997, p. 14).

### How Does One Develop a High Quality Service-Learning Program?

Designing a high quality SL program that meets community as well as learner needs requires careful planning, resources, and a dedication to best practices. Duckenfield and Swanson (1995) noted that SL projects typically follow four stages: preparation, action, reflection, and celebration. Muscott (1999) has argued for an adaptation of the stages to include two additional stages: evaluation and reconfiguration. In the preparation stage, community and learner needs are identified, goals and objectives are developed, projects are designed, recruitment takes place, and orientation or training is provided. A worksheet outlining the four steps in the preparation stage that has been used to help develop high quality projects is presented on the next page. The action stage involves both the service activities at the community site and any on-going preparation or practice activities that occur in the classroom. The evaluation stage consists of both formative and summative activities that occur throughout the project. The recognition stage occurs at the end of the project and consists of a formal set of activities designed to celebrate the achievements of the participants. Finally, on-going projects proceed through a reconfiguration stage where evaluation data is used to adjust needs, goals and objectives in order to redesign future

projects. Reflective activities take place throughout all stages of the project in order to inform practice.

More than a decade ago, an advisory group put together by the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education identified ten idealized principles of good practice in SL. According to the Wingspread Special Report entitled “Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning” (Porter Honnet & Poulsen, 1989) an effective SL program:

- engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good;
- provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience;
- articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved;
- allows for those with needs to define those needs;
- clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved;
- matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstances;
- expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment;
- includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals;
- insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interest of all involved; and
- is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations.

Taken as a group, these best practice principles have implications for educators developing SL programs for students with EBD. At the very minimum, SL programs should engage students in authentic projects that meet real needs, provide opportunities in which they are responsible for important tasks, connect the service to goals and objectives that are included on their IEPs, and integrate reflection in every facet of the project from identification of needs through implementation and evaluation of outcomes.

## What Challenges Do We Face In Implementing High Quality Service-Learning Programs?

While students with EBD may benefit from SL experiences developed using best practices, the very nature of the disability presents distinct challenges to effective implementation. Nicolaou and Brendtro (1983) sounded an early caution: "Most behaviorally disordered children want to be altruistic, helping or kind. However, many have learned to view hurting behavior as fashionable while helping or being 'nice' to others is seen as a sign of weakness" (p. 108). Ioele and Dolan (1993) stated that children with behavior problems frequently search for self-worth by concentrating on what they can purchase, manipulate or bargain for instead of finding ways to be of value to others. Based on their learning histories, these students have not developed caring behaviors, which address their innate need to be needed. As such, they need to be taught how to overcome their preoccupation with self and give to others; they need explicit instruction in caring.

According to Rockwell (2001), students with EBD present unique challenges to SL because of their limited social skills (particularly in the context of cooperative group activities), need for highly structured activities, and their initial tendencies to think in terms of self, rather than service to others. As a result of these realities, initial projects should be highly structured and based on a careful analysis of both group dynamics and the individual learning needs of students. Specific suggestions for creating initial projects when the group or class of students have not coalesced include:

- starting small and simple including beginning with projects that take place in the school, on school grounds or close by. Less complex projects have a greater chance of success and allow you the opportunity to "get the bugs out."
- identifying indirect, rather than direct or advocacy projects. Examples include making instructional materials for other students, books for young children, or refurbishing toys for hospitalized children.
- highlighting short-term projects with lots of preparation in advance of implementation. Examples include gardening, landscaping or murals.
- proposing projects that are of high interest to students. Students who are more interested in

## Steps in Planning for Service-Learning Projects.

### STEP 1: Preplanning

- Who will be involved in providing the service (students, staff, and families)?
- How long will the project last?
- How much class time can be used for the project?
- How much time in the field can be devoted to the service?
- Who on the administration needs to be contacted for permission?
- How will parents/guardians be notified and involved?

### STEP 2: Selecting and Pinpointing a Project

- What are the community (school, neighborhood, or broader community) needs?
- Which sites, agencies, or people should be contacted to determine interest?
- Which curriculum areas or units of study are involved?
- What learning outcomes/goals are important for students?
- What are the most appropriate annual goals on the students' IEPs?
- Will the project include direct, indirect, or advocacy activities?
- What are the students' interests and strengths?
- How can students' interests and strengths be matched to potential projects?

### STEP 3: Designing and Writing the Proposal

- Who are the key contact people at the site who will be directly involved in designing and coordinating the project?
- What specific service activities will be performed and with whom?
- What prerequisite skills will students need in order to participate?
- How will learning be assessed?
- What logistical (e.g., transportation, insurance, safety) and resource (e.g., staff, funding, materials) support is needed?
- Who is likely to provide financial support?
- What are the potential barriers to implementation (resources, logistics, or people)?
- What is the timeline for all phases of the project?
- Who needs to sign-off on the written proposal once it's completed?
- How will the project be celebrated?

### STEP 4: Training for Service:

- What types of orientation or training activities are needed prior to implementation?
- What specific information is needed in preparation for implementation?
- What on-going training or reflection is needed throughout the project?

sports, art, videotaping, carpentry, etc. would benefit from projects that include these elements.

- allowing students to choose among several projects. Having multiple community partners visit the class and pitch their site to the students is an empowering approach.
- matching students' talents to specific project roles. Projects should allow students who are more verbal, those who prefer drawing, those who like to work with their hands, etc., to use those talents in the program.
- having students help other students who are either younger or more disabled. Students with EBD often have to prove themselves in new situations and create a social pecking order. If direct service projects are chosen, those involving people who aren't a threat to students self-esteem will minimize this concern.

## What are Some Examples of High Quality Service-Learning Programs?

Descriptions of SL programs for students with EBD in the literature generally fall into one of three categories: (1) broad-based programs which reported on multiple projects with little detail about any one specific project; (2) specific project-based descriptions that highlighted an individual SL experience with a specific group of youngsters identified; and (3) larger, complex, multi-level programs which occur at more than one site and engage a variety of students with and without disabilities from different classrooms in intensive, long-term activities (Muscott, 2000). Three examples from that literature are provided here to illustrate potential programs. The first example is included because it is the most common form of SL program description in the literature. The other two examples are provided, not only because they are good examples in their own right, but also because the authors include evidence of their effectiveness.

### ***Broad Service-Learning Programs: The Service Club at Pathways***

Iole and Dolan (1993) and O'Flanagan (1997) provided a good example of the broad approach in their discussions of projects implemented by adolescents with learning and behavior problems enrolled at the Pathway School in Pennsylvania. Using a "service club" format, each year the students at the residential school chose from a variety of direct or indirect projects that lasted a day or several months. The students took responsibility for organizing the meetings and overseeing the projects. Projects included direct service activities such as regular visits to a homeless shelter and indirect activities such as working with the cook at the center to make casseroles for the homeless, cleaning and repairing used toys for preschoolers with disabilities, and raising money for UNICEF.

### ***Specific Service-Learning Programs: The From Desert to Garden Project***

The "From Desert to Garden Project" (Sandler, Vandegrift & VerBruggen, 1995) is one example of a specific SL project involving 13 teenagers from the Pascua Yaqui Tribe who dropped out of Tucson high schools. The project is a good example of both direct and indirect service. Of the 13 students involved in the project, 2 were teen parents, 2 were youthful offenders, and 1 had a history of substance abuse. The service was to research and create a native garden on the Yaqui reservation. During the project, the students wrote an article for the local paper, presented a story-telling session and garden tour for local Head Start children, researched, wrote, and produced a trilingual coloring/activity book, and organized an "Open Garden" day for the Yaqui community and other guests from Tucson. The authors reported that all 13 students completed the goals of the project, improved in basic skills performance on standardized achievement tests, and participated in career development assessments. Moreover, three received high school credits that enabled them to return to school and others made progress toward their GED diplomas. Other measures of success included personal narratives and a 35-item "Attitudes Toward Community Involvement" questionnaire. Results of a pre-post analysis of the

responses to the questionnaires showed significantly improved attitudes toward community, with greater gains shown for the at-risk students than for a control group of less at-risk peers.

### ***Multi-Level Service-Learning Programs: The Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP)***

A prime example of this type of program is the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) developed by Linda Lantieri (1999) in collaboration with Educators for Social Responsibility. The RCCP was originally designed as a primary intervention aimed at creating social responsibility in elementary children. Subsequently, a secondary intervention was developed specifically for children who were at-risk for school failure based on an early history of behaviors that correlate with violence later in life. The secondary prevention program has become a national demonstration program supported by the Center on Crime, Communities, and Culture of the Open Society Institute. It has been piloted with more than 150 at-risk students and school leaders in eight elementary schools in Anchorage, Atlanta, Vista, California, and New York City since the 1997-98 school year. The 30-week program involves team-building and conflict-resolution activities created to increase caring and cooperative behaviors and develop interpersonal skills and culminates with a SL project designed to help others in the school or local community. Examples of projects included making Easter baskets for people with mental challenges living at a center, food drives for families in need, collecting materials and books for hospitalized children, and coordinating a peace program. The program hired an outside evaluator to assess its outcomes (Metis Associates, Inc., 1998). Based on surveys and follow-up focus groups, the evaluators found that the students were overwhelmingly satisfied with the program, and had made gains in a number of areas, including getting along with others. The students' self-reports revealed they learned conflict-resolution and anger management strategies and improved their listening skills and ability to share with others. Classroom teachers reported that the at-risk students exhibited more positive attitudes toward school, an increased willingness to cooperate with peers and teachers, and increased self-esteem.

## What Evidence is there that Service-Learning is Effective for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders?

While evidence abounds for the general premise that SL is an effective practice for improving the cognitive and academic achievement, social and personal responsibility, and social development of K-12 and undergraduate college students (Astin & Sax, 1996; Cohen, Kulik, & Kulik, 1982; Conrad, 1991; Root, 1997), it is too early in the development of programs for students with EBD to make similar claims. There are four reasons for this conclusion. First, most programs involving students with EBD have been assessed qualitatively, with anecdotal reporting of student gains based on informal observations and gathered from teacher or student interviews being the methodology of choice. In most of these descriptions, triangulation of additional data sources to support the anecdotal information is missing. Second, many programs described in the literature provided little or no specific information about the specific methodology used in assessing the effectiveness of the SL program. Third, only one study used a comparison group and only two used pre-post designs. Fourth, no studies cited the use of either curriculum-based assessment measures or single subject designs to tease out the effects of SL on individual students. Given both the limited number of studies and the lack of rigorous evaluation designs, anything more than cautious optimism that SL is an effective method of instruction for students with EBD would be an overstatement. It will take stronger evidence and more rigorous research to match the anecdotal reports and qualitative studies that suggested SL had positive impacts on students' academic achievement and personality development.

Despite the limitations of the developing research base, both emerging research and the parallel history of SL for students without disabilities lends cause for optimism. The fact that the information available, limited as it may be, consistently supports the conclusion that individual students with EBD and their teachers were extremely satisfied with these programs and that students felt empowered by the experience of providing direct or indirect service to members of the community. This is

an important step in the right direction. Moreover, the fact that findings for students with EBD are consistent with early research on the effects of service on K-12 youth without disabilities is enlightening. It may be a reflection that we are in the "infancy stage" of a developmental process that the field must go through in order to move from "practice wisdom" to pure science. In fact, conclusions from the emerging literature on students with EBD parallels precisely those drawn by Conrad (1991) who noted that despite the discrepancies or vague support for certain outcomes, there is one salient finding of virtually every study of SL programs with K-12 students: "Participants, their teachers, their parents, and their community supervisors overwhelmingly agree that their programs were worthwhile, useful, enjoyable, and powerful learning experiences" (p. 545). □

## References

- Alt, M. N. (1997). How effective an educational tool is community service? *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 81(591), 8-17.
- Asher, S. R., & Hymel, S. (1981). Children's social competence in peer relations: Sociometric and behavioral assessment. In J. D. Win & M. D. Smye (Eds.), *Social competence* (pp. 121-151). New York: Guilford.
- Astin, A., & Sax, L. (1996). *How undergraduates are affected by service participation*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA, Higher Education Research Institute.
- Brendtro, L. K., Brokenleg, M., & Van Bockern, S. (1990). *Reclaiming youth at risk: Our hope for the future*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Cohen, P. A., Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. L. (1982). Educational outcomes of tutoring: A meta-analysis of findings. *American Educational Research Journal*, 237-248.
- Conrad, D. (1991). School-community participation for social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 540-548). New York: MacMillan.
- Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1982). The impact of experiential education on adolescent development. *Child and Youth Services*, 3, 57-76.
- Curwin, R. L. (1993). *The healing power of altruism*. *Educational Leadership*, 51(3), 36-39.
- Delve, C. L., Mintz, S. D., & Stewart, G. M. (1990). Promoting values development through community service: A design. In C. I. Delve, S. D. Mintz, & G. M. Stewart (eds.), *Community service as values education: New directions for student services, no. 50*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Duckenfield, M., & Swanson, L. (1995). *Service learning: Meeting the needs of youth at risk*. Clemson, SC: The National Dropout Prevention Center.
- Dunlap, N. C., Drew, S. F., & Gibson, K. (1994). *Serving to learn: High school manual*. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Education.
- Fitzsimmons-Lovett, A. (1998). Enhancing self-respect: A challenge for teachers of students with emotional/behavioral disorders. In L. M. Bullock & R. A. Gable (Eds.), *Second Mini-Library Series on Emotional/Behavioral Disorders: Successful Interventions for the 21st Century*. Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavior Disorders.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 (PL105-17), 20 U.S.C. 1400. loele, M., & Dolan, A. (1993). Teaching courage: Service learning at Pathway School. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems*, 1, 20-23.
- Kendall, J. (1990). *Combining service and learning*. Raleigh, North Carolina: National Society for Experiential Education.
- Knitzer, J., Steinberg, Z., & Fleisch, B. (1990). *At the schoolhouse door: An examination of programs and policies for children with behavioral and emotional problems*. New York: Bank Street College of Education.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lantieri, L. (1999). Hooked on altruism: Developing social responsibility in at-risk youth. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 8, 83-87.
- Metis Associates, Inc. (1998). *The Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) at-risk youth component: Summary of findings*. New York: Author.
- Muscott, H. S. (1999). *You want to trust these kids with what?* Creating service-learning opportunities for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. A keynote presentation for the Annual South Carolina Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders Conference, Myrtle Beach, SC.
- Muscott, H. S. (2000). *A review and analysis of service-learning programs involving students with emotional/behavioral disorders*. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 23, 346-368.
- Muscott, H. S., & Talis O'Brien, S. (1999). Teaching character education to students with behavioral and learning disabilities through mentoring relationships. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 22, 373-390.
- National and Community Service Act of 1990 (PL101-610), 42 U.S.C. 12572.
- National Commission on Youth (1980). *The transition of youth to adulthood: A bridge too long*. Boulder, Colorado: Author.

Nicolaou, A., & Brendtro, L. K. (1983). Curriculum for caring: Service-Learning for behaviorally disordered students. In R. B. Rutherford, Jr. (Ed.), *Monograph in Behavioral Disorders: Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth*, (Vol. 6, pp. 108-114). Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavior Disorders.

O'Flanagan, B. (1997). Building purpose through service. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 5, 223-225, 228.

Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., Jones, R. R., & Conger, R. E. (1975). *A social learning approach to family intervention: Vol. 1. Families with aggressive children*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.

Porter Honnet, E., & Poulsen, S. (Eds.) (1989). *Principles of good practice for combining service and learning*. Racine, Wisconsin: Johnson Foundation.

Quay, H. C. (1986). Conduct disorders. In H. C. Quay & J. S. Werry (Eds.), *Psychopathological disorders in childhood* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Rockwell, S. (2001). Service-Learning: Barriers, benefits, and models of excellence. In H. S. Muscott and K. J. Melloy (Eds.), *Service-Learning and Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, (Vol. 10, pp.16-21).

Rockwell, S. (1997). Building responsibility through entrepreneurship and service. *Reaching Today's Youth*, 4(1), 43-48.

Root, S. C. (1997). School-based service: A review of research for teacher educators. In J. A. Erickson & J. B. Anderson (Eds.), *Learning with the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Sandler, L., Vandegrift, J. A., & VerBruggen, C. (1995). From desert to garden: Reconnecting disconnected youth. *Educational Leadership*, 52(8), 14-16.

Saurman, K. P., & Nash, R. J. (1980). *An antidote to narcissism*. Synergist, 9, 15-18.

Selye, H. (1978). *The stress of life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

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

Southern Regional Education Board (1969). *Atlanta service-learning conference report*. Atlanta: Author.

Trainor, S. L., Muscott, H. S., & Smith, K. (1996). What, then, must we do? Service-Learning and the liberal arts academy. In P. Lizotte & N. Van Zandt (Eds.), *Insight*, 3, (pp. 131-149). Nashua, NH: Rivier College.

Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1997). *Community service and social responsibility in youth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zlotkowski, E. (1993). Service learning as campus culture. In T. Y. Kupiec (Ed.), *Rethinking tradition: Integrating service with academic study on college campuses*. Providence, R. I.: Campus Compact.

*Howard Muscott is the director of Undergraduate Special Education Programs, Graduate Programs in Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities, and the SO Prepared for Citizenship Program at Rivier College in Nashua, NH.  
(603) 897-8563 • hmuscott@rivier.edu*

Howard Muscott has more than 20 years of experience in education ranging from preschool through high school and higher education. He has been a special education teacher and principal of three different schools for students with learning and behavioral disabilities. The New Hampshire College and University Council recently honored him with an Excellence in Education Award as the New Hampshire Professor of the Year for 2000. He has provided leadership to the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD) for the past 15 years and currently serves as president of the National Foundation and the New England Subdivision.

A sixth grade boy leads students and mentors from Dr. Crisp Elementary School in a cooperative game—Photo by Howard Muscott

